DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES
HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION—SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT

19-20 GEORGE V, 1929

VOLUME III, 1929

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF MAY, 1929, TO THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF JUNE, 1929, INCLUSIVE

BEING

VOLUME CLXXXII FOR THE PERIOD 1875-1929

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1929

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Tuesday, May 14, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Ninth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills—Mr. Parent.

GERMAN REPARATIONS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): On the orders of the day of May 10, 1929, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) called my attention to a press despatch from Paris stating that the plan for revision of German reparations under consideration by the experts' committee would leave Great Britain nothing for the dominions or for arrears of interest on debt and that the British delegation would be practically certain to reject that phase of the proposals which would reduce the German payments to the dominions to zero. He requested that I lay on the table a statement showing the terms upon which the present payments are made, the arrears, if any, which exist, and the amount received to date together with any information regarding the suggested new arrangement. I accordingly now table a brief statement.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 216, for the relief of Laura Grace Osborne Lea.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 220, for the relief of Andrew Ralph Wilson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 221, for the relief of Marion Jane Stewart.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 224, for the relief of John Carbery Hickman.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 225, for the relief of Lydia Alice Hinch.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto High Park).

Bill No. 226, for the relief of Allan Plant. —Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 227, for the relief of Pansy Jean Van Luven.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 230, for the relief of Frederick Herman Schelke.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 232, for the relief of Alma Berlinda Swayne.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 235, for the relief of Edyth Viola Beacock.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 236, for the relief of Bertha Nichols.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 238, for the relief of Albert Victor Walter Holman Homan.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 240, for the relief of Frances Vera Carter Van Luven.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 243, for the relief of James Collingwood Darroch.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto High Park).

Bill No. 244, for the relief of Ross James Smalley.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto High Park).

Bill No. 248, for the relief of Fanny Green Fuchs Webber.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 249, for the relief of Henry Lawrence Jones.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 250, respecting The Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 251, to ratify and confirm the organization and the election of directors of Family Trust, and to change the name of that company to Financial Trust Company.—Mr. Laflamme.

PELEE ISLAND—FLOOD CONDITIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GOTT (South Essex): I would like to draw the attention of the government to a most alarming situation which exists in Essex county. I have under my hand a lengthy telegram apprising me that the Minister of Public Works had been informed that 7,000 acres or almost the total area of Pelee island is threatened with flood owing to the unprecedented high water in lake Erie; that a further rise in level or a storm may break the banks, and that private efforts are unable to cope with the situation. The people are asking for immediate attention and consideration on the part of the government, and they suggest in the wire that if a dry land dredge is on the ground promptly to raise the inner embankment the situation may be saved. They are asking for immediate action. The Public Works department have been communicated with and I would be glad if the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) would assure us of immediate action.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): If the hon. member, as I understand, has communicated with the

Department of Public Works, I feel sure the department will do whatever may lie within its power and scope.

FISH TRAPS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I should like permission to ask a question of the Prime Minister. In order to make the question intelligible, I would need to state very briefly the facts upon which the question is based. It will not take me more than two minutes to do so, and it will expedite the business of the house, because otherwise I would feel justified in moving the adjournment of the house to discuss the matter.

There has just finished its sitting in British Columbia a commission which has been considering the advisability of allowing the use of fish traps in northern British Columbia waters. All the fishermen, or to be accurate, 99 per cent of the fishermen in British Columbia generally, irrespective of their location, are bitterly opposed to fish traps as well as to the commission, and I think I am safe in saying that 90 per cent of the population in the vicinity affected, that is, Prince Rupert, irrespective of their occupations, are also bitterly opposed to both propositions. I said that they were against the commission. The reason for that is two-fold. First, they think it is uncalled for, the matter having been already decided, and, second, they object to a commission consisting of only one man. While he is a man of undoubted repute and integrity, they are afraid that in a matter of such importance, the personal views of one commissioner might affect his report. I now come to the question, or rather, the request that I wish to make of the Prime Minister. To be quite definite, I have put it in writing and it is this: whether, before adopting any policy of again allowing the use of fish traps in northern British Columbia waters, he would refer the matter to the house by resolution or otherwise, so that it could be fully discussed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In reply to my hon. friend I should like to say that I am only one member of the government, and I should like to have an opportunity to confer with my colleagues on the matter, and give my hon. friend a reply later.

REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC

PAPERS RELATING TO CONVENTION BETWEEN UNITED KINGDOM AND UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): I would ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) whether he can give us any information as to when the correspondence in regard to the convention of 1924 between Great Britain and the United States will be laid before the house. I have seen published in the press what purported to be partial extracts from that correspondence, and I thought that perhaps it had already been officially published in whole or in part so that one could have access to it.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I do not know whether my hon. friend was in the house yesterday when I referred to this matter. I then tabled the correspondence between Great Britain and Canada with reference to the treaty, and I mentioned at the time that the British government had advised us that they regarded the correspondence between the United States and Great Britain as largely confidential. I might say to the hon. member that when that communication was received we drew the attention of the British government to the very fact he has just mentioned, namely, that there had been press reports which would indicate that much of the correspondence had not been regarded as confidential but was already published. Having drawn the attention of the British government to that fact we hope that possibly they may be able to meet my hon. friend's wishes in the matter of having that portion of the corespondence tabled as well, but the decision must rest with the British government.

Mr. CAHAN: In the communications which passed between the Hon. Mr. Massey, representing the Canadian government, and the Secretary of State of the United States, certain quotations were made from the correspondence which had taken place. I wonder if we could have laid on the table of the house the parts of the correspondence which contain those quotations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall be very pleased to supplement the despatch which we have already sent with an exact quotation of what my hon. friend has just said.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. CANTLEY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS CANTLEY (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Some time ago I asked for information of the Department of National Revenue as follows:

What were the sums refunded by way of 99 per cent rebate of duty on imported coal used by iron and steel makers and/or other industries in each province of Canada during each year since these rebates came into force?

The answer I got to that question was that there was no record kept of the amount of drawback paid by provinces, but I was given the total amount of the refunds in each year from 1908 to 1928. That did not comply with my request. I then asked the question:

1. What persons or corporations, during the year 1928, received refunds by way of 99 per cent rebate of duty on foreign coal imported for use of iron or steel makers, and what was the amount of refund in each case?

2. What persons or corporations, during the year 1928, received refunds by way of 99 per cent rebate of duty on foreign coal imported for use of other than iron and steel manufacturers, and what was the amount of refund in each case?

To that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) replied:

1 and 2. It is contrary to the practice of the Department of Customs and Excise to give information which would disclose the business of an individual concern.

My reply to that is that a proper reply to my question would not have disclosed the business of any individual concern, because I was dealing with provinces. However, in order to make it undoubtedly possible for the department to give the information I sought, without disclosing anything that should not be disclosed, I put the question in another way:

1. Of the total amount of $1,060,096.16 reported on page 2121 of Hansard of April 29, as refunded to importers of coal during the year 1928, what was the amount refunded on coal used in the production or manufacture of iron and/or steel in each of the several provinces of Canada?

An answer to that question certainly would not disclose the private business of any concern. I also asked:

2. What was the amount so refunded on account of coal imported and used in connection with metallurgical processes other than the production of iron or steel in each of the provinces of Canada?

To the first part of my question the answer was:

1. $662,986.28.

That amount referred to the whole of Canada. The information was not given by provinces, which is what I asked for. The answer to part 2 of my question was:

For metallurgical processes other than iron or steel, nil.

I doubt if that answer is correct, although I am not quite sure. The department also gave by way of information in reply to my second question which figures I did not ask for, as follows:

For production of coke, $383,072.96.

That was not a matter of any interest to me at the time. The third part of my question read:

3. What was the amount so refunded on account of coal imported and used in connection with the production or refining of salt in each of the several provinces of Canada?

To that I received the answer:

3. $14,036.92.

And this note is added:

To give fuller details would disclose the business of individual concerns which is contrary to the practice of the Department of National Revenue.

I state emphatically that it would not. In the province of Ontario, for instance, there are two large concerns, and to give the information I asked for would not disclose the business of either one or the other, because I grouped them all together. I would also point out to the minister and to the house that in the case of bounties paid on iron and steel while the Bounty Act was in force, a statement was given each year, if I am not mistaken, of the amount of bounty paid to the different concerns coming under the act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. There is no question of privilege so far. I would ask the hon. gentleman to state his point as briefly as possible, or to put his question on the order paper.

Mr. CANTLEY: I have put my point, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to tell the Minister of National Revenue that I want and expect to get a definite answer to my question giving me the information asked for and to which I believe I am entitled.

Hon. W. D. EULER (Minister of National Revenue): Just a word in reply to my hon. friend. I want to assure him that there is absolutely no disposition whatever to withhold from him or anybody else any information that may properly be given out by the department. The statement that was made in connection with one of the answers that my hon. friend quoted that it was contrary to the practice of the department to give out information that might disclose the business of any individual concern was given entirely in good faith. In the opinion of my hon. friend the information he asked for would not disclose the business of any private concern, but in the opinion of the Commissioner of Customs the opposite was the case, and I think I am obliged to take the opinion of the executive officer of that branch of the department.

My hon. friend also questions whether one of the answers given is correct. I think that is hardly a fair statement for him to make. I have every reason to believe that when a question is answered by the department it is answered honestly and sincerely.

Perhaps one way out of the difficulty would be for my hon. friend to go to the department, where he might possibly be given access to the figures without betraying any information which it is the practice of the department to treat as confidential. That perhaps might be better than making a demand in the way in which he did.

Mr. CANTLEY: If I can get the information by applying to the department, I shall be very glad to do so. So far as the information wrongly given, or possibly wrongly given, is concerned, I still think that there was an error on the part of the officer of the department.

Mr. EULER: That might very well be cleared up if my hon. friend would visit the department.

MIGRATORY BIRDS CONVENTION ACT

RESIGNATION OF INSPECTOR R. W. TUFTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. P. QUINN (Halifax): In the absence of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) I wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to a despatch which appears in the Halifax Herald of May 9th last, from Wolfville, reading as follows:

> "Intolerable political interference, which was such as to hamper effort to deal with major offences against the Migratory Birds Convention Act, based on agreement with United States," was given to-night by R. W. Tufts, inspector in the maritime district, for his resignation which has been forwarded to Ottawa. No answer has been received from the capital as yet as to the course which will be followed there.
>
> "Recently my work has been hampered by intolerable political interference in my efforts to suppress some of the major offences against the Migratory Birds Convention Act. In these circumstances I felt obliged to tender my resignation, conditions being such as to seriously hamper my work in the protection of our wild life."

I ask the Prime Minister if it is the policy of this government to allow political interference in prosecuting offences under the Migratory Birds Act.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Not only is it the policy of the government not to permit the continuance of political interference in these cases, but it is the government's policy not to permit political interference in any case.

Mr. W. G. ERNST (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, further in connection with the question asked by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn), may I inquire of the Prime Minister, in view of the statement made by Mr. Tufts, as to the cause of his resigning being political interference—a statement, by the way, which appears in both the Halifax Chronicle and the Halifax Herald—if he will have the department which is responsible, the Department of the Interior, table all correspondence in connection with Mr. Tufts' resignation.

Mr. DUFF: I am not guilty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps the hon. member would put a motion on the order paper. I am sure that it will be granted.

Mr. ERNST: It is a matter reflecting on the government.

Mr. BENNETT: We will get the papers when the estimates are up.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sure it will be granted.

NEW WESTMINSTER PENITENTIARY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): On the orders of the day yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), regarding a return which was ordered on May 14, 1928. On page 2433 of Hansard he is reported as making the following statement:

> I will look into the matter, and if the return is ready, I shall be pleased to lay it on the table. But may I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that I do not think he has the right to criticize me, because, under the rules, a motion for a return drops after the session is over. If the motion has not been renewed this session, my hon. friend cannot get the papers as of right, although I will give them to him.

When I differed with his statement of the rule, he said:

> Yes, I am correct, I will show my hon. friend Bourinot, Beauchesne and all the other authorities. I was reading them yesterday.

My hon. leader (Mr. Bennett) also differed with the Minister of Justice. I now ask the minister if he has looked through the authorities. I would refer him to standing order 81, which reads as follows:

> A prorogation of the house shall not have the effect of nullifying an order or address of the

house for returns or papers, but all papers and returns ordered at one session of the house, if not complied with during the session, shall be brought down during the following session, without renewal of the order.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate my hon. friend on having been right. Obviously he wanted it to be made public that he was right. I may say I was right in principle; that was the former rule, because every decision of the house drops when the session is over, but the practice has been established in recent years so that these orders have not to be renewed. I shall be pleased indeed to give these papers to my hon. friend, and again I congratulate him on having been right this time.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The minister was right two years ago, but he is not up to date.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): That has been the rule of the house for many years.

MOTOR AND PLEASURE BOATS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka-Ontario): I desire to ask the Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin) when I may expect to hear from him in regard to rescinding the order in council imposing a tax on motor boats and canoes on the Muskoka lakes.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine): Mr. Speaker, I am considering the representations made to me from different sources, and expect to be in a position to give a final decision in the course of a few days.

NOVA SCOTIA—COAT OF ARMS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. A. BLACK (Halifax): May I ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret) whether he has had any correspondence with the premier of Nova Scotia with regard to the coat of arms of that province? If so, would he be good enough to lay the correspondence on the table?

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I do not recollect any such correspondence. There may have been an exchange of letters directly with the department. I will look into the matter.

IMPERIAL CABLE MERGER

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General) moved the second reading of Bill No. 213, to authorize consent to the sale of certain cable and wireless telegraph undertakings established under the Pacific Cable Acts, 1901 to 1924 (Imp.), and the West Indian Islands (Telegraph) Act, 1924 (Imp).

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (North Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, before this motion is carried, I think in fairness to the house the Postmaster General ought to make a complete statement, giving full particulars with regard to the whole bill. Until now the house has very little information with regard to the question. I have been anxiously awaiting a statement from the minister.

Mr. VENIOT: Mr. Speaker, this bill was before the house last week, and both the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) and myself went into the question as fully as possible; we gave the house all the information we could. If there is any further detailed information required, I think it ought to be given when the bill is in committee of the whole house.

Mr. HEAPS: If I may ask a question now of the minister, will he give us some enlightenment before the bill receives second reading?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We are on the second reading now.

Mr. HEAPS: Unfortunately the house has not any information worth while on which it can give judgment whether this bill ought to receive second reading or not. About the end of February I had a question on the order paper asking for the production of all documents and correspondence pertaining to this question. On the second day of May, nine weeks afterwards, the papers were tabled, but there was very little in them. I have before me now the correspondence tabled and I find a report of the conference held last year in London, England, and three letters. These letters afford very little information to the house. I find one communication dated November 10 and a telegram from our Secretary of State for External Affairs to the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs in Great Britain as follows:

Ottawa, November 10, 1927.

All circumstances make it clear that it is urgently necessary to give immediate consideration to commercial position of the Pacific cable as requested in our cables of July 30 and August 16 on which no action has yet been taken.

There is absolutely nothing in any of this correspondence to show the nature of the communications sent by the Canadian government on those dates—the summer of 1927. Further, it is stated:

Canadian government therefore proposes that a committee be set up in London comprising

representatives of the four interested governments to consider and report on whole commercial position of cable and question of broader policy as to future management, and particularly as to how cable and wireless systems can work together for their common advantage. Representatives on this committee should be invited to make concrete suggestions as to how cable might best be operated in future. Immediate appointment desirable as cable is losing money daily due to wireless competition and whole question becoming very serious one for all governments concerned.

In this paragraph it is intimated that the cable was losing money daily. From the information I have, however it appears that in the year 1927-28 the cable actually made a profit, after paying all depreciation and allowing for interest charges, of about $100,000. I have not the exact figures by me, but I can get them. The communication proceeds:

We appreciate force of considerations as to appointment of chairman and advisability of visiting cable stations to report as to what economies can be effected but believe essential first to deal with broader questions of policy, particularly as recommendations of policy committee if set up might involve change in entire organization of Pacific cable board. Canadian government therefore of opinion appointment of permanent chairman should be deferred until report of policy committee received which should be at latest before end of this year.

Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Having read this communication, I will now give the next one, dated Ottawa, December 15, 1927, from the Secretary of State for External Affairs and addressed to the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs in London.

Telegram, code, secret.
Your secret telegram 8th December—

This refers to a telegram or cablegram received from the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs in London, but there is nothing in the correspondence to show what are its contents. Evidently the whole trouble in this connection arose after the competition began between a government-owned and a privately-owned utility. The government-owned utility was giving such hot competition to the other that it was necessary for a conference to be called, and that conference resulted ultimately in a privately-owned utility, which was losing money, taking over the publicly-owned utility which was a huge success.

—competition between beam wireless and cables. Government of Canada agrees that special conference be held in London as soon as possible to deal with situation but requests that terms of reference allow of representatives sending for such British cable and wirelss bodies as they may wish and receiving from them such solutions of the existing problems as they may care to submit. Government of Canada nominates Sir Campbell Stuart as its representative on such conference board and will send a member of the Postmaster General's staff as adviser.

Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I want to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) who recommended to the government the name of Sir Campbell Stuart, because it will be shown before this debate has concluded that this gentleman was an interested party in the whole matter and was not a fit and proper person to represent the government at such a conference. There is one other communication, and this is all that the government have submitted. This communication is dated the 4th day of January, 1928, and is as follows:

Sir Campbell Stuart, C.B.E.,
Hyde Park Hotel,
Knightsbridge,
London, S.W. 1, England.

Dear Sir Campbell: I enclose papers re the Pacific cable as the minister will bring them before council to-morrow. We have sent a copy on to Mr. Gaboury also—he is in Montreal prior to sailing on the "Montrose" from St. John on the 6th. Should there be any change at council, or anything to add, we will cable you—in code, if necessary, using the code which Mr. Brown left with us when here last summer.

Yours sincerely,
Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

It does not appear where the communication was from or even who signed it. However, I should like to know who Mr. Brown is. Can the Postmaster General inform the house who this gentleman is? This is rather important, because it is evident that in the summer of 1927 a Mr. Brown—I have no idea who he is—was in Canada and left certain codes to be used if necessary. I have tried to find out who he is. I find in one of the documents before me the name of Mr. Brown, but I am not inclined to think it is the same gentleman referred to in this correspondence. I am anxious to have some information on this point, and I think the house would appreciate it if the Postmaster General would say at this stage who this Mr. Brown happens to be, to whom reference is made in the communication of January 4, 1928.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does not my hon. friend think that such questions might be more properly asked and answered in the committee stage? If the Postmaster General replies now the hon. gentleman will not be able to speak again.

Mr. HEAPS: I appreciate the point the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) makes, but had the Postmaster General given any information to the house touching the question it might put a different complexion on

[Mr. Heaps.]

the whole situation. But we have no information from the minister touching one of the largest problems before parliament this session. After a minister has introduced a bill which has received its first reading the house has a right, when it is moved that the bill be read the second time, to expect a statement regarding the whole matter; hon. members are entitled to some information for their enlightenment. Now I should like to have this information before the second reading takes place, and I do not think I am asking anything unreasonable from the Postmaster General. Here we are confronted with a short bill of two clauses and are given not a word of explanation. This is important legislation, and at least we should have information in the form of an appendix. The matter has been before the house on and off for some weeks, but as yet we are completely in the dark regarding the whole transaction.

There is also in this correspondence a letter dated December 22, in the nature of a Pacific cable policy. Immediately after this was despatched the whole question was completely changed, and the terms of reference to the committee, as shown in the report of 1928, are altogether different from those indicated in the correspondence tabled in the house on May 2. In this report the terms of reference are:

> We were appointed:—
> To examine the situation which has arisen as a result of the competition of the beam wireless with the cable services, to report thereon and to make recommendations with a view to a common policy being adopted by the various governments concerned.

We know now what that common policy was; it was a policy to take the government-owned beam system, which was paying, and the government-owned Pacific cable system, which was also paying its way, and hand them over to a private corporation. We find further that certain memoranda were submitted to the conference—on behalf of whom? Nothing was submitted by the Dominion government at all, and in fact there is nothing in the report submitted to the house which shows what was recommended by the Canadian government. We only know that the report is signed on behalf of the Dominion government, and possibly the Postmaster General may be able to give us further information before the bill is finally put through. Apparently they were in such indecent haste to get through with this conference that although the Australian representative was on his way to London the investigating committee, including a Canadian representative, refused to wait until he arrived and had an opportunity to present his views. Apparently there is some reason why we cannot get all this correspondence tabled here; there is some reason for all this secrecy. Is it because the whole transaction cannot bear the light of day? I am just beginning to wonder whether or not that is the reason.

On page 7 of the report I find the following:

> On the 25th October, 1926, the Anglo-Canadian beam service was opened, the operation being undertaken in Great Britain by the Post Office and in Canada by the Canadian Marconi Company. The rates remained the same by cable and by wireless. The long-wave service previously operated in Great Britain by the Marconi Company was terminated on the same date.

Here is a rather interesting feature in connection with this submission. In all other countries in which the beam wireless service was in operation there was a reduction in rates by one third; that is, the rates to Australia were reduced from two shillings six pence to one shilling eight pence by beam wireless; the rates to South Africa were reduced from 2 shillings to one shilling four pence and the rates to India were reduced from one shilling eight pence to one shilling one pence. Canada was the only country having beam wireless communication where no reduction was made as a result of that service. What was the reason? It was because the government of this country, or one of the departments of the government, handed over the operation of this beam wireless service to the Canadian Marconi Company, a private corporation, although there was no reason why the Post Office Department or the Department of Marine and Fisheries should not have controlled that service in Canada. Perhaps it would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, if I quoted section 18 of the report which is as follows:

> Before the opening of the beam services, the cables were working with a large margin of annual surplus, and there is evidence that the introduction of cheaper rates has already led to an appreciable increase in the total volume of telegraph traffic. But in spite of this it has been represented to us that the cable undertakings affected by the wireless rate reductions and the Indo-European land-line service have been brought to a serious position by the two-fold reduction in their receipts resulting from the operation of the lower rates introduced as a means of countering beam competition and also from the loss of a considerable volume of traffic to the beam services. It should, however, be observed with regard to the Canadian service, where wireless and cable rates are the same, that no crisis has at present arisen.

This report, which was signed by all the representatives at that conference, stated that no crisis had arisen in regard to the service,

then why was it that in 1927 the Canadian government was so anxious to get rid of this Pacific cable and other methods of communication with the other parts of the empire? I cannot reconcile this section of the report with the action of the government as shown by the one or two letters I have had the opportunity to peruse.

I have only forty minutes at my disposal; I know I will have the opportunity of going into some of these questions when we are in committee, but just here I would like to mention some of the companies represented at this conference in London:

The Eastern Associated Telegraph Companies.
The Indo-European Telegraph Company.
The Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company.
The Canadian Marconi Company.
The Wireless Telegraph Company of South Africa.
The Indian Radio Telegraph Company.

No representative appeared on behalf of the government of Canada to put forth the views and present the attitude of this country; our only information on this question is what we can obtain from the correspondence which has been tabled and from the report which is dated July, 1928. However I would like to read one or two sentences from a speech made in the British House of Commons in connection with this question. I have already referred on another occasion to the fact that the Labour party in Great Britain who opposed a similar measure very strenuously in the British House of Commons have stated in a pamphlet which they have broadcast throughout Great Britain that if they are returned to office they will repudiate this contract and will not be bound in any way by the actions of the Baldwin government. I will now quote one or two paragraphs of a speech delivered by Mr. Walter Baker, the member for East Bristol in the British House of Commons, in order to show this house the widespread ramifications of this trust which is now in control of these communications.

I will now come to some of the big people engaged in this business. The biggest and most important of these people is the firm of Lazard Brothers, a world-famed firm of financiers, who I believe have an excellent reputation. I have already referred to the fact that Lazard Brothers, whose managing director is Sir Robert Kindersley, purchased the shares of the Canadian Marconi Company. They appointed two of its three trustees, who are through the Cushion Trust, Limited, substantially interested in the Marconi Wireless Company.

Again, and this is of particular interest to Canada:

I was always very much mystified with the attitude of The Times on this question. One is tempted to regard The Times as a national newspaper, although it is perfectly obvious that on frequent occasions it is nothing but a Tory

[Mr. Heaps.]

hack. Yesterday I came across a very interesting piece of information. I found that the Hon. R. H. Brand, one of the directors, of The Times, is also a director of Messrs. Lazard Brothers. Another director is Sir Campbell Stuart, who is a member of the imperial wireless conference which is settling the whole thing. I think that is a curious combination, because it includes a member of Lazard Brothers, a member of a great organ of public opinion, and a member of the communicating body. Nevertheless, I go on hoping that from The Times I shall get the truth.

You will notice that Mr. Baker referred to Hon. R. H. Brand, one of the directors of The Times, who was also a director of Lazard Brothers. In this report which has been submitted by the government as the report of the conference of 1928 I find that one of the gentlemen who gave evidence before this committee on behalf of the Canadian Marconi Company was Hon. R. H. Brand, evidently the same gentleman. This goes to show the interlocking character of this whole business. I am sorry to have to repeat what has been said on this question in the British House of Commons, but we should have had all the correspondence tabled here so that we would have been able to form our own conclusions. I quote as follows:

The person of most interest to me in all this business is Mr. Szarvasy, who first came under our notice in 1926, when he appeared in court in connection with a reduction of the Marconi Wireless Company's capital. From 1910 he was no more than a shareholder in this country, so far as is known, but from 1912 he became a substitute director for Baron Springer, of Vienna, and he was a member of the board of the British, Foreign and Colonial Corporation, of which he is to-day the managing director and chairman. When Lord Rothermere formed his Daily Mail Trust, the British, Foreign and Colonial Corporation, through Mr. Szarvasy, issued a mortgage debenture for £9,000,000, when Mr. Szarvasy joined the board of the Daily Mail Trust, thus making one more link in the chain. Mr. Szarvasy is a director of the Dunlop Rubber Company. In April, 1922, he joined the directorate of the Danube Navigation Company, Limited, and he also became a director of the Guardian Assurance Company Limited, and of Martin's Bank Limited. He is also one of the three members of the committee of directors of the Hydro-Electric Securities Corporation of Quebec, along with the late Alfred Loewenstein, of Brussels, and Albert Pam, of J. H. Schroeder and Company. The Hydro-Electric Securities Corporation belongs to the group of interests which control the power used by the Canadian Marconi Company Limited. Baron Springer is still a member of the Anglo-International Bank Limited, which incorporates the business of the old Anglo-Austrian Bank and the British Trade Corporation. Mr. Szarvasy is the chairman of the Anglo-French Banking Corporation, which was formed a few weeks ago with Lord Derby as its president.

There have been one or two recent appointments to the board of the Marconi Company which are worthy of notice. There is Sir

Charles Coupar Barrie, who is associated on the directorate of the Danube Navigation Company with Mr. Szarvasy. Sir Coupar Barrie is interesting to me as a member of the Post Office Advisory Council. It is an excellent idea to have gentlemen of this type advising the state as to its best interests. The second addition is that of Mr. F. R. S. Balfour, who was associated on the Guardian Assurance Company with Mr. Szarvasy. Mr. Balfour appears as a member of the Bank of Montreal and the Bank of Montreal in France. This is interesting because. Canadian finance plays an important part in these matters.

When an imperial-owned cable service is transferred to a group of international financiers the house is entitled to all the information at the disposal of the government. It is not enough for the minister in charge to say that this is a secret matter. He has given us three documents which might be secret in their character, but those documents refer to certain other papers which it is important we should have so that in the consideration of this question every hon. member may have the benefit of all information available. The additional documents should be tabled.

Reference was made in those documents to a Mr. Brown, and I would like to know who that gentleman is. He must have been an intermediary of some character during the negotiations of the summer of 1927 between the Post Office Department and the other interests involved.

I strenuously object to the government handing over a government-owned utility which was beginning to show surpluses in its operation after years of deficits. I object to the manner in which this transfer was carried out as, from what I can learn from the documents, it is almost an accomplished fact and the operation of these wireless communications is now in the hands of international financiers. I believe the government has made a bad bargain. The Minister of Justice the other day referred to the fact that we were getting rid of a liability. I do not think the minister was correct in making that statement because the fact is that although money was lost for a considerable period, during the years 1927 and 1928 economies were effected which enabled a considerable surplus to be shown. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the beam service was handed over to private interests at a time when the government was losing money in the operation of the cable service between the Pacific coast and Australia. I do not know whether it was the Post Office Department or the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but some department issued a license and entered into an agreement with a private company to operate the beam service between this country and Australia. Has there ever been a more absurd or less business-like transaction than that? The government handed over this service to a private corporation to compete with the government in the operation of a utility which had been operated at a loss, but which might under the circumstances have been operated with great success. According to section 18 of the report, the gentlemen who were appointed to inquire into this matter claimed that no crisis had arisen.

I would ask the Postmaster General to refer this matter to one of the standing committees of the house. If that were done the gentlemen who were present in an advisory capacity at the conferences, such as Mr. Edwards of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and Mr. Gaboury of the Post Office Department, could appear before the committee and state the full details of the situation. Evidently the Postmaster General is not in a position at the present time to give the information to the house which the house has a right to expect, and I am going to ask the Postmaster General to refer this matter to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines instead of referring it to the committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee on the bill, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Power to consent to sale.

Mr. HEAPS: Would the Postmaster General tell us who Mr. Brown is?

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot see that there is very much importance attached to the name of Mr. Brown; I do not know who the gentleman is but I will endeavour to find out.

Mr. HEAPS: Will the Postmaster General allow this to stand until he obtains that information?

Mr. LAPOINTE: What has Mr. Brown to do with this bill?

Mr. HEAPS: He has a great deal to do with it.

Mr. VENIOT: He is not connected with the department at all.

Mr. HEAPS: All the more reason why we should know who he is.

Mr. VENIOT: If the hon. member has any suspicions he had better express them.

Mr. HEAPS: The information appears in the correspondence that a Mr. Brown was in Canada during 1927. He was in negotiation with certain officials of the government, and

I will again read certain portions of the correspondence which might explain why I want to know who Mr. Brown is. The following appears in the correspondence:

Should there be any change at council, or anything to add, we will cable you—in code, if necessary, using the code which Mr. Brown left with us when here last summer.

I think it is quite evident that Mr. Brown is an important personage. He evidently carried in his possession certain secret codes which he handed over to some official of the Post Office Department. It goes without saying that he must have been acting for some other party. If Mr. Brown acted as an intermediary between the Canadian government and some other party, I want to know who Mr. Brown is and whom he was acting for. Surely that is not an unreasonable question.

Mr. VENIOT: The only person that I or the department had any transaction with in connection with this matter was the representative of Canada on the cable board in London, Sir Campbell Stuart. I know of nobody else.

Mr. HEAPS: I do not think any hon. member will claim that I am asking for anything unreasonable. The Postmaster General has said that all the conferences he had were with Sir Campbell Stuart. I take that as being correct; I would not for a moment doubt the statement made by the Postmaster General. But this is a communication from the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General. Evidently he had been in touch with Mr. Brown. Has the house not a right to know whom the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General was negotiating with on such an important question. Why is the house to be denied an answer to my question?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will my hon. friend state what Mr. Brown seems to be doing? What is the purport of all this?

Mr. HEAPS: I am sorry that I have not made myself clear to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Brown left in this country some secret codes to be used in case of necessity between this government and other parties interested. I claim that a gentleman who comes to this country and who evidently is in negotiation with the highest officials of the Post Office Department—

Mr. LAPOINTE: The negotiations took place at a conference in London. Was Mr. Brown there? Who is he?

Mr. HEAPS: This makes it all the more confusing and all the more necessary that we should know who Mr. Brown is.

[Mr. Heaps.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is his first name?

Mr. HEAPS: There is no initial given. This letter is signed by the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. STEVENS: Who is now present.

Mr. VENIOT: I think I have discovered the mysterious Mr. Brown. There was a Mr. Brown engaged in financial arrangements for carrying on the business of the old Pacific board as between companies interested and ourselves, but he had absolutely nothing whatever to do with any negotiations carried on for this merger. That is one Mr. Brown.

Mr. STEVENS: What was his first name?

Mr. VENIOT: I forget the Christian name of the first Mr. Brown, but I have a second Mr. Brown. He is Mr. F. J. Brown, C.B., C.B.E., who is a director and who is among the list of witnesses called at the conference in London in connection with this merger. He was called by the board of trustees, if I may use that term, of the Pacific cable board when they were investigating the condition of affairs in connection with that cable prior to the suggestion of a merger. Those are the only two Browns.

Mr. HEAPS: The Mr. Brown whose name I have here represented the Indo-European Telegraph Company.

Mr. VENIOT: This Mr. F. J. Brown is the man who represents the Indo-European Telegraph Company.

Mr. HEAPS: I understand from the Postmaster General that the other Brown was a gentleman who was here in the summer of 1927 in a financial capacity. I want to know whom he represented, what financial institution if any he represented?

Mr. VENIOT: All the information I have is that he was an accountant of the Pacific cable board, but had nothing whatever to do with the merger.

Mr. HEAPS: The Postmaster General stated a moment or two ago that this Mr. Brown was interested in the financial aspects of the whole question, or he used words to that effect. Am I to understand that he represents the Pacific cable board or another board?

Mr. VENIOT: Which Mr. Brown does my hon. friend mean?

Mr. HEAPS: Not the Brown in that report, not the Brown that gave evidence, but the Brown in this letter of the 4th January. The minister need not try to confuse the matter. It is very simple.

Mr. VENIOT: I am trying to give the hon. gentleman the information, but he has placed on my shoulders a heavy task in distinguishing one Mr. Brown from the other. I have told the hon. gentleman and the committee that the first Mr. Brown, of 1927, had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the merger that has been carried on of the Pacific cable and these other interests. Surely that ought to be satisfactory. As to Mr. F. J. Brown, I am informed that he was connected with the old Pacific cable.

Mr. HEAPS: Whom was he connected with at the time this letter was written by the assistant deputy?

Mr. VENIOT: I have not a copy of the letter from which the hon. member has been reading. Will he let me have it?

Mr. HEAPS: The department of which the Postmaster General is the head has duplicated all the correspondence to make it look as though something were being given to the house. I will send it over.

Mr. NEILL: While Mr. Brown is being paged, might I ask a question of the Minister of Justice? Does he consider section one good law? It says: that the governor in council—that means the government—can sell certain things "in the manner specified in the said act," the said act being the Imperial Telegraphs Act which is named, "and upon the terms set out in the said report," the report being the report of some conference. The report of the conference is not an annex to the bill; neither is the imperial act. I have sent for the imperial act and I have the report that it is not in the library, so that I do not know whether the conference report is an annex to it or not. So far as I know, it is not. Therefore we are committing ourselves to giving the government power to do a very important thing on the terms of an invisible report of a conference. Fifty years from now, when this comes to be interpreted, that report may not be in existence or not available. This is a very important matter. The members of the house do not seem to appreciate the point of view expressed by the hon. member for North Winnipeg. Does the Minister of Justice not think we should have as an appendix to the act or embodied in the act, the actual terms upon which this important transaction is taking place?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand both the report and the imperial act have been laid on the table. I agree that perhaps it would be more convenient if the act had been printed as an annex to this bill. I do not, however, think it is essential that this should be done.

Mr. NEILL: We can find the imperial act at any time and it will be in existence for all time. But the report, which is simply a blue book of the Canadian government, may be here to-day and undiscoverable to-morrow; it may be like this Mr. Brown. I submit that it ought to be embodied in the act or be an annex to it. This act is nothing at all; it is simply a permission to the government to go out and sell something to the world at large. It is limited only by the terms of the imperial act and by the terms of this conference. There is a report somewhere. We do not have it. It is not in the act and it should be an annex to the act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If it be a mistake, the mistake was also made in the Imperial parliament, because the imperial act also refers to and is really based upon that report.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not often that I find myself so wholly in accord with the hon member for Comox-Alberni, but in this instance I do incline to the belief, although it might mean a little extra printing, that it would be desirable to put upon the statute books as an annex the authority upon which the legislation proceeds. I think the Minister of Justice will agree that the point is rather well taken.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think it would be better, but as my hon. friend knows, there was some urgency in introducing this bill.

Mr. BENNETT: I agree, and it was because of that that I hesitated to say anything at all about it, but I apprehend that the government has intimated that it will execute this agreement in any event. I think the hon. member for Argenteuil made it perfectly clear the other day that the government, if one might say so without offence, cannot do anything else. The other partners having concluded to dispose of the assets of the enterprise in a certain manner, this partner in a general way has also to do it. I can see no other way out of it myself. But inasmuch as the urgency has passed for the moment, inasmuch as the government has intimated, I assume, that it proposes to do in good faith whatever may be necessary to give effect to the arrangement arrived at by the partners who own the undertaking, I think it would not be too difficult to add as a schedule to the act the report. I think the suggestion is certainly a sound one. It is one which in times past I have urged upon legislatures and parliaments, so that anyone who picks up legislation for the purpose of ascertaining what it means shall be able without reference to any other document to find out exactly what was

done and why. Might we not, without delaying the legislation, add as an annex to it such further documents as would enable the causes operating in the mind of this parliament in arriving at the conclusion it did to be stated in the legislation itself?

While I am on my feet, I must say that I think the inquiry made by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) as to who Mr. Brown is is an entirely pertinent one.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Supose my hon. friend the Postmaster General moves that the two documents should be annexed to the bill. We could do that now.

Mr. VENIOT: I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENNETT: Probably one should be schedule "A" and the other schedule "B", because one is a report and the other is a statute. The imperial act should probably be schedule "A" and the report schedule "B".

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no objection to that.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: I would not want to be factious or captious, but I think when the hon. member for North Winnipeg asked who Mr. Brown was, in view of the correspondence and what it indicates, he was not going beyond his rights. It seems to me that when any member of parliament in connection with legislation of this kind finds correspondence indicating that a gentleman by a certain name has undertaken to play a very considerable part in connection with certain financial transactions, the minister in charge of the bill should be in a position to indicate who the gentleman is and why he comes into the transaction. Surely the department must have known who Mr. Brown was, or else Mr. Brown would not have left the secret code. It does occur to me that a member of parliament, if he were making a just and proper inquiry in order that he might be informed in relation to the matter, might properly expect the minister in charge to indicate who Mr. Brown was.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He got his answer, unless we are to produce Mr. Brown as schedule "C".

Mr. BENNETT: That is not quite good enough.

Mr. NEILL: The Canadian terminus of the Pacific cable is in the district I represent, at a place called Bamfield. I would like to know if these employees of the board who entered the service somewhat as if they were entering the government service with the prospect of continuity of service, pension, and so forth, will in the transfer have their rights as to continuity of service, salary, and pension safeguarded.

Mr. VENIOT: That is to be found in the agreement which will be signed by the contracting parties. I have a skeleton of the agreement here.

Mr. NEILL: Is the agreement to be embodied as an appendix to the bill?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. NEILL: How am I to find out if the interests of these employees are being safeguarded?

Mr. VENIOT: While I have not got the details at hand at the present moment, I can let my hon. friend have all those details.

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps the Postmaster General would say whether steps have been taken to look fully after their rights.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: In what manner is that provision being made? Let us have the details.

Mr. VENIOT: The agreement provides that the company shall take over the existing staff of the board subject to and in accordance with the provisions set out in the second schedule thereof.

Mr. NEILL: Could not the agreement be laid on the table?

Mr. HEAPS: Why not table the other correspondence?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The agreement is not published yet.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not think it should be tabled until all the parties have signed.

Mr. GEARY: Who are the parties to the agreement and what is it all about?

Mr. STEVENS: The chairman was just about to call section 1 carried, but if these schedules are to be added, section 1 will have to be amended by adding after the words "chapter 7" the words "as set forth in schedule A attached hereto," and by adding after the word "report" the words "schedule B." I understand that it would require one of the ministers of the crown to move this amendment.

Mr. HEAPS: I would suggest that the minister report progress so that all the information desired by the committee can be

made available when the bill is taken up again. In the meantime perhaps he would find out who Mr. Brown is.

Mr. VENIOT: I have already given the information touching Mr. Brown.

Mr. HEAPS: No.

Mr. VENIOT: I cannot see what other information I can give. I have already stated that Mr. Brown was connected with the Pacific cable board, that he was an officer of that board. I might add that when he came to Canada he accompanied Sir Campbell Stuart, and while on this side they visited and inspected the West Indies cable system.

Mr. HEAPS: When was that?

Mr. VENIOT: That was long before the merger was contemplated.

Mr. HEAPS: This was early in 1927, I presume?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, there was no merger contemplated at that time or even suggested.

Mr. HEAPS: I do not know whether the minister intends proceeding further just now with the bill. When Mr. Brown came to this country with Sir Campbell Stuart in the spring or summer of 1927, I should like to know whom he represented. He was one of the men behind the scenes of whom very little was heard subsequently. However, when he returned to England, he left a secret code in case it might be necessary for the Post Office Department to communicate with him. I think under those circumstances he assumed a position of importance. He evidently had a good deal to do with shaping the policy of the government. I do not know whether he was an Englishman, a Frenchman or what. We should like to be informed where he came from and what he is engaged in at the present time.

Mr. VENIOT: The only information I have before me is that Mr. Brown lives in London, England. He came here from London. So far as the secret code is concerned, my assistant deputy informs me that, while no merger was contemplated, at the time, there were communications with Sir Campbell Stuart, the representative of Canada on the cable board in London, and this code was so arranged that whatever passed between our representative and the department here would be secret. That is the information I get from the gentleman who apparently signed this with the title of "Assistant Deputy Postmaster General."

Mr. STEVENS: Whom did Mr. Brown represent? That is the point.

Mr. VENIOT: I am told when he came over here he acted as Sir Campbell Stuart's secretary and returned with him to London.

Mr. STEVENS: Have you his initials?

Mr. VENIOT: No, we have not.

Mr. HEAPS: Does the minister know if this Mr. Brown is in any way connected with financial institutions that are interested in private cable corporations?

Mr. VENIOT: No, I do not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I move, in order to give effect to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Vancouver:

That the words "as set forth in schedule A hereto" be added after the words "chapter 7" in the fourth line of section 1; and the words "as set forth in schedule B hereto" be added after the word "report" at the end of section 1.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. HEAPS: Before the amendment carries, I should like to know who recommended to the department the name of Sir Campbell Stuart to act for Canada?

Mr. VENIOT: As I remember, it was done by order in council.

Mr. HEAPS: How did his name come to the government?

Mr. LAPOINTE: He has represented Canada on the Pacific board for years, and naturally was the man who should be appointed in a commission of this kind.

Mr. VENIOT: I know he was a member of that board when I took charge of the department. I had an interview with him before he left for London.

Mr. HEAPS: Did the government at any time receive a report from Sir Campbell Stuart making any recommendation with respect to: what should be the policy in regard to the Pacific cables?

Mr. VENIOT: We did receive a recommendation based on the investigation held. He was a member of the investigating committee and the recommendation is contained in the report.

Mr. HEAPS: Is there any objection to tabling the report Sir Campbell Stuart made to the government?

Mr. VENIOT: We have no objection to raise to what he recommended to us.

Mr. HEAPS: No, I am asking if there is any objection to tabling the report which Sir Campbell Stuart made to the Dominion government as to his ideas on this subject.

Mr. VENIOT: The only report we have that I know of is the report of this commission which has been laid on the table, and of which I believe the hon. gentleman has a copy. We certainly did not take objection to any of the recommendations made in that report.

Mr. HEAPS: But did not Sir Campbell Stuart make any recommendations to the government? Or did he just simply sign the report and submit it to the government? I think it is customary in a case of this character where so much is involved that the gentleman representing the Dominion government should make a separate report to his government as to what his attitude was on the question.

Mr. VENIOT: No, there is nothing that I have other than what was contained in the correspondence laid on the table. There is some correspondence in connection with the one matter of the merger, which the home government will not allow us to make public yet, nor will the other contracting parties. Apart from that, I have laid everything on the table.

Mr. HEAPS: Has the minister available for the house a statement showing the receipts and expenditures of the Pacific cable board including the receipts and expenditures for the last two years?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, I think we have.

Mr. HEAPS: Would the minister give it to the house?

Mr. VENIOT: I have not got it with me. I did not think the question would arise, otherwise I would have had it on hand. Certainly I think the report given with the details it contains, which have been submitted to the house, would be sufficient in that respect. If the hon. gentleman is determined to delay the passage of the bill by his insistent demand, I will endeavour to see what I can do to obtain the information.

Mr. HEAPS: I think it is only fair. There is no particular hurry for this bill.

Mr. VENIOT: There is an absolute rush.

Mr. HEAPS: That is rather surprising, Mr. Chairman. A couple of weeks ago we had no idea this bill was to be introduced. Members of the house were not even to be consulted in the matter. To-day we are asked to pass a bill regarding which the Postmaster General himself has not the particulars. I ask for the information because there has been a difference of opinion between the Minister of Justice and myself regarding certain financial matters pertaining to the Pacific cable board. The minister stated that the last year or so the cable board was losing money.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. HEAPS: I may be permitted to read this extract from the British Hansard of November 21, 1928. It is from a speech by Mr. Baker. He says:

> My information is that although the traffic receipts on the Pacific cables for 1927-28 were down by £80,000 as compared with the previous year, that is about 17 per cent, the expenditure was reduced by about £32,000, and despite the drop in receipts, which was mainly in the cheaper traffic, the surplus available for division between the governments was £42,100, after devoting £77,544 to the payment of interest and repayment of capital and placing £10,000 to reserve account.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what I said. If my hon. friend reads my remarks of the other day he will find that those are exactly the figures I gave. As a matter of fact, from 1903 to 1916 there was a period of deficit, and the share which the government of Canada had to pay on those deficits amounted to $900,000. From 1916 the period of surpluses began. And they were to some extent large surpluses—so much so that at one time the board decided to duplicate its cable from the Fiji islands to British Columbia, against the protests of the Canadian government, who pointed out that wireless would be a strong factor in competition as against the cable. The result has shown this to have been the fact, and since 1927, since the beam has been put into operation, the profits have dwindled. May I say to my hon. friend at once that he is wrong when he says that it is the Canadian Marconi Wireless who are responsible for this; it is the big main wireless between England and Australia, which has been a great factor in the competition. That wireless is owned at one end by the British government and at the other end by the Amalgamated Wireless, the majority of the shares in which are owned by the Australian government. The Canadian Wireless came afterwards; and surely my hon. friend does not object to there being a wireless in Canada and from Canada.

The profits in 1926-27 were £100,000, but the following year, 1927-28, as my hon. friend has read from the British Hansard, the profits had come down to £42,000, and for 1928-29 zero is anticipated owing to the decrease in business.

I do not see why there should be such objection on the part of my hon. friend to this bill. After all, Canada entered the scheme by way of contributing to imperial inter-

communication; it was done at a time when it was necessary, not so much in the Canadian interests, because our share, so far as the sending of cables was concerned, was very small in comparison with communication between England, Australia and New Zealand; but the Canadian government years ago undertook to contribute to imperial intercommunication. We paid a large amount of money as our contribution thereto, and happily, from 1916 until two or three years ago, it proved a more profitable investment, so that we ceased to pay towards deficits. But when the beam wireless was put into operation it became manifest that there would be a reversion to the former condition and that the Canadian government would have to pay every year a certain sum towards the deficits which it was admitted would ensue from the competition of the wireless. We have everything that was contemplated when we undertook to pay our share towards imperial intercommunication, and to-day the companies remain British; it has been seen to that they shall be under British control at all times.

Mr. NEILL: Is there control of rates?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Rates are controlled through an advisory committee on which Canada is being represented. More than that, on the board of directors of the merger there will be two representatives to be selected by the Imperial government. In short, we have everything without paying anything, and we are getting back $700,000 of the $900,000 which we paid during the period of deficits. And the other governments of the empire have agreed to that; they have passed legislation to that effect. We are interested only to a certain extent We were interested in the payment of deficits in this proportion: Canada 5, England 5, Australia 6 and New Zealand 2; 5/18 was our share. All others agreed to this scheme. We are going to enjoy every benefit that may come to us because of cable and wireless facilities and we do not pay anything. Why should we object to the scheme?

Mr. HEAPS: I wish I could be as enthusiastic about the proposal as the Minister of Justice is. The control which the government have in this whole matter is more apparent than real. As a matter of fact, the two representatives who, the minister says, are to be nominated by the British government, may sit only with the consent of the new company that is being formed, and if these two representatives whom the British government may appoint do not meet with the approval of the new company they will have no right to sit on the board. Moreover, what control can two representatives exercise on a board of this kind comprising thirteen, especially when the two must be nominated subject to the approval of that board? I say, therefore, that the control is not very real.

As regards rates, there is little control. According to the statements that have been made there is some arrangement whereby rates are not to be increased for a certain time, but there is nothing about reducing the rates; not at all. Personally I cannot see very much in the argument of the minister. It is true that there were deficits for a number of years until 1916. But just at the moment when they are showing a surplus it is decided to sell out. When all the pioneer work has been done, when the years of struggle have been passed which have been spent in making the Pacific cable board a success, then they sell out.

There is another point which the minister never touched, and that is that the government themselves issued a license to a private company—I do not know just what it is called—to operate a beam system between this country and Australia in competition with our own cable system. If there is to be a loss, as the minister has pointed out—if as he says a loss on the cable system is inevitable—is there any reason why this government could not own and operate a beam wireless between this country and Australia? What is to prevent it? Nothing, except the question of policy. The beam wireless, I would point out, is a huge success from every point of view. It can transmit messages at two-thirds of the rates charged by the cable companies, and at the same time it makes for greater efficiency; furthermore, it shows a large surplus over operation expenses. If this is the case, was there any reason why in 1926 a license should have been issued or permission given by the government to a private concern to operate a beam wireless between this country and Australia?

Mr. LAPOINTE: At that time the beam wireless was in operation between England and Australia quite independently of any license given the Canadian Marconi.

Mr. HEAPS: Yes, and operated by the British Post Office.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is where the profits went.

Mr. HEAPS: They got the profits and not the private company; and now it is proposed to hand the enterprise and profits over to a private corporation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was no private company operating between England and Australia, at least not with regard to the beam wireless.

Mr. HEAPS: There was a private company operating the cables, although a large amount of the stock was owned by the Australian government. The beam system, of course, was operated by the British Post Office Department; they were getting the profits and the private companies were losing money, so the companies said that unless some arrangement was made, they would be forced out of business, and they threatened the British government that they might have to sell out to American interests. That threat worked with the British government and apparently it has worked with the government here as well.

My friend the Minister of Justice says the system is entirely under British control, but I would venture to assert that this cable merger is at least one-third under foreign control at present. I do not think there can be any dispute as to that in view of the interlocking directorates which I discussed this afternoon. There are people of foreign extraction—whether or not they are British subjects I do not know—connected with this cable merger; American interests are interlocked with it and consequently I do not believe the idea that it is entirely under British control is entirely in accordance with the facts.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is one of the conditions of the whole transaction, that British control shall be guaranteed.

Mr. HEAPS: Control may only mean 51 per cent of the total stock, a majority control rather than an absolute control.

Mr. LAPOINTE: More than that, there is a provision that in a time of emergency the government will be able to take over the whole system.

Mr. HEAPS: Does not the minister think that in view of what is involved in this question and in view of the importance of these communications in time of emergency, we should have had all this information before us in order at least to form an intelligent opinion? I may be wrong in some of the facts I stated but surely we can expect nothing else when no information is presented to the house.

Mr. NEILL: I have studied this question to quite an extent, and as far as I know the statement made by the Minister of Justice is substantially correct. We may be assured that the British government will take care to ensure British control of this system; we may leave that to the British government, and I certainly understood that to be the arrangement. The fatal mistake was made when this Pacific cable board, under the direction of some gentleman in England quite unadapted to the position, to put it mildly, embarked on the project of duplicating the cable against the firm opposition of the Canadian government and of the then Postmaster General, Hon. Charles Murphy. Had his views prevailed at that time there is no doubt that we would not be in this position at present. At the very time when money was becoming available for distribution to the shareholders, so to speak, or the different portions of the British Empire, the board embarked upon this duplication of the cable in spite of the fact impressed upon them by the Canadian government that the beam system was just coming into operation, and certainly should have been tried out first. The result is that we have this white elephant on our hands, and I think the arrangement made by the different governments concerned is a good arrangement. The hon. member for North Winnipeg says there was a profit last year. That is so, but it was a diminishing profit; the full effect of the competition of beam wireless has not been felt as yet.

Then there is another element which would affect the situation further in future with regard to the competition of beam wireless. At present in the transmission of messages by beam wireless there is a condition called fading; at certain periods of the day which cannot be foreseen reception fades out entirely. The beam wireless people accept messages for Australia at the rate which would prevail if all the traffic were handled by the beam system; when this fading commences, in order to keep up their record for rapid delivery they turn over their business to the cable board at the full cable rate for the period of the fading. As a result the cable board makes a profit and the beam wireless company loses heavily on that particular business, because they must pay the full cable rate although they only receive the reduced wireless rate on the whole business. There is no question but that with the advance of science it will be only a short time before this fading will be overcome, and when that is accomplished the position of the cable board financially would be very poor indeed. So, if the Canadian government comes out of the business financially as well as the Minister of Justice says will be the case, with the protection of rates guaranteed by the British government, I think the best we can do is to accept the situation and the bill as it is presented here.

There are features about the whole proceeding which I know are not as satisfactory as they should be; there have been suggestions that some of the competing companies had too much to do with the negotiations, but at any rate this whole business was arranged with the consent of the British government and the other dominions, who presumably knew what they were doing, so I think our best plan is to accept the situation and let the bill go through.

Mr. HEAPS: I asked for some information from the Postmaster General in reference to the financial standing of the Pacific cable board, and I wonder if he has that information available as yet?

Mr. VENIOT: I am told that quite a bit of work is necessary in order to secure this information and that it will take some time to complete. Would the hon. gentleman be satisfied to allow this bill to go through on my undertaking to produce the information later? It will take more than a day to obtain what he desires, because we will have to go over all the traffic accounts and everything submitted to the department, and that will mean a good deal of work.

Mr. HEAPS: I do not wish to hold up the bill but I do think we should have had all this information some time ago in order to allow us to discuss this question more intelligently. However, perhaps the Postmaster General can tell me something about the contract entered into between the government and the company operating the beam system between Canada and Australia?

Mr. VENIOT: That information will have to come from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, as far as I know.

Mr. HEAPS: Was a license issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. VENIOT: I believe that is the only department with authority to issue such licenses, but I do not know whether or not such a license was issued.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

Amendments read the first and second times and concurred in.

Mr. VENIOT moved the third reading of the bill.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I did not wish to interrupt the discussion when the bill was in committee, but I deem it advisable to place on record the reason why our government has been anxious to proceed with the measure and not occasion delay through waiting to bring down some of the further information which has been requested. As my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) knows, the sale of the Pacific cable is a matter which concerns the British government, the Australian government, the New Zealand government and the Canadian government; all these governments met together through their representatives and concluded the arrangement which is now before this house. The British government naturally was anxious to conclude this transaction before its present term of office was up, and the reason we have been handicapped in the matter of securing much of the data is because it is only within the last day or two that the business has been finally concluded. The parliament in Great Britain has been dissolved and it is unknown just what government may be in office after the next general election. The present administration is anxious that this transaction should be completed before that particular unknown period is reached. If we were to delay our consent to the agreement, we might be assuming the responsibility of upsetting a transaction which three other governments have already approved of and assented to, and which we believe to be in the interest of Canada. There would be, too, the possibility of returning to the position we were in a year or two ago when instead of assets to the government's credit we were confronted with increasing liabilities.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read the third time and passed.

WESTERN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

READJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF THOSE DISMISSED AND REEMPLOYED

The house resumed from May 6 consideration in committee of the following proposed resolution—Mr. Veniot—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the readjustment of the salaries of certain postal employees in western Canada who were dismissed in 1919 and subsequently re-employed, to give them the benefit of salary they would have received had they re-entered the service in the class equivalent to the one they were in when dismissed, and of subsequent salary revisions, and to make provision whereby certain former employees not now in the said service shall be eligible for reappointment as vacancies occur.

Mr. VENIOT: When this resolution was before the committee certain interpretations were placed upon it, and those interpretations,

if correct, did not meet with the views I had expressed to the house in connection with this matter. Since that time the matter has received considerable attention and I propose to move the following amendment:

That the proposed resolution be amended by striking out all the words after "them" in the third line thereof, and substituting the following:

"payment as from the date of their reemployment for services actually performed at the rates of remuneration paid to other employees for similar services."

The amendment would then read:

Resolved that it is expedient to provide for the readjustment of the salaries of certain postal employees in western Canada who were dismissed in 1919 and subsequently reemployed to give them payment as from the date of their reemployment for services actually performed at the rates of remuneration paid to other employees for similar services.

If the legislation proposed by this resolution is enacted it is our purpose to work out a system in order to determine what would be coming to each employee who had gone out on strike and then returned. It is my intention that the Civil Service Commission be requested to appoint a man to work in conjunction with an official of the Post Office department, perhaps the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, to arrive at the amounts, if any, which would be due to the different persons whose names apear on the list of ninety-six submitted to the house.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Veniot thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 252, respecting certain employees of the postal or railway mail service of Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 7, to amend the Civil Service Act (Private Secretaries).

Mr. STEVENS: Explain.

Mr. RINFRET: The amendments proposed by the senate are purely technical. Section 60, subsection 1 of the act reads as follows:

Any person may be appointed by a minister of the crown or other member of the government to be his private secretary,

[Mr. Veniot.]

In the amendment submitted at the beginning of the session, which was passed by the house, the following words appeared, "and in the event of the minister" without stating "or other member of the government," and the amendment proposed by the senate makes subsection 2 of the section agree with subsection 1.

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): This bill was called to my attention by certain of the civil servants of Ottawa. Under the Civil Service Act an employee expects promotion from year to year, and it seems to me that if private secretaries are taken into the service when the ministers leave and employed as chief clerks they would be preventing the promotion of those under them. We should have some information from the minister as to what hardship is likely to be imposed upon those already in the service.

Mr. RINFRET: The house has already approved of the principle of this bill, and I think on a previous occasion I made an observation on the very point the hon. member now raises. If a minister takes from the service one who is to be employed as his secretary, and that person remains as his secretary for three or four years, in the meanwhile the work of the department must be done and naturally the positions will be filled. I have explained before that it does not matter very much to the civil service whether you employ a man already in the service or one from outside. If this bill carries, it means only that when a minister retires his secretary becomes a member of the civil service. If the minister had taken a person from the service instead of from outside, that person would go back into the service just the same. It will be for the commission and the department, of course, to adjust the situation, but it is expected that this will not occur very frequently.

Mr. STEVENS: Very few cases.

Mr. RINFRET: It will apply to only a few cases. I think the house was unanimous in approving the bill, and I desire to repeat that the amendment made by the senate does not add a single individual to the scope of the bill, but merely provides for a clearer wording of it.

Mr. SPENCER: Has there been any opposition to this bill from the organized civil service?

Mr. RINFRET: None has come to my notice.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFUNDING OF MATURING OBLIGATIONS

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the Canadian National Railways to provide for the refunding of certain maturing financial obligations, and to issue substituted securities therefor guaranteed by the Dominion as to principal and interest, but not exceeding $18,000,000, the aggregate face value of the original securities.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. STEVENS: I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not rising to voice any objections to providing ample finances for the Canadian National Railways. The resolution however, affords an opportunity of my presenting to the committee some facts which I think the committee ought to have in mind in dealing with this and other similar resolutions. It will be noted that another resolution on the order paper provides for $50,000,000 for Montreal terminals, and there are perhaps half a dozen or more other bills providing for the purchase of certain railway lines. We also have before us the estimates of the railway department, calling for a capital expenditure of $53,000,000 and so on. I want simply to bring to the attention of the committee and of the house the commitments of the next year or thereabouts in connection with this great undertaking.

Before addressing myself to that technical phase of my remarks, may I observe that we have recently, in the special committee on national railways and shipping, given considerable study to the position of the national railways and listneed to most elaborate reports from the president and his officers—and I may interpolate that the president and his staff undoubtedly came before that committee exceedingly well equipped to give to the committee the fullest information. But the study of this information, the consideration of the various phases of the undertaking, impressed most of us, I think, with the gigantic character of it. Perhaps we are prone to pass over a little too lightly many of the commitments that come before the house. It might be advisable just to call attention to the fact that the Canadian National Railways, as reorganized and brought into their present combined or composite condition, constitute a system that is larger than the Canadian Pacific system as regards mileage. It is a tremendous undertaking. As the net revenues increase, we naturally congratulate ourselves. During the last several years there has been a tendency on both sides of the house—I am speaking particularly for this side—to give to the government, and to the minister who asks, on behalf of the railway, for appropriations, a pretty generous response. I note, for instance, that the minister will come before parliament, present a very heavy item and indicate that this has had the consideration of the management, who recommend it. These recommendations have been received with favour and have been given every consideration, and I think the minister would be one of the first to state that we have given every reasonable consideration to his presentations of that character. But as they come sometimes in this form of individual items, we are prone to forget the magnitude not only of the undertaking in its physical state but of the many obligations that we are incurring from time to time. I wish to give to the committee—and what I shall say now will apply as well to resolution No. 32 for the $50,000,000 for the Montreal terminals—a picture of some of the country's commitments to the railway for the immediate future.

There is a carry-over from last year of $40,000,000 of capital expenditure which was provided for by the Canadian National Railways by borrowing from the banks, I think last October, for a period of six months, and this was renewed on April 15 for a further period of six months. To provide for the capital expenditures for 1929 a further sum of $100,000,000 is required. I am just giving the general outline of the figures.

Mr. DUNNING: Including refunding, of course.

Mr. STEVENS: Not in the $100,000,000. I will give the items of that in a moment. This, together with the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and the West Indies service, another $2,000,000, makes a total of about $145,000,000. In order that I may not be thought to be giving these figures recklessly, let me quote from the evidence of Sir Henry Thornton before the special committee. I am reading from page 117 of that committee's records:

Sir Henry Thornton: I can tell you what our total requirements are, item by item.

Hon. Mr. Stevens: Then let us have them.

Sir Henry Thornton: The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, $2,500,000; Quebec, Montreal and Southern, $6,000,000; Inverness Railway and Coal Company, $375,000; Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, $3,500,000; The Kent Northern Railway, $60,000; 1927-1930 branch line program, $1,500,000; new branch lines now be-

fore parliament, approximately, $1,500,000; 1929 budget, $53,750,000; Manitoba Northern Railway, $7,000,000; loan account, Central Vermont bonds, $8,609,000; temporary borrowings from bank, $40,000,000; new equipment, $18,000,000; all of which make a total of $142,794,000.

There is included in the $53,000,000 certain requirements which I shall not analyse at the moment. To the figures already given there must be added approximately $1,000,000 for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and approximately $1,000,000 for the West Indies service, or $2,000,000, bringing the total to $145,000,000, which will have to be provided for this year by some form of financing.

But that is not the whole story. There is accruing due by June of next year, within about a year from now—we must bear in mind that approximately half of this year has now passed, and that the railway operates on the calendar year, not the fiscal year—the following securities:

4½ per cent 5 year gold bonds, Canadian National, February 15, 1930	$18,000,000
4 per cent consolidated debenture bonds, Canadian Northern, June 30, 1930 (Manitoba guaranteed)	10,785,000
4 per cent Ontario division bonds, Canadian Northern, June 30, 1930	5,700,000
4½ per cent Ontario division bonds, Canadian Northern, June 30, 1930	61,000
4 per cent first mortgage debenture stock, Canadian Northern, June 30, 1930	2,860,000
4½ per cent Prince Albert branch bonds, Canadian Northern, unguaranteed, June 30, 1930	300,000
	$37,706,000

There must be added to that a further sum, namely, the $10,000,000 estimated as being required in connection with the $50,000,000 vote for the Montreal terminals. That $10,000,000 may not be required for the balance of this year, but within one year at least it may reasonably be estimated as required. That, together with the $142,000,000 previously given, brings the figures up to the enormous total of $192,000,000.

But by June next one-half of the railway year will have expired, and provision will have to be made in the early part of next session, as provision has already been made this session, for the current year's capital expenditures. Estimated on the basis of the railway expenditures for the past few years, that will amount to another $35,000,000, which will have to be authorized by parliament like the sum we have in the estimates to-day. That would bring the total up to $227,000,000 which we might properly say the Canadian National railways must raise or finance for the year from now until June, 1930. That is an enormous sum of money, Mr. Chairman. These funds will be raised by guaranteed bonds; that is, the railway will issue its securities which will be guaranteed by the government. It is true that part of this sum may be raised in the way this $40,000,000 is being carried at the moment, by borrowing from the banks, but that is only temporary financing. Sir Henry Thornton indicated that it was his intention to take care of that $40,000,000 temporarily borrowed from the banks as early as could reasonably be done. So we may say that the Canadian National railways must go into the money markets during the next twelve months for the enormous sum of $227,000,000. They will do that, of course, with the assistance of the Minister of Finance; that is, the Minister of Finance, acting for the government, will guarantee the bonds of the railway.

But we find that the Minister of Finance has also some obligations maturing. I checked these figures up with the Finance department this morning and I find that during this year there is accruing due in August next a 5½ per cent bond loan of $60,000,000; in February next, 4½ per cent securities amounting to $20,000,000, and in the latter part of next year, 4 per cent bonds, three-year treasury notes, amounting to $45,000,000. Part of that $45,000,000 comes due beyond June, 1930, but it will have to be provided for. There is an additional $125,000,000 which must be raised. A substantial portion of this amount the Minister of Finance in his budget speech indicated he expected to retire out of consolidated fund surplus. We have then facing the financial experts of the country the raising of these two enormous figures, $227,000,000 for railway purposes, and $125,000,000 of the country's obligations, making a total of $352,000,000. I would just in passing indicate that this $352,000,000 amounts to more than the whole national debt of Canada in the pre-war period.

Where is this money coming from? We look to the New York market for the raising of this money; there is no doubt of that. I understand that some indication has been given that possibly we might look to London for part of this financing. I am bringing this to the attention of the committee and of parliament not for the purpose of reflecting in any way on the Canadian National Railways, but with this idea: When the railway committee are studying, as they will study several of these resolutions and bills—not this one but some of the others—which will obli-

gate this country to the expenditure of large sums of money for the purchase of small railways in different sections of the country, and when they come to examine the Montreal terminals bill, which will require an expenditure of $50,000,000, I suggest that they consider at that time the total obligations of the national railways for the next twelve months period.

May I be permitted, not that I want to digress and discuss another resolution, but merely to make this picture complete, to refer to the Montreal terminals? I am not referring to that project with the suggestion that the work in Montreal should not be proceeded with, because I want to postulate this at once. Montreal undoubtedly must have additional terminal facilities at the earliest possible moment, because the present terminals in Montreal are a disgrace to the railways. Let us bear in mind that the Canadian Northern terminals in Montreal represent a capital obligation—for which this country has assumed full responsibility, and will undoubtedly pay —of $18,000,000; I refer to the Canadian Northern mountain tunnel terminal, which will become part of the main terminal. It is proposed this year to authorize a further expenditure for the Montreal terminals of $50,000,000. I think any thoughtful member will agree with me when I say that when you enter upon a scheme estimated to cost, say, $50,000,000, you may reasonably expect that ultimately the project will cost much more than that sum. I think that all who have discussed it agree with that statement. So I suggest that with the $18,000,000 in the tunnel terminal, with the proposed $50,000,000, which would make $68,000,000, we may anticipate the cost of the Montreal terminals to reach the enormous sum of approximately $80,000,000.

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry to interrupt my hon. friend. I think he would be well within the mark in making that statement, if he included the cost of the present old Grand Trunk facilities there and the Moreau street property of the old Canadian Northern, which of course were not included in the tunnel scheme. Our total commitment, including the new $50,000,000, would probably be at least $80,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS: So we can say between $80,000,000 and $100,000,000.

Mr. DUNNING: Including what has already been invested.

Mr. STEVENS: Including what is already there.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not saying that the most favourable consideration should not be given to the problem, but I do say if we are to authorize such an enormous expenditure, then the committee that takes hold of this legislation when it leaves the house should give to it the most careful study and be perfectly sure that the most economical form of development has been adopted. I pause just to say this to the minister and to pass it on to the committee for what it may be worth; for it is a different committee from that which considers Canadian National Railway matters—it is the regular standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. In passing I suggest this might have gone to the other committee.

Mr. DUNNING: I would have preferred that course, but it was not possible.

Mr. STEVENS: The other committee has all the information before it. That is why I am anxious to give expression to these views this afternoon. I do not wish in any way to disparage the standing or reputation of Mr. Palmer. I understand the terminals which have been suggested have been planned by the railway engineers, but that their plans have been modified or changed somewhat by Mr. Palmer and now bear his imprimatur as an expert. Mr. Palmer is, as far as I know, an estuarial engineer, that is, an engineer who has made a specialty of that branch of engineering dealing with difficult streams and currents and so forth—a very, very important branch of engineering—but he is not necessarily a city passenger or freight terminal engineer which is a vastly different thing.

Mr. DUNNING: He is.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister indicates that he is. I cannot put my opinion in opposition to that of the minister.

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend will permit me, it is not a matter of the opinion of either of us, but a matter of fact. I shall be glad to give my hon. friend information in respect to the very large railway schemes on which Mr. Palmer has been engaged. I will discuss that on the Montreal terminals resolution.

Mr. STEVENS: The reason I am reciting it now is to get the whole of the picture together. But I submit very great care should be taken—

Mr. DUNNING: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: —not necessarily to accept Mr. Palmer's dictum as the final word in this matter. We are going to authorize the ex-

penditure of a huge sum for these terminals, in addition to these enormous obligations of $227,000,000 to which I have referred. It should be further borne in mind when we are considering this matter that a terminal of this character produces very little revenue in itself. Undoubtedly it contributes to facilitating the despatch of business, but the passenger end of it unquestionably will be a total loss, or at least a charge against the freight revenues of the railway system, because the passenger revenue I do not think at the present time any more than about breaks even. So the freight revenues of the Canadian National Railways will have to bear the fixed charges of these enormously expensive terminals. Therefore no plan should be adopted without the most careful scrutiny and study.

Mr. DUNNING: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: There does arise in my mind a question whether this year we should actually authorize and proceed with the expenditure of money on that terminal, or whether it should not be studied for a further period of a year. The minister will be able to state—if he will just give ear to this as I pass along—whether I am right or wrong, but my information is that the railway traffic engineers and the railway construction engineers made certain plans, and that these plans have been modified or changed by Mr. Palmer. I will not say against their wishes, but leave it at that—they have been changed by him. I would be inclined to trust pretty well the opinion of Canadian engineers who have lived and grown up with Canadian railway traffic rather than that of an outside expert, unless that expert can be shown to have had wider experience in traffic similar to that which would occur in a Canadian terminal.

Mr. DUNNING: I may dispose of that if my hon. friend will permit me. I share with him in appreciation of the qualities of the engineering assistance which the Canadian National system has been able to assemble, and I can say on behalf of those engineers that all of the suggestions which Mr. Palmer made are not only accepted by them, but are enthusiastically supported. Mr. Palmer testifies to the ability which has been displayed in the drafting of these plans. In fact he said to Sir Henry Thornton and myself: "Naturally as a matter of vanity I should like to have evolved a plan which would be described as the 'Palmer plan' but after carefully going into it I am in a position to say that your engineers have taken into account every possible factor. I have only this and that suggestion to make with respect to the detailed working out of the major plan as affecting the Canadian National."

Mr. STEVENS: I am glad to hear that. But let me again emphasize the necessity for great care, because once a plan is adopted, property acquired, and progress in construction made, it will be exceedingly costly and difficult to change or modify such a plan.

Mr. DUNNING: I agree.

Mr. STEVENS: I have already intimated that a terminal of this character is not usually a revenue producing unit; almost invariably it is a load upon the freight revenues of the system. But in a city such as Montreal I believe it would be possible to adopt a plan in the development of which revenues might be produced in the improving of properties and the establishing of business contiguous to the terminal.

Mr. DUNNING: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: I submit again that the committee of parliament having this in hand should take great care that a survey of that feature be exhausted before any plan is finally adopted.

Mr. DUNNING: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: It is not my intention to delay the minister or to offer criticism of his predecessor, but merely to present these enormous commitments—which as I have indicated, amount for the railway in the next twelve months to the huge sum of $227,000,000—and to ask parliament, and particularly the committee which from now on will have these various matters before them, to scrutinize with the utmost care the proposals that are made and to see that nothing is passed or adopted that is in any sense unnecessary or may well be put off. Furthermore, parliament and the country should be impressed with the magnitude of this undertaking, which calls for the expenditure of this huge sum, a portion of which of course is for renewals. I had intended to say that, in respect to some of these renewals, securities which at present are unguaranteed will become Canadian government guaranteed securities. For instance, the Prince Albert one; and I am not sure whether this $18,000,000 is at present guaranteed.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: It is guaranteed. And then we have the Manitoba one. It is not guaranteed by the Dominion but it is guaranteed by the Manitoba government, and it

amounts to $10,000,000. I presume the Manitoba government's guarantee will now be removed and it will become a direct obligation of this country. The point in regard to that is that all these renewals will now become actual guranteed obligations of this country for which we as a parliament are taking full responsibility.

Had time permitted I might have said a few words on the necessity of hastening the remodelling of the financial structure of the railway system. This, I understand from the minister, cannot be done at present, for certain very good reasons which he gave to the committee. But undoubtedly there exists a very urgent necessity for an early and complete remodelling of this financial structure, so that if possible we can place this great system on a basis where it will take care of itself, at least to a large degree. I wish also to say that in these figures which I have quoted no note is taken of the interest of the public, which amounts to $43,000,000 annually and which at present is taken care of out of surplus operating revenues of the railway; nor is any note taken of interest due to the Dominion government for advances made by it to the railway system. These two items have not been included in my remarks.

I present these views so that we may keep them before us when considering this very important matter of the financing of the national railways.

Mr. DUNNING: I appreciate very much the constructive tenor of the remarks of my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) with respect to what is the country's major business enterprise. I shall not offer any observations at this time with respect to the Montreal terminal matter; I propose to go on with it immediately after this resolution is disposed of so that my hon. friend's remarks in that connection may be in the minds of hon. members when the question is before the house.

With respect to the general situation as outlined by my hon. friend, I can find no fault with the figures he presented as having to do with the financial requirements of the National system; I believe, listening to them, that they are approximately correct. He calls attention very properly to the magnitude of the figures and to the responsibility which rests upon the management, upon the minister and upon parliament in connection with an undertaking so huge, involving as it does problems of financing very large in character. Let me say, however, that we might easily go to the opposite extreme in our view of this great institution. These capital commitments would be just as necessary and would be just as large if not larger were these railways to-day owned by the three institutions which formerly owned them. They would be split up, it is true, among the three corporations or institutions; but the requirements would be there, and I am inclined to think that if the management were divided into three, as formerly, in all probability the aggregate financial requirements would be greater than they are to-day when we have the benefits of coordination in management, in operation and in the financing of the undertaking.

My hon. friend is quite right in pointing out that these obligations are not merely corporate obligations as they were in the days of private ownership, but are now really obligations of the Dominion of Canada, by way of direct guarantee, as he indicated; or even if not guaranteed they are in fact obligations of the Dominion; because no one can conceive of the Dominion retaining ownership of the property while repudiating the bonded indebtedness attaching to the property, I appreciate to the full my hon. friend's suggestion that the committees of parliament charged with these matters should go thoroughly, sympathetically and constructively into all proposals made. My experience with the management, going back now as minister, to early in 1926, convinces me that we have in the present management and official personnel of the Canadian National Railways, men who really desire to make this undertaking succeed as an undertaking, and without regard to the fact that they are able to come to parliament for money. When any proposal is put before me requiring parliamentary sanction the railway officers are always anxious to demonstrate to me, and through me to parliament, the intrinsic economic merit of that proposal. With respect to new extensions and things of that sort, it is always the effort of the railway officials to demonstrate that the proposal will earn more than sufficient to pay interest on its cost —more in other words than 5 per cent per annum, and make some provision for capital in addition.

Necessarily in a new country our calculations must admit of the presence of some uncertainties. We are developing new country in many directions. Up to now experience has indicated that this development has been wise from an economic point of view. But necessarily, in commencing it, there must be a willingness to take a certain degree of chance; there is always a certain degree of economic chance in entering upon the development of new country. I am happy to be able to say that so far as one can accurately

analyse the results of proposals for extensions from time to time whch have been made by the Canadian National officers, their judgment has been vindicated in the main by results; in fact in most cases, the results of extensions and developments have gone beyond the initial expectation as presented to parliament. That, I think, is fairly well borne out by the increased traffic returns of the system which are apparent practically all along the line, from coast to coast.

Mr. MATTHEWS: Is that basis used in the purchase of new lines?

Mr. DUNNING: In regard to the purchase of new lines, as I shall explain when I come to the individual lines, we are unfortunately linked to the past in many cases; and that linking to the past—the obligations arising out of the past—does occasionally involve that the same standards which would be applied to-day by railway officers in recommending new development cannot be applied to all of the proposals for the acquisition of properties carrying obligations reaching back into the past. I shall be glad to go into them individually when we come to the items.

In the Canadian National system we have possibly the greatest agency under the control of parliament for the material development of the resources of this country. That system must be allowed to grow if this country is to grow, and I feel sure it is not in the mind of any member of this parliament that we should adopt a parsimonious attitude towards the Canadian National in connection with its bona fide extension to meet the growing needs of this country as it develops.

Unfortunately, as my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre mentioned, we have in prospect in various places, notably Montreal at the moment, terminal situations which must be dealt with in order that the railway may adequately function, and which run into large sums of money not in themselves productive of a large earning. A terminal scheme such as that of Montreal or Toronto does not bring large increases in revenue to the railway. It does involve in practically every case economies in operation for the railway, representing savings along that line, but I should be the last to pretend that any terminal scheme in a city the size of Montreal or Toronto can produce economies at all proportionate to the expenditure which is required in order to give to the public the service to which they are entitled. I am sure Sir Henry Thornton would confirm that view. However, the provision of adequate terminal facilities is inseparable from the operation of a great railway property, and I agree with my hon. friend to the fullest extent in his suggestions; in fact I will amplify them a little when we come to the Montreal resolution. As he has suggested the railway committee of the House of Commons should give the closest possible study to the proposals of the Canadian National railways in that regard.

I have a few words to say with respect to the resolution now before the committee, which has to do with the refunding of $18,000,000 of maturing bonds. The $18,000,000 of guaranteed securities in question fall due on February 15, 1930, but in view of the fact that it is uncertain whether a bill could be put through parliament next session in time to meet the situation we are asking for the necessary parliamentary authority now to renew the obligation.

Mr. GEARY: I would suggest to the minister that this is a matter we would like to consider at some length and as it is just six o'clock perhaps he would not proceed with his remarks at the moment.

Mr. DUNNING: I had not expected to finish before six o'clock.

Mr. GEARY: Then perhaps the minister might commence all over again when the committee resumes this evening.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THE NIAGARA FALLS MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMPANY

Mr. G. H. PETTIT (Welland) moved the third reading of Bill No. 22, to incorporate Niagara Falls Memorial Bridge Company.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a slight mistake in the bill as printed, in that there is a difference between the preamble and the enacting clause. The preamble sets out one location for the bridge while the enacting clause changes that entirely. I think they should be made to agree.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless it is by unanimous consent of the house, the only thing to do would be to ask the house to refer the bill back to the committee of the whole with instructions to alter the preamble so as to make it agree with the amended enacting clause:

Mr. GUTHRIE: Very well.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 94, for the relief of Edyth May Shields.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 98, for the relief of Marion Ruth Laidman.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 127, for the relief of Sophia Love. —Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 138, for the relief of Harry Freeman Switzer.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

MARY MELVINA GUERIN

Mr. N. M. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast) moved the third reading of Bill No. 95, for the relief of Mary Melvina Guerin.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the bills on which I gave notice of motion which appears in the votes and proceedings of yesterday. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Beaubien):

That the said bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills for further consideration.

I need not dwell at any length upon the reasons which I think justify the house in sending this bill back to the committee for further consideration. This bill is for the dissolution of a marriage between two Roman Catholics who had married according to the rites of their church. As I pointed out last night—and I insist upon this point—I am not making this appeal to the house from the viewpoint of one church in particular, but I am basing my argument on the principle which I then enunciated. When the two parties concerned in legislation of this nature belong to one religious body, it is unfair to the children of those parties, who are unrepresented in the case, who have no one to place their position before parliament, that their future welfare should be prejudiced. Several divorce bills on previous occasions have been rejected by parliament for the very same reason. As I reminded the house last night, one such bill was rejected by the house not many years ago. Besides, this bill should not pass the house upon the evidence which is before us. The supposed guilt of one of the parties is evidenced by the other party, the petitioner, and the declaration of the petitioner is corroborated only by one other witness, a child of fifteen years of age. This was the daughter of the two parties in the case. She was brought before parliament for the purpose of proving the adultery of the father in order that the mother might obtain a divorce. I claim that that is unmoral and anti-social to an extreme degree. In any case involving a severe penalty to a man or a woman I do not think any court of law would base a verdict upon the testimony of a child placed in that cruel and unnatural position. That ground itself, it seems to me, should be sufficient for referring this bill to the committee, so that the facts supposed to have been proven in this case should be corroborated by some other witness.

The third ground is that there are four children involved in the case. Several hon. members have taken the position, and I think rightly so, that some pronouncement or some investigation should be made by the select standing committee as to the exact status of the law at present with regard to children. If it has been found necessary or opportune to raise the point in a case involving one or two children, surely it is as pertinent when there are four children concerned. This is the only case into which I have looked so far in which such a number of children are involved. The reason which has been presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and others with regard to children applies in principle to this case and, as a matter of fact, it applies a fortiori. It is for these reasons that I offer the amendment of which I gave notice and which I moved at the outset of my remarks.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): I should like to say a word on the amendment. The other day when this matter came up I voted in favour of the bill passing simply because there are, it seems to me, two issues that are rather confused. One relates to the question of the religion of the people concerned, and it was sugegsted that since both the individuals were Roman Catholics, there ought to be some hesitation in granting a divorce. I understood that to be the argument of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I could not accept that position. I think we must take the stand in this house that we must deal with these questions on their merits and entirely disregard church affiliations; that if people come to us with petitions for divorce against the will of the church, it is not for us in any way to discipline them by refusing to grant a divorce on that ground.

I was, however, greatly impressed with the argument of the hon. member for Labelle when he spoke about the children. All along I have taken the ground that we ought not to grant these divorces leaving the children unprovided for. I would go so far as to say that I was impressed with the plea that for

children to go to an environment entirely different from that in which they were brought up, involves a hardship. That is a matter which deserves very careful consideration. Unfortunately the two questions were interinvolved, and so the other night I had to vote for the passing of the bill. I have not, however, the slightest objection to the bill being held for further consideration; I would be in favour of having that done when there are children—whatever the religion of the people—because, it seems to me that in this a fundamental principle is involved. The reference back is merely for reconsideration in order, if possible, to secure the rights of the children. I shall be very glad to support the amendment.

Mr. A. L. BEAUBIEN (Provencher): Just before the motion carries, as seconder of the amendment I should like to make a few observations. I think the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has fully explained the position of the children in regard to their future in their community, both the parents being Roman Catholics, and I do not intend to deal with that phase of the matter. Leaving aside, if you wish, the question of religion, I think hon. members should consider the matter seriously and not allow a divorce to be granted on the testimony of a child fifteen years of age, a child of the parties concerned, who is brought before a committee of senators and whose testimony is the only evidence, outside of that of the interested party, on which a divorce is asked.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Unfortunately, ninety-five per cent of the divorce cases that come before us are ex parte cases; they are uncontested, and we hear only one side of the story. Evidence is usually given first by the petitioner; then that is corroborated by the detective or police agent and, the facts alleged not being opposed, the divorce is granted. This case, as has been pointed out by two hon. gentlemen, is an exceptional one. Outside of the religious aspect, with which this house has nothing to do, there is the fact that four children are involved. These four children should receive some consideration at the hands of the committee, and if the bill is referred back the committee would hesitate before granting a divorce, especially on the evidence that was adduced in this case, namely, that of a child of fifteen years of age who was called upon to testify against her father. I do not think the sentiment of the house or of the Canadian people is in favour of granting a divorce on such evidence. For that reason I am glad of the opportunity to support the amendment which has been presented by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa).

Mr. GEARY: May I ask the mover of the amendment a question? His motion is to refer the matter back to the private bills committee. What can that committee do? Where do we get by sending it back to the private bills committee?

Mr. BOURASSA: Am I allowed to answer, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Mr. BOURASSA: I have adopted this procedure because it seems to be the only one which can bring results. To refer the bill back to the committee of the whole house would simply mean that we would rehash the debate of last night, but I understand that the select standing committee could call for other witnesses; and one of the reasons why I ask that this bill be referred back is, as I have just explained, because I consider that the evidence adduced is not such as would be received in a court of law.

Mr. GEARY: What can be done with regard to the children by referring the matter back to the committee?

Mr. BOURASSA: That applies to several bills; but suppose the committee made a test case in connection with one of these bills where children are involved and called for carefully considered legal opinions from the Department of Justice and perhaps others on the question of whether or not parliament can do anything for the care of the children.

Mr. ADSHEAD: We have such a case before us now.

Mr. BOURASSA: Yes, and there are others. There is the question of the children, there is the question of evidence, and there is besides the broad question of principle upon which I have touched in my previous remarks on the subject.

Mr. N. M. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast): As the sponsor of this bill perhaps I should say a word or two. The evidence in support of this case has been understated. There is such a thing in law as res ipsa loquitur—the thing speaks for itself. This man had venereal disease, and no one would deny that that is a reason for divorce. As far as the children are concerned, whether this house has jurisdiction or not there is in the province where the petitioner resides jurisdiction to grant the custody of the children, and there are institutions to look after these children if the

parents are unable to do so. I do not think it becomes us to give any petitioner coming before this house more relief than is asked for. There is no relief asked for in this case so far as the children are concerned, and I am prepared to take the responsibility of saying that institutions in Ontario will provide sufficient protection for the children either at the behest of or in spite of their parents.

Mr. GEARY: I wonder if the Minister of Justice would be prepared to express to the house his view whether there is any jurisdiction in parliament to make an order in respect to the children.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. I have already stated in another case that I believe there is none. It is purely a provincial matter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But divorce might be refused on account of the position of the children.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of course parliament has the right to refuse the divorce for that or any other reason.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Bourassa) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Baubien, Benoit, Bettez, Bird, Blanchard, Boucher, Boulanger, Bourassa, Bourgeois, Bowman, Cannon, Cardin, Casgrain, Desaulniers, Deslauriers, Dionne, Dubuc, Dussault, Evans, Fiset (Sir Eugene), Foster, Gervais, Girouard, Howard, Jenkins, Lacombe, Lacroix, Laflamme, Langlois, Lapierre, Lapointe, Letellier de St. Just, MacLean (Prince), McIntosh, McKenzie, McMillan, Marcil, Mercier (Laurier-Outremont), Mercier (St. Henri), Morin (Bagot), Morrissy, Perras, Pouliot, Power, Rinfret, Roberge, St-Père, Sanderson, Séguin, Sylvestre, Tobin, Veniot, Verville, Woodsworth.—54.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead, Anderson (Toronto-High Park), Anderson (Halton), Arthurs, Bancroft, Barber, Bell (St. John-Albert), Bothwell, Bowen, Brown, Cantley, Casselman, Cayley, Chaplin, Clark, Coote, Cotnam, Dickie, Dunning, Edwards (Waterloo South), Embury, Ernst, Esling, Forke, Fraser, Gardiner, Geary, Gershaw, Glen, Grimmer, Guthrie, Hanson, Hay, Heaps, Hubbs, Jones, Kaiser, Kellner, Kennedy, Ladner, Lawson, Lovie, Lucas, MacLaren, Macphail (Miss), McDiarmid, McGibbon, McGregor, McPhee, McPherson, McRae, Matthews, Maybee, Millar, Milne, Peck, Perley (Sir George), Pettit, Plunkett, Price, Ralston, Ross (Kingston City), Rowe, Ryckman, Ryerson, Simpson, Sinclair (Queens), Smoke, Speakman, Spence, Spencer, Stevens, Stewart (Leeds), Stinson, Taylor, Thorson, Tummon, Ward, White (London), Wilson, Young (Saskatoon), Young (Toronto Northeast), Young (Weyburn).—83.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time on division.

MINERVA ELLIOTT

Mr. N. M. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast) moved the third reading of Bill No. 88, for the relief of Minerva Elliott.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, this is the second bill with respect to which I gave notice of motion. My object in asking for the reference of this bill to the committee is that the evidence be reconsidered. The three witnesses in the case are police agents in the city of Montreal hired by the petitioner or on her behalf. Yesterday I proved conclusively that the testimony of at least one of these witnesses is not acceptable. Here is a police agent living in the city of Montreal, who states, among other things, that he followed the accused party, who left his car in front of the Place Viger station "on Bleury street" —a street half a mile distant from the Place Viger. I pointed out last night that in any court of law where the two parties were represented, or where there was somebody acting in the public interest—the king's proctor in England—immediately the testimony of this witness would be rejected, because it is manifest that either he did not reflect for a moment on his statement or took it for

granted that the five judges in the case—I mean the five members of the senate committee—not knowing anything about Montreal, would swallow anything. Here in the evidence is a statement that a car was parked in front of a station which as a matter of fact is situated about a quarter or half a mile distant from the street indicated as that on which the station is. That is one point. Then two other witnesses like himself shadowed the man; they followed him. There is not a tittle of evidence by any of the witnesses that they followed the man into any room or saw through the door or the window, or saw in any way whatever into that room. The whole thing is based simply on presumption. My object in asking to have the bill referred to the committee is to find out whether in that committee there are some rules of evidence. If they have no rules in the committee of the house surely that committee should inquire from the committee of the senate whether that body is governed by some rules of evidence.

Looking through May's Parliamentary Practice, 12th edition, 1917—it is quite recent —I find that in the House of Lords in England there is the following standing order:

> No petition for any bill of divorce shall be presented to this house unless an official copy of the proceedings taken or had in the court having jurisdiction over matrimonial causes at the place of his domicile or residence, or in some other court having jurisdiction in that behalf, at the suit of the party desirous to present such petition, be delivered upon oath at the bar of this house at the same time.

I understood that the object of this rule is to have some kind of evidence taken in a judicial manner in order to enlighten the committee of the House of Lords. Here we have nothing of the kind.

I am informed by people who know that there are now both in Toronto and Montreal, but in Toronto especially—I do not say this in any disparaging sense but simply because most divorce cases come from that city or its surroundings—special agencies who make these cases. The most respectable detective agencies, private agencies, do not wish to have anything more to do with such cases; some of the agents of respectable agencies are not prepared to make cases with as much ease as others do. Now the granting of divorce is becoming the most important business of parliament; parliament is passing more divorce bills every session than all public and other private measures put together; and it seems to me that we have reached the point where we shall either slaughter public business in order, as has been frequently said, to do justice to the parties concerned in these divorce cases, or go on at an increasing rate granting divorces on evidence collected and presented to a committee of the house, under apparently no rules such as obtain in ordinary tribunals, or at least without a sufficient study of the various points of law that may be raised. In these circumstances it is about time, especially in a case where it is obvious that the ordinary rules of evidence have not been observed, that we discovered whether or not we are guided by some definite procedure. In this case it is clear that the testimony of one witness at least is not admissible, and the whole evidence is such that no man could be convicted on the strength of it in any court of law.

Are we going to countenance this? Are we going to discharge our responsibility by merely saying that there is a committee which has taken the proper precaution? The committee has not taken that precaution, and it is precisely because I desire to have the committee reconsider the matter that I suggest that the case be referred back in order to find out whether or not the evidence can be corroborated by genuine witnesses. It is becoming important also to ascertain the standing of these detective agencies who are now making a trade of the manufacture of evidence in divorce cases. Just by way of illustration I may observe, in connection with another case which has now been disposed of, that one of the agents testified, when asked why he had not gone further in the gathering of evidence, that there was not sufficient money in it. He said there was not much money in the case and he was in a hurry. That agent was candid enough to admit that when they are not sufficiently well paid they content themselves with what flimsy evidence they can get hold of, relying probably upon the complacency of parliament to overlook such discrepancies as there may be in the evidence. Are we going to encourage that sort of trade? Is it to be known that parliament is putting a premium on organizations of police such as every civilized country is stamping out and forbidding to operate?

Mr. SPENCER: To what police agencies is my hon. friend referring? Are they city police?

Mr. BOURASSA: In the case of Bill No. 88 the whole evidence is made by three police agents of Montreal.

Mr. SPENCER: Private agents

Mr. BOURASSA: Yes, all of them are private—private investigators, private detectives. If my hon. friend will look through

some of the records he will see that there are very few policemen—in fact, I have not noticed any this year—of either a municipal or a provincial force giving evidence. They are hired agents, just like some secret agents who are hired to locate smugglers and who receive from the government a share of the fines collected. That may be excused on the ground of public policy in view of the sad necessity of collecting revenue. But is it allowable in civil life? In a so-called civilized country which boasts of having a system of justice and a police so far superior to the system of justice and the police in the country to the south of us, is it allowable that parliament should lend its authority to the carrying on of that sort of trade, which apparently is beyond the control of any public body, municipal, provincial or federal?

My object in asking that the bill be referred back to the committee is to have these questions looked into more carefully. I am sure the members of the committee will be glad to have their attention called to the anomaly; and members of the high court of justice on the other side will also be pleased no doubt to have occasion to put themselves right in the eyes of the people of this country. If they are politically irresponsible, I do not think they are without a sense of moral responsibility. I believe they realize their moral responsibility in this matter and would like to do the right thing. This action would enable them to find out the real status of these police agencies. It would also save them from being imposed upon in the future as they have been heretofore. The committee should call before them witnesses who would testify just as they would before an ordinary court of law. In court such testimony would be brought to the attention of the crown prosecutor and action would be taken for perjury. What has been done in this case, and what will be done? It is to secure that information that I have asked the house to refer this bill back to the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the house ready for the question? Those in favour of the amendment will kindly say aye; those opposed will kindly say nay.

The members having been called in:

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for private bills being exhausted the house will now revert to consideration of the resolution concerning the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would draw attention to the fact that the vote already has been called, and must be completed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has not yet been put. Unless unanimous consent is given to continue the vote rule 15 must apply. I am quite ready to take the division, but it must be by unanimous consent.

Mr. McGIBBON: I raised the same question last night but Your Honour gave a different ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was a different question. If there is unanimous consent I am ready to proceed with the division.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Bourassa) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bettez,
Bissett,
Blanchard,
Boucher,
Boulanger,
Bourassa,
Bourgeois,
Bowman,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Dionne,
Dubuc,
Dussault,
Evans,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Foster,
Gervais,
Girouard,
Howard,
Lacombe,
Laflamme,
Langlois,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Letellier de St. Just,
MacLean (Prince),
McDiarmid,
McMillan,
Marcil,
Morin (Bagot),
Morrissy,
Parent,
Perras,
Pouliot,
Power,
Rinfret,
Roberge,
St-Père,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Sylvestre,
Tobin,
Verville,
Woodsworth.—49.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Anderson (Toronto-High Park),
Arthurs,
Barber,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bowen,
Brown,
Campbell,
Cantley,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark,
Coote,
Cotnam,
Dickie,
Edwards (Waterloo South),
Ernst,
Euler,
Forke,
Fraser,
Gardiner,
Geary,
Gershaw,
Glen,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hay,
Heaps,
Hepburn,
Hubbs,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Jones,
Kaiser,
Kellner,
Kennedy,
King (Kootenay East),
Ladner,
Lawson,
Lovie,
Lucas,
MacLaren,
Macphail (Miss),
McGibbon,
McGregor,
McPhee,
McRae,
Matthews,

Maybee,	Spence,
Millar,	Spencer,
Neill,	Steedsman,
Pettit,	Stevens,
Plunkett,	Stewart (Leeds),
Price,	Taylor,
Ralston,	Tummon,
Rennie,	White (London),
Robb,	Wilson,
Ross (Kingston City),	Young (Saskatoon),
Ryckman,	Young (Toronto Northeast),
Ryerson,	
Senn,	Young (Weyburn).—74.
Speakman,	

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time on division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for private bills being exhausted, the house will revert to consideration of the resolution respecting the Canadian National Railways.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFUNDING OF MATURING OBLIGATIONS

The house resumed consideration in committee of the following proposed resolution —Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the Canadian National Railways to provide for the refunding of certain maturing financial obligations, and to issue substituted securities therefor guaranteed by the Dominion as to principal and interest, but not exceeding $18,000,000, the aggregate face value of the original securities.

Mr. DUNNING: When the house rose at six o'clock I was explaining the need for the legislation which will be based upon this resolution. Canadian National Railway guaranteed bonds were issued in February of 1925, maturing February 15, 1930, and it is necessary to secure authority at this session of parliament for the refunding of these bonds in case it should not be possible to enact legislation and secure royal assent next session in time to take care of the refunding. I think the committee is aware of the fact that in the case of Canadian Northern debentures, or the debentures of any of the companies comprising the Canadian Northern system, a general authority exists for refunding, but the securities to be dealt with by this legislation are Canadian National securities issued since the consolidation and maturing, as I have stated, in February of next year.

The bill to be based upon this resolution will contain the usual provisions with respect to the issue of Canadian National securities. I believe that is all the information I have to give the committee at the present time.

Mr. CLARK: Earlier in the day the minister was dealing with the capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways for branch lines, terminals and so on. We have another great railway corporation in this country, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which is also necessarily well equipped and which necessarily must make capital expenditures annually. It would be interesting to know whether or not the minister, or any of his officials, has examined the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and made a comparison over a period of years of the capital expenditures of the two companies.

Mr. DUNNING: I have no doubt that such a study as suggested by the hon. member would be of interest, but it would only be of academic rather than of practical value. In the one case we have a putting together in 1923 of three systems which had been allowed to run down during a long period of years. This condition had been brought about by necessities and by circumstances of which we are all aware. On the other hand we have an institution which has had a long continuous period of management efficient in character and prosperous in results, enabling it to keep its property up to a standard far above that of the three privately-owned corporations which were the original proprietors of what is now the Canadian National system. I do not think the upbuilding of the Canadian National system since Sir Henry Thornton took charge could be made comparable in any sense with the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the same period. I do not know that I can answer the hon. member any more intelligently than that.

Mr. CLARK: It may have been of academic value a few years ago, or for the first two or three years after the amalgamation of the units which now comprise the Canadian National system, but since that amalgamation an amount of capital has been expended greater than the estimated total cost of the transcontinental railway. It seems to me that the time has come when it should be comparable to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and such a comparison would be of tremendous value to those of us who are not experienced in railway matters but who are responsible to the people for the capital expenditures which are now being made in connection with the Canadian National. If the minister has not done that already I suggest that it be done in future years, as I believe there will be an increasing demand for such a comparative statement.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall be glad to produce the information, but in advance of producing it I would say that it is not exactly relevant to the matter now under discussion

Mr. CLARK: This matter was discussed at some length this afternoon.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not believe such a comparison would have a practical value. Let me give one illustration. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has a free choice as to whether or not it will spend large sums of money on terminals in the city of Montreal. The Canadian National system has no choice in the matter; it is absolutely necessary that it spend large sums on terminal facilities in that city, the matter having been neglected in the past by the privately-owned companies now forming part of the system. The hon. member very properly said that for a period of years following Sir Henry Thornton's appointment it was necessary to spend large sums in order to bring the property up to its maximum earning capacity. I am sure there is no doubt in the mind of any member of the special committee that the period of years required gradually to bring the property up to the standard required for efficient and economical operation cannot yet be said to be over. If my memory serves me aright, some criticism was made at the sittings of the special committee during this session as to the delay in bringing the property up to the required standard. I do not think that was the general view of the committee, but individual members requested the management to move faster in that respect, particularly as related to branch lines.

I do not see any reason why the information requested by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard should not be brought down. As a matter of fact the information is available now. Each year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company publishes a statement showing the amounts which it proposes to spend on capital account, and these amounts are authorized in due course by the shareholders of the company. From the minutes of the special committee we know the amounts which it is proposed to spend on capital account for the Canadian National system. It is quite easy to make a comparison, but I do urge that such comparisons really lead to nothing but an academic result and do not offer any conclusion of practical value, because it is impossible to take into account relatively the physical necessities of the two systems.

Mr. CLARK: The minister has mentioned the matter of terminals in Montreal. When that question is being considered I suggest that it would be of great interest and of practical value to this house to know how much has been spent on the terminals which are now being used by the Canadian National system in Montreal, and how much has been spent on the terminals now being used by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The condition of the terminals of the Canadian Pacific Railway might be stated also. It will be of great interest to us to know how usefully the money has been spent in the past or how usefully it will be spent in the future. I think the plan of the terminal should be before the committee, as well as full information as to the situation as it applies to the two railway companies.

Mr. DUNNING: I intend to take up the resolution dealing with the Montreal terminals after this one is disposed of. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre introduced this matter this afternoon really as part of a larger picture which he was trying to present, and I would prefer not to enter into a discussion of the details at this moment.

Mr. GEARY: These matters came before the committee and each in its turn was quite fully dealt with. As the minister has just stated, the question was raised whether or not the maintenance of way was being caught up with, as well as the question whether or not the system was paying too much or too little in that regard.

Mr. DUNNING: And equipment also.

Mr. GEARY: And equipment. Every member of the committee had the opportunity of asking questions, and it was very clearly brought out that the Canadian National system does spend money, when it has it to spend, in order to bring its equipment and right of way up to date; but it is often obliged because of lack of funds, particularly from ordinary operating income, to leave matters in a less complete state than it otherwise would. If we could compare the cost of construction of branch lines, which is absolutely new work, we could ascertain whether or not the one company was getting the work done more cheaply than the other. There are problems connected with the Canadian National system which the Canadian Pacific has long ago solved, such as tying up different parts of the system and making expenditures which from the standpoint of operating return did not at the time appear to be warranted, but which subsequent results may have fully justified. I remember one matter which came up in that connection—the ballasting of the track from Montreal to Sarnia. It may be that on that sort of ballast the Canadian National will have to spend more than a competing system in the same territory. I do not see how we can get very much

information from a comparison, but from consultation with and cross-questioning of the officials—and officials of all sorts will be before the committee—we can get information as to each item of expenditure as it comes up. It might be for a hotel purchase, for a property purchase in Paris or Toronto. The competing road is doing much the same in the way of building hotels. Whether we are doing much more in building structures than the Canadian Pacific is a matter of some interest, but whether we are building wisely more or fewer hotels than the Canadian Pacific can be judged only from a consideration of the circumstances attaching to each expenditure. I know what the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard wants, and if the money that is being spent on similar objects is being spent as advantageously by the Canadian National as by the Canadian Pacific, I think he will be quite satisfied so far as that particular matter goes. My impression at the committee was that the expenditures, so far as they are carried out by contract, are very carefully guarded, and not much fault could be found with the actual expenditure of money provided that the reasons for spending it have been approved.

Mr. MATTHEWS: Will there be opportunities later on to discuss the form of securities to be issued?

Mr. DUNNING: The bill itself will deal with that, and the opportunity will occur on the second reading, and in committee on the bill when the various sections can be dealt with.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Dunning thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 253, respecting the Canadian National Railways and to provide for the refunding of certain maturing financial obligations.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONTREAL RAILWAY TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Canadian National Railway Company may construct and complete terminal stations and facilities and other railway works and improvements at or in the vicinity of the city of Montreal, and the governor in council may guarantee the principal and interest of securities to be issued for these purposes by the company to an amount not exceeding $50,000,000, and the proceeds of any sale, pledge or disposition of the securities shall be deposited to the credit of the Minister of Finance in trust for the company, and released from time to time to the company by the said minister to be applied to expenditures made or indebtedness incurred in connection with the said works.

[Mr. Geary.]

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. DUNNING: I think it would be well for me to make a brief general statement regarding what is contemplated as a result of this resolution, although necessarily, in dealing with a matter so large, as was indicated during the discussion on the last resolution, it will be desirable for the proper committee of the house to go very carefully into the proposal in all its bearings, into all the plans of what is proposed and generally into the manner of dealing with it.

One of the many problems with which the Canadian National railway management has been faced in the development of that system has centred around the city of Montreal, a particularly important railway centre. The problem is not a new one; it has for some years engaged the attention not only of the present management of the national railways, but of previous managements of the constituent parts of the system, as well as the city council and the citizens of Montreal. Prior to the war the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in conjunction with the city and the Board of Railway Commissioners, had made a study of the situation affecting principally the separation of grades between Bonaventure station and Victoria bridge and Turcot, and had developed a plan involving the raising of the tracks of the railway company in this area to a sufficient extent to permit vehicular traffic to pass underneath the railway facilities. This plan involved the construction of a new passenger station upon the site of Bonaventure station. The estimated cost of the project at that time before the war, was $15,300,000, and when the government acquired the Grand Trunk, it was considered as a capital expenditure which would have to be faced in time, the then estimated cost, due to advancing prices, being slightly over $20,000,000.

The Canadian Northern Railway Company, through its subsidiary the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, broke ground in June, 1912, in connection with the construction of a tunnel entrance to the city. The work was in progress at the time the Canadian Northern railway system was taken over by the Dominion government in 1918, and shortly before the end of the war the tunnel was

opened for traffic, the first train being operated into the tunnel station on Lagauchetiere street on October 28, 1918. In connection with the general plan of this Canadian Northern entrance, considerable property was acquired between the tunnel station at Lagauchetiere street and the harbour front for the purpose of extension to the harbour tracks, but because of the financial situation of the Canadian Northern and the evident necessity of coordinating these terminal facilities with those of the Grand Trunk Railway, the acquisition of which was under negotiation by the government in 1918, the completion of this work was halted and the situation remains exactly the same to-day as it did then. During the war and the period immediately after the war, public agitation for improved conditions naturally died down in spite of the fact that grade crossing difficulties and terminal congestion due to the constantly increasing traffic both in the railway terminals and on the city streets crossing the railway tracks, became more and more acute.

When Sir Henry Thornton took charge of the administration of the Canadian National Railways, public agitation for an improvement in the situation had again developed, and steps were initiated to study the situation from the Canadian National point of view. It soon became evident to Sir Henry Thornton and his officers that the expenditure involved in a readjustment of the terminal facilities would be very large, and also that the financial position of the Canadian National at that time would hardly justify the immediate assumption of the capital load involved. Studies were continued with a view to developing the most satisfactory plan from the point of view of the Canadian National Railways. Meanwhile the conditions affecting the operation of the Canadian National Railway traffic at Montreal became so acute because of interference with vehicular traffic at the numerous grade crossings, that it became evident that the problem required to be speedily dealt with. Accordingly, as Minister of Railways, on the advice of the management of the Canadian National, on October 24, 1927, I filed expropriation plans covering property between the tunnel at Lagauchetiere street and the waterfront in the vicinity of Victoria bridge so as to protect the Canadian National against an undue rise in price due to speculative influences in the area which anyone might presume would be the area affected by any possible terminal scheme development. By that time the investigations instituted by Sir Henry Thornton and his advisers had progressed so far as to convince the management of the railway that the site of the tunnel terminal was the most advantageous at which to construct a modern passenger station in which the passenger facilities of the Canadian National railways could be concentrated. It had also become evident to Sir Henry Thornton that the amount of money involved to meet satisfactorily the terminal situation at Montreal was larger even than he had at first anticipated. These views were communicated to me and discussions took place upon the question at that time. In order to make the matter more clear I should point out to the committee that there are at the present time three separate Canadian National stations in the city of Montreal which do not at all directly connect with each other; indeed in one case there is no connection save by going many miles around. That is very inconvenient both for the public and for the operation of the railway.

After discussing the matter on many occasions—and I may say that the management has kept the government through myself, well informed of any developments in that connection—when it became apparent that the problem was so enormous from the point of view of possible financial commitments, while having the utmost faith in the officials of the Canadian National who were particularly charged with the duty of dealing with an engineering enterprise of this character, it was nevertheless thought best both by the government and by the management of the Canadian National railways, and I might add by the engineers of the Canadian National railway staff particularly concerned, to secure if possible some entirely independent outside advice, an outside review, if you will, of all that had been developed in connection with this problem both by the Canadian National engineers and also the eight or nine other proposals which had from time to time been made as tentative solutions of the Montreal terminal problem by various interested parties. In order to obtain this independent advice on the whole terminal question, not only from the standpoint of the Canadian National but also from the standpoint of the interests of the public, the government decided to engage Mr. Frederick Palmer, who was mentioned this afternoon by my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre, an eminent British engineer who had previously reported on the Hudson Bay terminals, to review and report on the terminal situation in Montreal.

As to Mr. Palmer's qualifications to deal with railway terminal matters, I may tell my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre that Mr. Palmer's initial engineering experience was

in railway work. He has kept up his connection with large railway enterprises from that day until this, and is in fact at the present time still consulting engineer to the government of India in connection with all Indian railway problems. As my hon. friend probably knows, the government of India owns the major part of the Indian railway systems.

Mr. Palmer came to Canada and in due course reviewed the local conditions, physical and traffic, and made a personal study of all the various schemes which had been advanced and to which I referred a moment ago. Eight or nine plans had been advanced by various private interests. The results of the studies which were made by Mr. Palmer have been embodied in his report, dated January 31, 1929, which has been printed and copies of which have been distributed to all Montreal members, and are available also to any member of the house who is interested, and for public distribution. Mr. Palmer in his report states that in his opinion the location development of the Canadian National railway in its studies for a central passenger station is the best which could be thought of not only from the Canadian National standpoint but also from the standpoint of a union terminal to provide for the requirements of both railways should a union terminal be decided upon. That, Mr. Chairman, I believe to be a very important factor, as to whether this proposal of the Canadian National railways would close the door for ever to a union terminal of all the railways in the city of Montreal. Mr. Palmer has studied the situation carefully from that point of view and advances the opinion that the scheme now under consideration, while providing adequately for Canadian National requirements for many years to come, does not close the door to a possible unionizing of all the passenger traffic entering the city of Montreal, should that be decided upon by the parties interested to be in their own best interests and in the interests of the city of Montreal and its people.

Mr. CANTLEY: That will hardly be accepted.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not speaking of its acceptance; I am referring merely to the question whether this scheme closes the door to a possible union in the future. I would regard it as a matter of some importance if we were at this time closing the door to and thus effectually preventing the development of a union terminal should that be desired in Montreal in the future. I am now merely advancing the idea, which is confirmed by Mr. Palmer, that the scheme proposed by the Canadian National does not close the door to a possible union in the future.

Mr. CANTLEY: Not if you have unlimited funds. Anything is possible if you have enough money.

Mr. DUNNING: Of course these things do cost money, but I would not follow my hon. friend so far as to say that unlimited money is required. The economic desirability of creating union facilities would, of course, be carefully studied by all the parties who would be required to spend money, and I have no doubt that none of them, the Canadian National, the Canadian Pacific, the Montreal Tramways or the city of Montreal, would be prepared to spend the necessary money unless they were convinced from their own point of view, of the economic desirability of doing so.

Mr. Palmer suggested certain modifications in the Canadian National proposal to permit of a more convenient distribution of passengers to and from the passenger terminal and to avoid the congestion of street traffic in the vicinity. He also suggested the development of improved yard facilities accessible to both railways at the west end of the harbour for the purpose of improving the interchange of traffic between the harbour and the railways—a very important factor in the traffic in and around the city and port of Montreal.

With regard to grade separation—and this I think will illustrate the difficulty of that problem for the average member of the house better than anything else I can say—one of the principal reasons for the complaint on the part of the citizens of Montreal in connection with the Canadian National terminal has been the large number of grade crossings at which there exists an element of danger, and at which delay in the movement of street traffic has been growing. Between Bonaventure station and Victoria bridge and Turcot there are at present 27 grade crossings, some of which are particularly important. Between Moreau street station and the present city limits there are 39 grade crossings. The town of Montreal East and Point aux Trembles contain an additional 9 grade crossings, and on the balance of the line to the east end of the Island at Bout-de-l'Ile, there are, 6 more grade crossings. The total grade crossings are 81. These have always been a source of complaint on the part of the public of Montreal.

Now, as to the importance of the terminal from the railway point of view, I only desire to place on record a very few figures which

I think graphically illustrate the growth in freight traffic of the city and port of Montreal. The tonnage handled into and out of the city of Montreal by the Canadian National railways has increased rapidly, as the following figures will show:

Year	Originated	Terminated	Total
1913	586,000	1,729,000	2,314,000
1924	1,146,000	2,295,000	3,441,000
1925	1,329,000	2,360,000	3,689,000
1926	1,490,000	2,434,000	3,924,000
1927	1,699,000	2,567,000	4,266,000
1928	1,969,000	2,948,000	4,917,000

I would point out that the increase as between 1927 and 1928 is nearly 700,000 tons.

With respect to this proposal to expend $50,000,000, I should explain that the bill to be introduced will provide an expenditure of not more than $10,000,000 in any one year, except with special permission by order in council. It is planned to develop the works during the course of the next seven years. I do not expect, neither does the railway management, that during the current fiscal year it will be possible or desirable to spend up to the $10,000,000 which is provided as the yearly limit. As my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre has said, it is difficult in planning works of this magnitude to place any definite limit on what the expenditure will be. My attitude towards engineering estimates for large works is well known. I take a somewhat sceptical view of such estimates. I usually regard it as being necessary to allow a proportion over the forecast made by the engineers.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You are as bad as the lawyers.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not as bad as the lawyers, but the engineers are in that respect, although in some other respects the profession stands very much higher than the legal profession, particularly with respect to the fees charged to the public. The intention, then, is to submit this bill, based upon the resolution, to the general committee of the house on railways, canals and telegraph lines. My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre suggested that he would rather have it referred to the smaller special committee, but of course that committee is appointed by the house only for the specific purpose of dealing with Canadian National railway accounts and estimates, and in any case in a question of this magnitude there is merit in referring it to the larger committee.

I have requested the Canadian National railway officials to provide in the railway committee room full detail maps of the whole proposal, and to bring models which they have prepared, which illustrate graphically what is involved in the entire scheme, and show the city of Montreal and the island of Montreal in miniature. These will enable any member of the committee or of the house to grasp the details in a very short time. When therefore this bill gets before the railway committee I would suggest not only to the members of the committee itself but to all members of the house that they take the opportunity of studying at close range all that is involved in this vast terminal project.

I have only one word more to say. I do hope that when the railway committee is dealing with the matter, if there are interests in the city of Montreal having any constructive views to offer or criticisms of any kind, that they will attend and give the committee the benefit of their advice. As my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre has said, this is one of the largest projects in connection with the Canadian National Railway that we have ever entered upon, and I do hope that all phases of it can be fully developed and fully studied before the committee. I hope the critics, if critics there be, will be present and give us the benefit of their views. The officials of the Canadian National Railway system, who have spent years in studying this project, will be present with all plans, details, and models of what is involved. I know the Canadian National Railway management is desirous, and the government also desires, that the right thing be done in embarking upon an enterprise so large as this.

Mr. GEARY: Would the minister think it well, not to speak of the plans in detail at the moment, but to tell the committee something of that part of the scheme which has to do with the development of property in the vicinity of the new terminal? I understand attention has been paid to the development of that part of Montreal, that highways for vehicular and pedestrian traffic have been laid out to suit the station, and I believe there is a plan for utilizing the ground purchased but not required for actual railway purposes for warehouses, factories, shops and that sort of thing. That, I assume, Mr. Palmer would know very little about, but I should like the assurance of the minister that this part of the scheme has been carefully studied. Perhaps he can give us some indication of what the plans lead to in that regard.

Mr. DUNNING: The broad plan in that particular can be much better understood in the committee room from the models and plans than I can convey by any description. But it is planned to utilize to the fullest extent what might be called the surface rights

over the terminal property generally. The terminal station which the Canadian National Railways own is situated, as my hon. friend knows, in the heart of Montreal, on property which in value would approximate very closely to the most valuable property in Canada. Now, we are evolving a plan contemplating the complete coverage of the station proper and utilizing the area above that for building, not only for railway purposes but valuable property rights for sale or rental or lease to other parties, such as has been done in the case of one or two of the larger terminals in New York city. The plans also contemplate the creation of entirely new streets over and around the terminal property. Every effort is being made to utilize the property in a manner which will produce the maximum revenue to the Canadian National Railways. I will make a special point when the models and the plans are brought here that this feature is given special attention in the committee room.

Mr. McRAE: I share the hon. minister's uneasiness with regard to engineer's estimates. Perhaps he would tell the committee of the care which has been taken in arriving at this $50,000,000, because, as we all appreciate, it is rather an ambitious program.

Mr. DUNNING: I should like to be able to go further into that. Frankly I had not anticipated going into so much detail at this stage because of the fact, as my hon. friend from North Vancouver will appreciate, that the officers who have been working on this will be available to give reasons for the faith that is in them, or at any rate in their own estimates, and I hope for a full representation of the committee on that occasion. I may say it has always been the practice in the railway committee to welcome any members of the house who are not members of the committee and to permit them to ask questions.

Mr. McGIBBON: There are many other committees meeting at the same time.

Mr. DUNNING: I appreciate that, and I shall endeavour, so far as in my power may lie, to avoid in this case any inconvenience from that cause. I will ask the chairman of the railway committee to endeavour as far as possible to cooperate. In any event, perhaps this would help: It might be arranged to have the plans and models in the railway committee room over a number of days with a Canadian National official present most of the time, so that any member may go in at any time and obtain information. That, I believe, would probably facilitate arriving at an understanding of the whole matter by the membership of the house generally. I shall be glad to arrange that and shall also endeavour to avoid as far as possible anything that will inconvenience hon. members.

Mr. McGIBBON: Very good of the minister.

Mr. DUNNING: No, merely decent.

Mr. CANTLEY: I think the minister is to be congratulated on his method of bringing the matter before the house. He made reference to some area which at one time was under consideration and might have been secured by the Grand Trunk Railway between the Victoria bridge and the Point St. Charles property. How much land was it proposed to secure for the $15,000,000?

Mr. DUNNING: The plan involved in the $15,000,000 scheme was a four track elevated line west from Bonaventure station and the acquisition of a strip of property alongside sufficient to make it possible to erect a four track elevated line and to provide for the necessary grade separations.

Mr. CANTLEY: There may be good reasons for it, but frankly I am surprised at the decision of the management to put the station at the point suggested. I am surprised for several reasons; one is that the climb up from Bonaventure depot or the track levels between the Victoria bridge and the Bonaventure depot will mean surmounting a very considerable elevation. Of that there can be no doubt. I understand that Sir Henry Thornton, the president of the road, makes a strong point of the necessity for having what he calls a through station. I would point out, however, that most of the great railway stations on this continent are not through stations, such, for example, as those of Boston, New York and Philadelphia. These are not through stations, and if you take the old country—London, where there are half a dozen stations, Liverpool and Glasgow—you will find that the same thing applies. There are no through stations in any of these large centres which handle enormously greater numbers of passengers than we can expect to handle for a good many years to come. Surely some other solution of the problem is possible than that the traffic from Montreal coming westward shall go through the tunnel. That means a bottleneck of simply two tracks, one inward and one outward. Is not that correct?

Mr. DUNNING: Only for passenger purposes.

Mr. CANTLEY: Only for passenger purposes; but certainly if this country is going to grow, as the minister believes and as we all believe, this will be a factor of considerable importance in a very short time. Further, in my opinion, it will be impossible to climb up from Bonaventure station or the level of the Bonaventure station tracks except by the erection of a tremendously expensive steel structure; and then we get to a point which I think means congestion from almost every point of view as a terminal. As regards the 27 grade crossings between Victoria bridge and Bonaventure depot—and there are really more than that number—I have long thought that what should have been done by the Grand Trunk, or later on by the Canadian National Railways as soon as they got round to it, was to acquire most or all of the tract of land between the Victoria bridge and the present terminals at Bonaventure station. That would elminate the whole question of grade crossings and give the railway control of all the land at the head of the harbour and connection with the canals coming up this way, with yard standage of great value to the railway.

Mr. DUNNING: That would cost more than the terminal scheme.

Mr. CANTLEY: It might have cost a little more, but the railway would then have an enormous amount of territory for all time to meet the growth of this country for years to come, and we should not be hemmed in, as the present proposal will mean. What we did not need we could have disposed of to very great advantage. These are some of the points that occur to me. I have no doubt they must have been considered by the minister and the officers of the railway, but I hope that when the matter comes before the committee, as the minister suggests, we shall then have some further information with reference to these various points, which I regard as of considerable importance. Frankly, I repeat, I am surprised at the decision reached in regard to this matter.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall not attempt now to go into this detailed criticism my hon. friend offers; I hope he will present it to the officers of the company and get, as I am sure he will get, full information regarding the points he has raised. With respect to the question of gradient, my recollection is that the rail level at Victoria bridge is identical with the rail level at the present tunnel station. There is, it is true, a dip in between, but the problem of dealing with Bonaventure, no matter who may have viewed the situation from Bonaventure west involves a grade separation; all are agreed that a grade separation is necessary, and a grade separation in that area does involve elevated tracks to a considerable extent. However, I will not follow my hon. friend in any detail at this time inasmuch as the committee is the proper place for all these matters to be carefully examined.

Mr. McRAE: In view of the great importance of this work, I would suggest to the minister that the railway committee, and also such members of the house as may see fit to accept his kind invitation to attend the meetings, be given an opportunity to go over the ground and examine the actual layout after they have heard the plans.

Sir EUGENE FISET: By special train.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McRAE: I am not particularly interested in a special train.

Mr. DUNNING: From the applause I hear I take it that some other things will be found for hon. members to do in Montreal in addition to going over the ground. I can assure my hon. friend that the Canadian National Railways will be only too happy to show over the ground any member or members who may wish to go to Montreal. I know that a number of members on both sides have been to Montreal, have visited the offices and seen the plans, and have gone over the ground, and I can assure every other hon. member that he is more than welcome to go and do likewise. The Montreal members who sit behind me and one of them across the way will see to the entertainment of their fellow members.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Dunning thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 254, respecting the construction by the Canadian National Railway Company of certain terminal facilities with grade separation and other works at and in the vicinity of the city of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

AGREEMENT FOR THE PURCHASE OF ALBERTA RAILWAYS

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 71. to

incorporate the Northern Alberta Railways Company, and respecting the Canadian National Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. A. D. McRAE (Vancouver North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this bill I give expression to my own personal views only; I feel that the principle at stake merits a further discussion before going into committee.

The residents of the Peace River district, as I found them last fall, were indifferent as to who should be the purchaser of their transportation system so long as the province of Alberta got out of the railway business. Either of our two great transcontinental railway systems would be satisfactory to them, but they had some doubts as to the joint ownership proposed; they feared that the board of directors which will result from the combination, with all the conflicting hopes and ambitions of their principals—agreements to the contrary notwithstanding—will not make for the rapid development of that new country. They feel certain that in the difference which inevitably will arise the interests of the district will suffer.

I must say that I share their feelings. I can understand our two great railways getting together on joint terminals and perhaps on a main trunk line where density of traffic and cheap ton mileage are the only ends to be considered, but I am sure that a partnership of this kind would not have brought about the present development of the west, which was the work of broad-visioned, courageous men who were in charge of the competing railway companies.

I cannot see that in the joint ownership of the present Alberta railways the interests of our two railway systems are identical. To begin with, it must be apparent even to the blind that the increasing traffic of the Peace River country cannot long continue over the present railway via Edmonton. Some more direct outlet to the coast must be built, the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot possibly continue to carry its half of the Peace River wheat crop via Calgary to the sea. The Canadian National Railways already have a line to the coast within striking distance of Grande Prairie, but that route is not the natural outlet for the larger part of the Peace River district which is north of the Peace river itself.

The economic outlet for this part of the Peace river country is, undoubtedly, by Peace pass, Prince George and Vancouver, and willingly or otherwise that is the outlet which, in the development of that great district, eventually must be constructed.

Why do I say this? Let me give this house a brief description of the country north of the Peace river. Immediately on the west of the Peace river agricultural district, some 150 miles north of Prince George, is the Findlay river mining section, a district already well under development. A few miles east we have a large coal area which Providence has conveniently located at the western door to the Peace river agricultural country, and there is also available nearby, in the Peace River canyon, sufficient water-power to supply cheap power for the entire mining, smelting and refining requirements of that mineral zone. Then, for about 600 miles northeastward to the source of the Mackenzie river, at the northwest end of Great Slave lake, there is a continuous tract of excellent agricultural land.

When we get to the Mackenzie river we are on the doorstep of that now famous precambrian shield which extends across the northern part of the Dominion, the value of which all hon. members fully understand. This shield continues through the Coppermine river mineral reserve to the Arctic, a district which has long promised to be one of the great copper mining areas on the continent. As a matter of fact on the shores of Great Slave lake preparations already are being made for drilling the extensive zinc and lead deposits during the coming summer.

In addition this railway which, we may anticipate, will be joined by a short extension from Peace River Crossing and Edmonton, will meet the Mackenzie river somewhere below Great Slave lake in the vicinity of Fort Providence. When completed it would give a forty-hour rail service from Edmonton to that point as compared with the present infrequent boat journey of eight days down stream and twelve days up stream, and that for a limited time each year. This railway would provide a daily service for twelve months of the year. In fact such a line, by escaping all the boat delays occasioned by ice jams in Great Slave lake, would make it possible to reach the open Mackenzie river six weeks earlier in the spring and leave it two weeks later in the fall, increasing the present season on the Mackenzie from two and a half months to four and a half months, thus opening up a new Arctic region for this country. The present boat season on the Mackenzie is from July 1 to September 15, but when railway connection is established the Mackenzie river season will be from May

15 until early in October. This railway connection would bring into the market via Edmonton the fish of the Great Slave and Great Bear lakes, the Mackenzie river and the Arctic ocean. It would give the mining area to which I have referred a year-round service as against the present limited boat service of two and a half months yearly, under which the country never can develop. Such is the future of this great northern empire when railway facilities are provided.

The unusual attractiveness of this whole railway program is due to the fact that over its entire length from Findlay Forks to Great Slave lake, almost 700 miles, every mile is freight producing and undoubtedly would justify the construction of the line when a definite program for the development of the country is assured.

The Peace pass has been long regarded as the most favourable pass through the Rocky mountains. Undoubtedly there would be some difficulties to contend with in securing acceptable grades; but considering what we have accomplished in that respect already, there need be no fear of eventually not getting the minimum grade necessary for a heavy freight line, which this railway is destined to become, from the Mackenzie river to Vancouver.

From this hurried resumé of the district north of the Peace river, I am sure that hon. members will appreciate that there is ample room for both our national railways in that country. I do not believe that this joint proposal is sound. It savours too much of a combination which I am sure will not work out to the benefit of the district.

What does this partnership of our two competing railways actually mean? Does it go any further than the 60 miles of new branch lines provided for in the purchase agreement? Under schedule B, rights, good for five years, are granted to this new combination—provided they start the construction within two years—of four branch lines, totalling approximately 600 milles. At $40,000 per mile this would work out at about $24,000,000, and parliament would have to vote one-half of this amount, or $12,000,000, if these branches are to be built. If this house or either of the railway companies do not feel inclined, because of financial or other reasons, to go ahead, then the branches cannot be built.

It will be observed that this schedule includes the 60 miles the new company is obliged to build under the purchase agreement, so the necessary start is certain to be made. By passing this bill we are tying up for five years the principal branch lines in the Peace River district without any certainty that the construction essential to its development will be proceeded with. It is no assurance of prompt action to say that in case of differences each railway could build its own branches. That is not practical and, therefore, is not probable.

What about the hauling of freight to the sea over the most economical route regardless of who owns it? This is certainly in the interests of the settlers and residents in the Peace River district, and yet this agreement provides for the interests of the companies but not the district.

Are both the railways equally interested in another route through the mountains to the sea? I do not believe they are. As I have already pointed out, the Canadian National system has a line within striking distance of this district. These, and a thousand other equally contentious questions are sure to come before the board of directors representing both of our rival companies.

What about the Peace River country when this new railway partnership does not agree? Where does the district get off at? Is it to stagnate? These are matters which I think the house should consider before giving effect to this legislation. The success of the industries of this country depends upon the continuance of the present healthy competition between our two national railway systems. They are two separate corporations and should always be considered in that way and be treated alike. The joint ownership of the Peace River railways would be the first serious breakdown in this competitive position.

The people of the west might well take heed lest in the precedent about to be established the interests of our two railway systems may in time become so harmonized that this competition, obtained after a waste of so much effort and money, will become a thing of the past.

When speaking about the future railway development in the Peace River district the hon. Minister of Railways said that public opinion would protect the interests of the residents of that district. I have always looked upon public opinion as being a late cure; sometimes too late, and never farsighted, particularly when the development of a new country is concerned.

I cannot see how hon. members from the prairie provinces can support a bill which puts the new settlers of the Peace River district in a position similar to that from which the farmers of Manitoba freed themselves more than a generation ago. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the merger, even by slow

degrees, of our two national transportation systems. I oppose this bill because I consider it a railway combination which is not in the best interests of the Peace River district or of the country as a whole.

Mr. J. C. BRADY (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I hope the house will pardon my saying a few words concerning this bill. There is no doubt that this agreement between the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific Railways for the development of the Alberta railway lines was arrived at after considerable care and thought, but I would remind the house of the discussion which arose in 1925 regarding the Peace River country. At that time an estimate was passed to construct an elevator at the port of Prince Rupert, the terminal of the Canadian National lines. If some of the ministers present this evening can remember what they said at that time they will realize that they expressed the view that the building of this elevator and its functioning in the future would become a part and parcel of the development of the Peace River country. It was definitely connected up with the opening of the shortest route to the Pacific coast.

I am opposed to this bill, not because it will be a benefit to Alberta but on the ground that it will materially interfere with the opening up of the legitimate, natural outlet for the Peace River country. I think that is the most important aspect of this matter. The hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) has summed up very well the difficulties which must be met. The Canadian National Railways should carry out what I consider to be a moral obligation on their part to protect and guard their own line to the port of Prince Rupert.

I do not think it would be advisable at this time for me to say where the outlet from the Peace River should go to, nor do I believe it is possible for anyone to say that. During the past three years we have had many reports from the engineers of both the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways. Four passes, Obed, Monkman, Pine and Peace river, were mentioned. I contend that in no instance have we been able definitely to say where the proper economic outlet to the Peace River district should be. It may be known to the Canadian National, or the Canadian Pacific, or to the engineers of both these great railway systems, but I honestly believe that this is where the Canadian National failed. The Peace River country is really a district that the Canadian National should have taken the utmost interest in. What has happened? We must acknowledge facts as we see them. I hope the Minister of Railways will not be offended, but I believe the Canadian National have been negligent in the duty which devolved upon them in not taking over for themselves the development of the Peace River country. The Canadian Pacific entered the field; they sent in their engineers repeatedly, and finally—they were prior to the Canadian National so far as I am aware—they decided that they were going to develop that country. Then it was that the Canadian National entered.

A few weeks ago I asked the minister whether he believed that this agreement would interfere with, retard or hasten the development of an outlet from the Peace River district to the Pacific coast, and he replied that he believed it would facilitate it. I do not believe that it can facilitate the development of the nearest economic route to the Pacific ocean for this reason: Can anyone say that either of these two great railway companies, working on a fifty-fifty basis, can break away from this contract and start in to feed their own lines irrespective of the other? I do not know how this can be done. I believe both railway companies have agreed to a survey along the Pacific Great Eastern. If that survey is satisfactory and if it meets the requirements as regards possibilities of freight, these companies will be obligated to connect up with the Pacific Great Eastern say from Prince George. If that be the case—and it is a possibility—I say to the Minister of Railways: It is futile to think that the Canadian National port of Prince Rupert will benefit in the least degree from that. If Prince George is connected with the Pacific Great Eastern, undoubtedly, geographically the only way whereby freight from the Peace River district will flow in accord with that railway development, will be down that line.

Mr. DUNNING: Down to Vancouver?

Mr. BRADY: Down to Vancouver.

Mr. DUNNING: Over the Pacific Great Eastern?

Mr. BRADY: If the Pacific Great Eastern is found acceptable—and both companies have agreed to make a survey of it—and if it were understood, according to the hon. member for North Vancouver, that from Grand Prairie a line would be built to Prince George, I contend that the Canadian National line to the port of Prince Rupert would be left practically high and dry. I ask the Minister of Railways to consider this seriously. One of two things should be done regarding the national line to the port of Prince Rupert. One is that steps should be taken to connect

up their branch lines in Alberta with some point on the Canadian National west of Prince George, so as to ensure that the port of Prince Rupert and the line of the Canadian National will receive a portion of freight developed, or let the Canadian Pacific take over the line. What do we find today? Anybody who has read the wheat records of the past week must realize that a great change has taken place regarding the movement of wheat to the various world ports. We find that the Argentine and Australia are now big competitors with Canada in the matter of wheat. The reason is obvious, namely, that their wheat moves when our wheat is lying in cold storage, in the elevators on the great lakes. The result is that we must turn more and more to the movement of wheat to the Pacific coast. Vancouver has received so far over 80,000,000 bushels of wheat and no doubt she will receive more. The reason is that the port is open for twelve months in the year. The port of Prince Rupert is likewise open for twelve months in the year and it is nearer to the Orient than any other port on the Pacific coast. It is 480 miles nearer to five big ports in the Orient, for instance, Kobe, Shanghai, Tokyo and others. That being the case, the people of Prince Rupert look upon this development in Alberta with very grave fears; they are afraid that it means the holding up of rightful development or a great delay in the matter of bringing a share of the produce from the Peace River district to the port of Prince Rupert. I believe there is plenty of room for Stewart, Prince Rupert and Vancouver to share in this development; I do not believe the grain will flow through one main channel; it will break up and divide into these three channels if the opportunity is afforded. I trust therefore that the Minister of Railways will satisfy us regarding the future of the port of Prince Rupert. We have a large ocean dock there; we have also an elevator that has been closed throughout the year, and I am sorry to say—but this is the place to say these things; after all, it is the only place where a man can determine whether he has facts or not—that I have it on good authority that last season's shipments of wheat destined for the port of Prince Rupert were changed at Jasper and deflected to the port of Vancouver. I should like to know on whose authority or why that deflection took place. There must be a good reason for it and as the port of Prince Rupert is a national creation, the people expect that at least it shall receive some attention in the big development that is going on and will go on in the Peace River country. I do think that some clause should be placed in this bill to assure the people of western Canada that there shall be no interference with any extension which the Canadian National might make towards joining up their own line to the port of Prince Rupert, and I would like the Minister of Railways before this bill is sent to the committee to enlighten us as to what he considers the situation will be should this bill pass. I have read the bill carefully and I find that first of all three conditions must be met, and that practically immediately the bill becomes law. Then there are other conditions which are introduced with the word "may," such as, "The company may construct and operate one hundred and two miles," and so on. In other words, they do not need to enter upon that work at all; they "may" do it. Therefore I think we are entitled to be satisfied that the future of the port of Prince Rupert is not in danger and that that port will not be overlooked.

I would just like to draw attention to another feature. The other evening the minister mentioned that certain existing lines in eastern Canada were to be taken over by the Canadian National at a sum running up to about $10,000,000. We have the great Hudson Bay railway on our hands, and I do not think that anybody in this house or anyone in Canada can say definitely that that great engineering work is going to be a success. These will involve heavy responsibilities financially. The Hudson Bay railway is still a theoretical proposition; there is no guarantee that it will fulfil the requirements, and that it will function in accordance with our expectations. The Peace River development will benefit all Canada.

There is one other thing which I think cannot be denied and that is that the Canadian National has in the port of Prince Rupert a port second to none strategically, and second to none as a port itself, because there is no expense attached to it. It is looked upon by ocean captains as one of the finest harbours on the whole coast of America. Therefore I do not think that I am trespassing upon the time of the house when I request the Minister of Railways to see that the Canadian National safeguard the interests of that port and maintain the line running to Prince Rupert in their own system and make it function, in order to build up the port of Prince Rupert, instead of concentrating the whole movement of grain and all other produce on the line down to the port of Vancouver. I do not think that that is the best think to do either nationally or

economically, and I believe there is a moral obligation resting upon this government to see that Prince Rupert will receive the consideration to which it is undoubtedly entitled.

Mr. J. A. FRASER (Cariboo): I must congratulate the province of Alberta on being able to dispose of their railways at so fair and equitable a price. I have on a great many occasions pointed out the necessity for coupling up the Peace River country with the western outlet, and I very much regret that such a provision is not contained in this bill. This bill does not do anything to forward in the slightest degree the connecting up of the Peace River country with the western outlet. I think there should be some indication in this bill that it is the intention of the companies who are acquiring the control of the Edmonton and Dunvegan road to connect up the Peace River country with the western outlet. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) a short time ago seemed rather surprised that anyone would venture the suggestion that the Pacific Great Eastern really could carry the freight of that country to the city of Vancouver.

Mr. DUNNING: No, my hon. friend does me an injustice there.

Mr. FRASER: I am sorry if I do.

Mr. DUNNING: Perhaps I might clear up the point so that my hon. friend could then discuss it. The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Brady) was arguing that grain which moved to Prince George over a railway from the north would go to Vancouver over the Pacific Great Eastern rather than to Prince Rupert. I shook my head, because from what I know of the Pacific Great Eastern it would not be economical to haul grain to Vancouver over that road from Prince George, when it could be hauled over our good grades to Prince Rupert. I do not think it would be economical to haul grain from Prince George over the Pacific Great Eastern as compared with shipping it from Prince George to Prince Rupert.

Mr. FRASER: The distance from Prince George to Prince Rupert and from Prince George to Vancouver are the same. Of course under present conditions, with the Pacific Great Eastern uncompleted for eighty miles of its length, it would be impossible to haul grain over that line, but I wish to make it quite plain that it is not by any means an impossibility to haul wheat from the Peace River country over the grades on the Pacific Great Eastern if that road is properly completed. The completion of that road will have to be undertaken before we can discuss the question of hauling grain or anything else over it. As a matter of fact the grades over that line are not as high as those on the Canadian Pacific from Calgary to Vancouver, over which they are hauling wheat to-day.

Mr. DUNNING: I would hope not.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I have just one observation to make, Mr. Speaker. The time is not opportune to engage in a discussion of the advantages to be gained from an extension to the coast from the Peace River district. We have all enthusiastically supported that. Provision is made in this bill particularly for the ratification of the contract between the two railways and the government of Alberta with respect to the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the agreement provide specifically for certain extensions. One extension consists of 25 miles of railway from Wembley to Hythe; another, of 15 miles from Whitelaw to the Waterhole district. Paragraph 8 of the agreement provides for the construction of not less than 60 miles of additional branch lines, within a period of five years, of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia and Central Canada railways in the Peace River district. Now, my point is that provision could be made, and in my judgment should be made, in the bill to empower these railways, if they consider it expedient or good business, to extend that railway system in conjunction with the branch lines or otherwise, so as to make an outlet from the Peace River district, either at Vancouver or at Prince Rupert, by connecting up with Prince George.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend does not care which way they want to go; he would have parliament give them a free hand to get through provided they went via Prince George?

Mr. LADNER: I understand the railway commission would have something to say as to that; they must give their approval.

Mr. DUNNING: To the route map only.

Mr. LADNER: Is not that the most important thing?

Mr. DUNNING: No, that is a detail.

Mr. LADNER: If the minister would incorporate that empowering clause, the good judgment of the railways in any event would dominate the situation, and parliament would not likely go against the joint judgment of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National railways with respect to the route or the method of extension. I urge upon the minister that by cutting off the extensions as set out in the agreement, without any en-

abling clauses in the bill itself, is a step which in my judgment makes more difficult the possibility of bringing about a connection between the Peace River district and the coast.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to record in a general way my support of the proposed legislation now before the house. I am not going to say that I am absolutely satisfied with its provisions, I am one of those who have laboured for some time to persuade the government and the Canadian National Railways to act in connection with this matter, both as to the taking over of the Peace river section of the Alberta railways and the construction of a railway out to the Pacific coast. I have declared in Alberta as well as here my disappointment that some provision was not made in connection with the coast outlet. However, to oppose the bill does not, as I see it, get us anywhere nearer a Pacific coast outlet than to allow it to pass; in fact it is just the reverse, in my judgment. I think it has been recognized in all our discussions of this question that one of the chief difficulties in connection with a coast outlet was simply the fact that the Edmonton Dunvegan and the Central Canada Railways which would be part of the system to connect the Peace River country with the Pacific coast, belonged to the province of Alberta, and it was not expected by anyone in that province or outside of it, so far as I know, that Alberta would build a railway through British Columbia to any Pacific coast port.

Now, to oppose this bill, as I understand it, would simply mean that the Canadian Pacific Railway would get the Alberta railways. It may be that some hon. members, as well as certain people outside this house believe that that would ensure the best development of the Peace River country. But I am not convinced of that. I am not insensible to the possible difficulties in connection with the working out of this legislation, that were referred to to-night by the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae); but when it comes to the question of the objection he raised, as I understood him, to the House of Commons, possibly not being ready to vote $12,000,000 to build its share of the 600 miles of branch lines for which this railway company will hold charters in the Peace River country, I think it more likely that parliament would provide that $12,000,000, than that we would carry out the program referred to in the correspondence which was brought down yesterday. I find that on September 20th, 1928, Sir Henry Thornton wired the Minister of Railways as follows:

> Canadian Press announce Canadian Pacific has made independent offer something less than twenty-five million for Alberta Government Railways and receipt of offer acknowledged by Brownlee Montreal urgently suggest and I agree we should announce we propose ask parliamentary authority build line Obed through Grand Prairie northwesterly towards Peace or Pine pass with branch from Sturgeon lake northeasterly towards McLennan and Peace river crossing. Kindly telegraph quickly your views.
>
> Thornton.

That expenditure would not open up anything like the vast area of new territory that the 600 miles would open up, and yet it would cost, not $12,000,000, but possibly $20,000,000 or $30,000,000, if we are to go by the experience in the province of Alberta, and I think they built their mileage just as cheaply as the Canadian National Railways. If that is the only alternative to joint ownership, I would rather wrestle with the problem of joint ownership of the present railways and the problem of future development in the extending of branch lines, because I do not believe this parliament would be likely to vote money for the duplication practically of the present railway without serving any very large amount of new territory.

During the last three or four years the Peace River country has been very, very anxious to see the Canadian National Railways take over the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway. I find also that the Alberta government was very anxious that the Canadian National Railways should buy the Alberta railways, and two years ago, May 3, 1926, according to sessional paper 226A of 1928, I find an offer by the Premier of Alberta, Mr. Brownlee, to the Minister of Railways, Mr. Dunning, in which he argues for the taking over of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway and the Central Canada Railway at a price just a little over $14,000,000. These figures were submitted, not as a final offer, but as a basis for consideration. I may say that the price agreed to be paid for the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway by the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific must be $20,000,000. Probably I should read one or two paragraphs of this letter:

> Dear Mr. Dunning,
> In submitting, for your consideration, the proposition that the Canadian National Railways—

Mr. DUNNING: What is the date of that, please?

Mr. KENNEDY: May 3, 1926; sessional paper 226A of the session of 1928.

Mr. DUNNING: But the letter is early in 1926.

Mr. KENNEDY: Yes, I am showing just what the Alberta government was trying to do at that time.

In submitting, for your consideration, the proposition that the Canadian National Railways should take over the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway and the Central Canada Railway, I desire to draw your attention to the following:—

1. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, between Wolf Creek and Prince Rupert, was constructed at a very heavy cost as a main artery to serve the country which is tributary to it, and, as this portion of the national railway system is short on traffic, the loss on operation, maintenance, and interest on capital represents a large proportion of the annual deficit on the national railway system. The mileage between the above points is 834.3 and, at $125,000 per mile, which is a fair estimate of the cost at the present time, amounts to $104,287,500 capital investment. If the Peace River territory is not obtained as a feeder for this main artery, it will preclude any possibility of the traffic necessary to provide revenues sufficient to carry the interest on this capital investment.

2. The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia and Central Canada railways tap the productive portion of the Peace River territory which has been developed up to the present time, and are a valuable addition to any railway system which assumes the responsibility for the future development of that country. These railways were built as colonization lines and, as such, should have received a subsidy from the Dominion government; in fact, 50 miles between Roycroft junction and Grande Prairie on the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia was subsidized to the amount of $6,400 per mile, and $175,000 was paid to assist in the construction of the bridge across Peace river on the Central Canada railway, which sets out clearly the fact that the Dominion government did partially recognize their responsibility in this respect.

Mr. DUNNING: I suggest that the hon. member put the whole letter on Hansard.

Mr. KENNEDY: Very well.

3. The traffic which these lines provide will justify their purchase by the national system, as, under present conditions, the profits on the traffic will almost meet the interest on the capital to be assumed in addition to taking care of the cost of operation and maintenance, and with the future development and settlement of that vast territory will become very valuable to the system as the years go on.

4. The Peace River tract of land in northern British Columbia, which is owned by the crown in the right of the Dominion, contains 3,500,000 acres, 1,200,000 acres of which is reported to be good agricultural land and through which the proposed western outlet for the Peace River would pass; if sold it would provide a large portion of the cost of construction to connect the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia with the national railway at Prince George.

5. For the above reasons it is submitted that the interests of the taxpayers of the Dominion of Canada will be served by obtaining the Peace River territory as a feeder to the Canadian National system.

[Mr. Dunning.]

I have handed you a memorandum showing that a fair valuation of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia and Central Canada railways is approximately $17,472,994.43. Against this, the province has guaranteed debentures totalling $9,420,000, payable in thirty years from the date of issue, and has advanced other sums, from time to time with proper security, totalling $9,388,456.93, making a total claim, as at December 31st, 1925, of approximately $18,808,456.93.

As a basis for consideration, it is suggested that the Dominion government should:

(a) Assume the liability for payment of the said guaranteed bonds, amounting to $9,420,000.

(b) Issue debentures or other security, payable on such terms as may be agreed, for 50 per cent of the amount advanced by the province ($9,388,456.93) as above $4,694,228.47.

I have informed you orally of the nature of the security held by the Royal Bank of Canada, totalling $2,400,000, with accrued interest, and the terms of settlement already suggested. We propose the Dominion government should assume this obligation in addition to the above.

Yours very truly,

J. E. Brownlee.

Honourable C. A. Dunning,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

On motion of Mr. Kennedy the debate was adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I move that the name of Mr. McGibbon be added to the list of members of the select standing committee on public accounts.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house.

Motion agreed to.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, May 15, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEDNESDAY NIGHT SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With the consent of the house I should like to move:

That notwithstanding section 2 of standing order 6, this house shall not be adjourned at six o'clock on Wednesday, May 22nd instant, and on every subsequent Wednesday until the end of the present session.

That means that we shall adjourn at six o'clock to-night, but on Wednesday of next week we shall sit in the evening.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

BRITISH COLUMBIA SOCKEYE SALMON

Mr. FRASER:

1. What was the amount of sockeye fry released in the Skeena river, the Naas river, and Rivers inlet, in each year since the inception of the Department of Fisheries?

2. What quantity of sockeye spawn has been taken annually from the Skeena river, lakes and tributaries, and placed in the lakes and tributaries of the Fraser river, giving places taken from in the Skeena watershed and where placed in the Fraser river watershed?

3. What, if any, other varieties of salmon spawn were so transferred, with quantities of each variety each year?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Distribution of sockeye in the Skeena river watershed—sockeye salmon eggs, fry, advanced fry, fingerlings and older fish:

Year	Number
1903	3,450,000
1904	4,000,000
1905	4,267,900
1906	3,784,450
1907	4,125,750
1908	8,946,950
1909	11,782,200
1910	12,089,000
1911	12,556,470
1912	12,367,500
1913	11,430,430
1914	11,843,200
1915	13,822,613
1916	13,544,257
1917	9,699,350
1918	12,166,010
1919	8,096,000
1920	8,834,000
1921	12,325,095
1922	9,416,279
1923	16,018,178
1924	18,237,993
1925	14,620,510
1926	14,061,850
1927	20,729,774
1928	16,284,870

Distribution of sockeye in the Naas river, nil; distribution in waters in the rivers inlet district—sockeye salmon:

Year	Number
1906	8,000,000
1907	7,577,000
1908	8,594,000
1909	13,300,000
1910	12,588,000
1911	11,436,000
1912	11,791,000
1913	10,981,000
1914	12,397,000
1915	12,712,000
1916	11,994,100
1917	13,243,400
1918	13,694,000
1919	2,908,800
1920	10,566,500
1921	10,429,080
1922	16,929,885
1923	13,270,723
1924	13,408,253
1925	15,554,996
1926	18,169,754
1927	18,859,010
1928	20,068,786

2. Salmon spawn taken from the Skeena river watershed and transferred to the Fraser river watershed.

Year	Where Taken	Number Distributed	Where Distributed
1907	Lakelse lake waters	100,000	Bon Accord hatchery.
1915	Babine lake waters	3,360,000	Stuart lake hatchery.
1916	Babine lake waters	2,840,000	Stuart lake hatchery.
1920	Babine lake waters	6,587,000	Stuart lake hatchery.
1921	Babine lake waters	5,893,720	Stuart lake hatchery.
1924	Lakelse lake waters	7,674,000	Quesnel district waters.
1925	Lakelse lake waters	5,000,000	Quesnel district waters.
	Lakelse lake waters	2,300,000	Quesnel district waters.
1926	Babine lake waters	2,485,000	Stuart lake waters.
	Lakelse lake waters	5,000,000	Stuart lake waters.
	Lakelse lake waters	2,110,000	Quesnel district waters.
	Lakelse lake waters	5,014,500	Nadina river-Francois lake.
1927	Babine lake waters	4,957,000	Stuart lake waters.
1928	Babine lake waters	4,004,075	Stuart lake waters.

3. Varieties of salmon other than sockeye were not transferred from Skeena watershed to Fraser river watershed.

GLACE BAY POST OFFICE

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton):

1. What work was done on the public building at Glace Bay during the past year and by whom was such work done?

2. What was the revenue of the Glace Bay post office for the years 1922 to 1928, inclusive?

3. How many persons are employed in the Glace Bay post office?

4. What are their names and salaries?

5. How many letter carriers are employed in connection with Glace Bay post office?

6. Of the number, how many are returned soldiers?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Installation of hot water furnaces, A. Almon; rewiring of building, Arthur & Conn; repairs to plumbing, A. Almon; repairs to pavement, light and curb, P. McCaskill.

2. Fiscal year ending 31st March:

1922	$17,758 60
1923	17,658 54
1924	18,185 19
1925	16,502 01
1926	15,891 32
1927	14,964 17
1928	18,343 13

3. 14.

4.

J. R. Burchill	$2,400
J. D. Cameron	2,100
F. J. Keliher	1,080
Miss N. E. McLeod	1,080
Miss A. F. Cullen	720
Donald Gillis	720
J. R. Cameron	1,080
L. G. MacCorrison	1,080
P. M. McKinlay	1,080
G. J. O'Neill	1,080
G. D. Walker	1,080
Chas. Weeks	1,080
J. B. McNeil	1,080
E. J. Rogers	1,080

5. 8.

6. 5.

PICTOU COUNTY—PATRONAGE

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. What is the name and the address of the gentleman recognized by the minister, resident engineer, or other officer of the Department of Public Works, as having the patronage of the county of Pictou during the year 1927 and part of 1928?

2. Who succeeded to the patronage of the county during the latter part of 1928 and 1929?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. There is no individual so recognized.

2. Answered by number 1.

LONG BRANCH RIFLE RANGES

Mr. CHARTERS:

1. How many acres are contained in the government property in Toronto township known as the Long Branch Rifle Ranges?

2. Is it the intention of the government to offer this property for sale?

3. What was the acreage sold in 1925, if any?

4. Who was the purchaser?

5. What was the purchase-price and terms of payment?

6. What amount, if any, has been paid in actual cash?

7. What amount of principal and interest remains unpaid?

[Mr. F. MacDonald.]

Mr. RALSTON:

1. 377.54 acres.

2. No.

3. 26.28 acres.

4. Hubbs & Hubbs Ltd., Toronto, Ont.

5. Purchase price, $40,073.95. Terms, initial payment, $10,073.95; semi-annual payments—nine, of $1,000 each. Balance payable December 31, 1930. Interest on unpaid balance at six per cent per annum.

6. $20,149.13.

7. Balance of principal unpaid, January 1, 1929, $24,975; balance of interest unpaid, January 1, 1929, nil.

MR. T. L. CORY—TRAVELLING EXPENSES

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton):

What amount of travelling expenses have been drawn during the calendar year 1928 by Mr. T. L. Cory, of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MOTHERWELL (for Mr. Stewart, Edmonton): $1,645.20.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—TYPEWRITERS

Mr. COOTE:

1. How many of the typewriters now in use in the stenographic branch of the House of Commons were previously used in other offices of the House of Commons or by other government departments?

2. How many were new when taken into this branch?

3. How many now in use were salvaged at the time of the fire?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. 58.

2. 2.

3. 14.

KENT BOOM PUBLIC WHARF

Mr. PRICE:

1. In the construction of a public wharf at Kent Boom, county of Kent, New Brunswick, what quantity of gravel was used?

2. What quantity of stone was used?

3. From whom was such gravel purchased, and at what price?

4. From whom was the stone purchased, and at what price?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. Approximately 175 cubic yards.

2. Approximately 700 cubic yards.

3 and 4. No gravel or stone was purchased. both were secured at cost of cartage.

SHEDIAC-BUCTOUCHE MAIL CONTRACT

Mr. PRICE:

1. At what date was a contract signed for the carrying of the mails between Shediac and Buctouche, New Brunswick?

2. Who is the contractor and at what price?
3. What are the names of those who submitted tenders and the amount of each tender?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. 29th September, 1928.

2. A. McNairn, $1,690 per annum.

3. A. McNairn, Buctouche, $1,690; Fabien Pellerin, South St. Norbert, $1,740; Alyre Robichaud, Buctouche, $1,800; Arthur H. Allain, St. Joseph de Kent, $1,950; Thadde Melanson, Buctouche, $2,000; Vital Arsenault, Dundas, $2,000; Charles McDonald, St. Maurice, $2,200; William Babineau, Buctouche, $2,400; Abbey J. Hebert, Shediac, $2,500; Henry A. Cormier, St. Thomas, $2,575.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

PICTOU COUNTY PUBLIC WHARF

Mr. CANTLEY:

1. For a copy of all correspondence, reports and recommendations received at the office of the district engineer of the Department of Public Works, Halifax, relating to, or in any way connected with any work done in the county of Pictou by the Department of Public Works, during the years 1927, 1928, 1929.

2. A return showing all appointments and /or dismissals made by or under authority of the said district engineer, with the causes assigned therefor, if any, during the years 1927, 1928, 1929.

BUCTOUCHE FISHERY OVERSEER

Mr. PRICE:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions and other communications between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the Civil Service Commission and any person or persons, with reference to the appointment of a fishery overseer at Buctouche, in the county of Kent, province of New Brunswick, for that district known as south of Chockpish river to the Westmoreland county line, together with a copy of any complaints filed against the appointment of Mr. Wilfred D. Bourgeois, a veteran of the World's war.

COCAGNE POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. PRICE:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions and other communications between the Postmaster General, the Post Office Department, the postal superintendent's office at Saint John, New Brunswick, and any person or persons, with reference to the proposed appointment of a postmaster at Cocagne, in the county of Kent, province of New Brunswick.

COCAGNE-NOTRE DAME MAIL CONTRACT

Mr. PRICE:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other communications between the Postmaster General, the Post Office Department, the postal superintendent's office at Saint John, New Brunswick, and any persons or persons with reference to the awarding of a mail contract for the service between Cocagne and Notre Dame in the county of Kent, province of New Brunswick.

GUS CARRIER, PRINCE ALBERT PENITENTIARY

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to Gus Carrier, Prince Albert penitentiary, from January 1, 1925, to date.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE: May I ask that this order stand? I should like to ascertain what these documents are and whether they can be made public, because I see that this motion relates to a penitentiary.

Motion stands.

PELEE ISLAND—FLOOD CONDITIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GOTT (South Essex): Yesterday I drew the attention of the government to the flood conditions existing on Pelee Island The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) was absent yesterday, but I ask him now if he has any statement to make and if he is in touch with the conditions existing there.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): This is one of a number of requests for relief on account of flooding in various districts throughout the country. I have issued instructions to have the engineers look into the matter and to see if there is anything properly coming within the scope of this department which can be done to relieve the present situation.

Mr. GOTT: How long will that take?

WESTERN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

READJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF THOSE DISMISSED AND REEMPLOYED

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General) moved the second reading of Bill No. 252, respecting certain employees of the postal or railway mail service of Canada.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair

On section 1—Salaries of certain post office employees who were dismissed and reemployed.

Mr. VENIOT: I might draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the bill is in similar terms to the resolution as amended by the house yesterday, and which was fully discussed the other day. If hon. members will compare section 1 of the bill, which is the only section, with the resolution adopted yesterday, they will find that it is in exact conformity with the resolution as adopted.

Mr. STEVENS: Yesterday when the minister was discussing the resolution upon which this bill is founded, he indicated that there was a certain procedure to be followed. I think he said that an appointee of the Civil Service Commission and an expert of the department would be appointed to check the matter over and to determine the manner in which the terms of the bill should be applied. but I see no such provision in the bill.

Mr. VENIOT: There is no such provision in the bill, because I did not think it necessary to insert it. If, however, the committee regard it as necessary, it will be an easy matter to add a second clause to the bill.

Mr. STEVENS: Speaking for myself, I would say unquestionably that it ought to be in the bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know whether my hon. friend was in the house yesterday when the Postmaster General made his statement. He indicated then the method that would be taken to ascertain what remuneration, if any, was due to certain of the employees of the department. As I recall it, an officer of the Post Office department and one from the Civil Service Commission were to cooperate with the postmaster at Winnipeg in making a report to the minister. I do not know whether my hon. friend really feels that that ought to be incorporated as a section of the act. It is purely an administrative matter, and I think that the word of the ministry in a matter of that kind ought to be sufficient; there is no desire on the part of the government to deal with the matter in any unfair way. But to put a purely administrative clause dealing with detail into a bill which merely provides for repaying men what is owing to them seems to me to be loading the bill perhaps unduly.

Mr. STEVENS: May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that this bill contains the proviso, "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act." In other words, so far as this matter is concerned the Civil Service Act is repealed or entirely superseded. We have set up under the Civil Service Act certain machinery to deal with the civil service of Canada, and therefore inasmuch as you are eliminating the Civil Service Act entirely from this matter —by the way, may I interject here this suggestion, that a lot of these men were placed in their positions in the Winnipeg post office without reference to the Civil Service Commission, after they were reemployed in contravention of the terms of the Civil Service Act—

Mr. THORSON: All the appointments were made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STEVENS: No sir, the men were put in their positions in contravention of the terms of the Civil Service Act, or without reference to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. THORSON: All the appoinments were made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is in error.

Mr. VENIOT: The only exception was the age limit.

Mr. STEVENS: I think it will be found that I am absolutely correct in what I am saying. Therefore I contend that this bill should contain a clause setting out the manner in which this extraordinary procedure is to be carried out; because we must admit it is not the ordinary procedure. There should be recognition of the Civil Service Commission and its knowledge of the technique in this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that to be logical I think any reference to the Civil Service Commission should be left out. I agree entirely with him that these men were reemployed notwithstanding the Civil Service Act. When the original resolution was before the house I gathered from what the right hon. leader of the opposition said that the men had been reinstated under an order in council passed by virtue of the War Measures Act, and that that was the reason why the civil service law had been ignored. I have since discovered that the order in council was not passed under the War Measures Act at all, but as a matter of fact it was simply an arbitrary act on the part of the government of the day. Now, all this measure proposes is that where

those men have been employed on a certain class of work at a lower rate of wages than is paid to other employees in that class, they shall be paid the difference in remuneration due to them on that score.

Mr. MANION: Should not the right hon. gentleman use the word "reemployed" rather than "reinstated"?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, instead of "reinstated" I should have used the word "reemployed." I gathered from the discussion when the resolution was originally introduced that we were practically in agreement on the question of paying the men the difference between what they are or were actually earning in accordance with the rate of wages the positions carry and what they are or were being paid. The only difference between us was whether that extra payment should be retroactive. The house having passed the resolution and adopted the principle of the bill, the only question which remains is that of the method by which we shall ascertain what is due to the men. The Minister of Justice says it would be difficult to frame a clause setting out this feature which is wholly administrative. Therefore I should hope that hon. gentlemen opposite would accept the Postmaster General's statement to the house as to the method he proposes, with the obligation of course on his part of being responsible to the house for carrying out matters in accordance with that method. I should think this should be sufficient.

Mr. GUTHRIE: May I ask the Prime Minister if the bill as now drawn does provide for retroactive pay? I was not here when the discussion took place on the resolution. I understand from reading the discussion that my hon. leader, who is absent to-day, took the ground that he would not agree to a proposal which provided for retroactive pay. Does the modified proposal provide for retroactive pay?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is quite right. The only difference between us is that the government maintains that these men where they have actually performed the work should be paid for it at the current rates, whether it relates to the future or to the past. I gathered at the time the measure was under discussion that the leader of the opposition did not wish to go to the length of paying for work done in the past, although it had not been paid for at the current rates. I had rather hoped that in the interval my hon. friends opposite had changed their views. On that point there is still a difference between us.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the Postmaster General kindly say how much money this measure will involve?

Mr. VENIOT: On a previous occasion I said $123,000. Since then I have been able to go into it minutely and I do not think the cost will exceed $100,000. Since the committee sat last we have ascertained that the Winnipeg authorities have an absolutely correct record of all the men reemployed and the positions they were put in and as they graduated—if I may use that term from one class to another, and the difference in the rates of salaries, and so forth. That is why yesterday I suggested that two persons be appointed, one representing the department itself, the administrative end, and the other the Civil Service Commission, and that these two men go to Winnipeg. Then with the information they already had and the information they would get in Winnipeg, they could take the list of 96 men, go over it in detail, and work out each individual case. Under the system there may be some who, having come in later, will not be entitled to anything; there are others who came in at the first and certainly will be entitled to be considered under this bill. It is a matter that will take some time to work out. Working off and on, I think the two gentlemen I have in mind could complete their task in about two months. As I say, they would have to go to Winnipeg, get the balance of the information there and work it out from both ends, from the departmental end here and from the Winnipeg end. By that system it can be done.

Mr. McGIBBON: Has the minister any clear conception as to how this can be worked out? For instance, these men, had they stayed in the service, would have got promotion. Not having stayed in the service, but being reemployed, some of them later got promotion. How are you going to average the graduation between those two promotions? It is absolutely impossible.

Mr. VENIOT: That will have to be worked out from the very first moment the men were taken back, dealing with it year by year and taking into consideration what promotion they were entitled to and got during that time, and also what extra amount of money those promotions brought to them. It will take some considerable time to work out the details.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister does not get my point. Supposing there had been no strike, and these men had stayed in the service, automatically they would have got promotion, would they not.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

Mr. McGIBBON: That is one step. Then you reemploy them and they get promotion along another line; how are you going to readjust those two lines?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend, I am afraid, is confusing the present bill with the original resolution. As originally introduced there was all the difficulty my hon. friend sees in making the assessment, if I may use that term, because it would have put the men in the same position they would have been in if they had not gone on strike. All the present bill does is to take into account the work a man is doing or has done in the particular position occupied and if he is being or has been paid less than other men in similar positions, then he shall be given the difference.

Mr. McGIBBON: The Prime Minister does not get my point. How is he going to get at what they would have earned?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not what they would have earned; it is what they have actually earned. For instance, take a man who is a sorter. He is working with a lot of sorters in the office. Let us suppose he is one of the men who went out on strike. When he was reemployed he was reemployed as a postal helper, and he has been receiving the wages of a postal helper, notwithstanding that he has been doing the work of a sorter. All this bill provides is that when that sort of thing happens, or has happened, the man who has been doing a sorter's work shall be paid as though he were entitled to sorter's wages from the time that he was engaged on sorter's work. That is all.

Mr. McGIBBON: That would be all right from the start; but how are you going to decide two or three years afterwards what position he might have been in?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What counts is what he has actually done in that time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There should be added to the bill a clause elaborating the system under which the money is to be distributed. As the bill is drawn now the Civil Service Act has no bearing on it at all; the Civil Service Commission is practically wiped out. There is no one left to administer the fund but the Post Office Department and the Postmaster General. He may do it in any way he sees fit and there is no check whatever on him. There are ninety-six men to be provided for, and with the commission wiped out, as it is by the first clause of the bill, the matter is in the hands of the Postmaster General who may deal with the fund as he sees fit. In my opinion the scheme should be elaborated by a new clause; it is entirely too open at the present time. If the scheme is to be worked out under the supervision of the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission, let us so state; but as the matter stands the Civil Service Commission will not be appealed to at all. It will be purely a matter of departmental administration by the Post Office Department.

Mr. ROBB: How does my hon. friend reconcile his position this afternoon with reference to this matter with the attitude he took a few days ago when he urged us to put in a special vote for certain postal workers?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I named the postal worker and the amount in each case, and if that is done here it gets over the difficulty.

Mr. GLEN: I have just had the bill presented to me and so far as I can see it does not affect the principle of the argument which has already taken place on this question not only this session but on the previous occasion as well. There is no doubt, from the terms of the bill, that this legislation involves retroactive payments to these postal workers. In other words, any striker who was reemployed—not reinstated—after the strike had been settled will now be entitled to claim salary for the work he performed from the date of reemployment until the present moment. That is a correct statement. I am opposed to the retroactive character of this bill for the reasons I have already stated. These men went out on a sympathetic strike and according to some they had grievances; but having seen the gravity of the situation in which they placed themselves they were taken back into the service. Now that does not justify any government in paying to them salaries for such services as they were willing and anxious to render at that time; they were reemployed as postal helpers and they went back on that understanding, and on that basis they should still be dealt with.

I do not think there is any great merit in what the leader of the opposition says with respect to the way in which the fund will be dealt with, but I do think that some consideration should be given to the principle involved. I cannot, for one, take the position that civil servants in the class of these workers should have the right to strike and thereby upset the whole business of the country; I should as soon expect the police or the army or the navy to take that attitude and go on strike. And if this bill is passed as it stands a precedent will be established and

other public servants will feel entitled to similar treatment under circumstances of a like character. Not long ago I read of the strike that took place in England in 1919 on the part of the policemen, and they certainly were not reinstated in the service; and the same principle applies here. I am opposed to the retroactive principle involved in this bill. If these men wish now to get the seniority to which they are entitled I am willing and anxious that they shall be given it, but the retroactive feature I must oppose.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

AGREEMENT FOR THE PURCHASE OF ALBERTA RAILWAYS

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 14, consideration of the motion of Hon. Charles A. Dunning (Minister of Railways and Canals) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee on Bill No. 71, to incorporate the Northern Alberta Railways Company, and respecting the Canadian National Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): When the house adjourned last night I was pointing out that the Alberta government had offered the Peace River railway to the Canadian National Railways. I notice that I stated the price offered as $14,000,000; I should have said $16,500,000. This was in 1926. Previous to that time the Canadian Pacific Railway had operated the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia and Central Canada railways under an operating arrangement with the Alberta government. They claim to be losing money on the operation of these railways but the Alberta government declined to enter into a lease for a further period of time with the Canadian Pacific Railway; instead they appointed Mr. Callaghan manager of the railways and made a joint traffic arrangement with the Canadian National Railways. There was a very strong feeling in Peace River and in certain sections of Alberta that the Canadian National Railways should get the preference in connection with the purchase of these railways on condition that the offers were alike, in case offers were received from both the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway for their purchase. A large number of members of the legislature took this view. The Grand Prairie district in Peace River was strongly in favour of the Canadian National, the town of Peace River was favourable to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the district north of Peace River, where I reside myself, was somewhat neutral. The people there thought it was up to the Alberta government to get the best price possible.

So far as I am concerned, I have always favoured the acquisition of these railways by the Canadian National Railways because in the first place I am rather favourable to national ownership as against private ownership of railways; and in the second place the Canadian National was in a much better position geographically through the location of its railways and could give the Peace River such service as the Canadian Pacific Railway could not provide without a large expenditure in extensions westward. The Canadian National Railways could give Peace River entry into Vancouver and Prince Rupert with the construction of from 200 to 500 miles of railway, whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway could not do so without building between 600 and 1,200 miles of railway. I have felt all along that if the Canadian National purchased the Alberta railways they were much more likely to work out a solution of the problem so far as the coast outlet was concerned in the near future than was the Canadian Pacific. Between May 3, 1926, and September 17, 1928, a number of offers were made in connection with these railways. The Premier of Alberta offered the Minister of Railways the Central Canada, the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia and the Pembina railways for about $16,500,000. On November 11, 1927, Mr. Hungerford wrote Mr. Brownlee offering $17,200,000, in round figures, on behalf of the Canadian National Railways, but that offer was turned down by the Alberta government. On November 13, 1927, Mr. Brownlee suggested to the Minister of Railways the possibility of a joint offer, because the Alberta government were not satisfied with the offer of the Canadian National Railways and would not accept it, suggesting that a better offer might result through joint action of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway. A joint offer was submitted on January 16, 1928, offering somewhat better terms than had been offered by the Canadian National Railways, but this was still unsatisfactory to the Alberta government. On September 17, 1928, the Canadian Pacific bought the road, including the Alberta Great Waterways, for $25,000,000, and on November 26,

1928, Sir Henry Thornton notified Mr. Beatty that the Canadian National Railways would participate in the arrangement on a fifty-fifty basis.

It has been felt in Peace river and the view has been expressed in other parts of the country that between the Canadian National Railways and the government a good opportunity was lost to get hold of the Peace river railways; others have thought the Alberta government somewhat unreasonable in their demands, but I do not believe that to be the case, because the price of the Alberta railways went up steadily after 1926. The reason for that increase is shown in the speech delivered by Hon. V. W. Smith in the Alberta legislature during the last session of that body. He said:

> The first full year of government operation, that of 1927, resulted in a net operating surplus for all the northern railways of $303,786.63, as against an operating deficit of $188,655.34 in the previous year. This was regarded by the government as a very satisfactory outcome of its policy in assuming control of all the northern roads. The results obtained for the year 1928, however, have been even more satisfactory than those of 1927, and it is gratifying for me to be able to announce that the total operating surplus derived from all the northern railways for the year 1928 is $810,209.41.

That represents an improvement in earning of almost $1,000,000 in two years, and that is why the Alberta government held out for a good price. That is also the reason why the Canadian Pacific Railway came back and finally bought the roads, because after all not much more than a sixth of the land lying close to these railways has been developed, and yet during the last year of government operation the income was almost sufficient to pay not only the operating charges but the fixed charges as well.

Yesterday the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) said he did not see how any member from the prairie provinces could support this agreement, because it might put the Peace River country in the position occupied by the three western provinces before the extension west of the Canadian Northern and other railways. At page 2501 of Hansard the hon. member said:

> I cannot see how hon. members from the prairie provinces can support a bill which puts the new settlers of the Peace river district in a position similar to that from which the farmers of Manitoba freed themselves more than a generation ago.

That position has to be stated generally in this way: The Canadian Pacific Railway had control and the settlers could not get what they wanted in the way of extensions or railway service, but after the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern were built that private monopoly was broken up. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if parliament turns down this bill and does not allow the Canadian National Railways to participate in this scheme, we will be putting the Peace River country in exactly the position occupied by the western provinces some twenty or twenty-five years ago. Because of that fact I was very glad to learn that the Canadian National Railways had decided to go in and help develop that country, because I do not believe this parliament would ratify the construction of another line north, duplicating the present road.

What we want this parliament to do is to take care of the development of that country and build a railway west towards the Pacific coast. The Canadian National Railways could give us an outlet to Vancouver and Prince Rupert without any tremendous expenditure, and if someone comes along with a railway from Stewart we will have three separate outlets. Because of these facts I intend to support this bill.

Mr. DUNNING: Who does my hon. friend suggest should pay for that last outlet? He indicated who should pay for the others.

Mr. KENNEDY: I have an idea that the country pays for all railways in the long run, but I believe that any railway economically built from the Peace River country will pay. Then there is the further fact: if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company took over the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia road and had control of the Peace River country, if I were to come back to parliament next year asking for an outlet to the Pacific the government would say, "Go back and talk to the Canadian Pacific Railway." I would not like to be put in that position. No one has promised more definitely to go ahead and deal with this Peace River outlet than has the Prime Minister of Canada. I am not going to quote his statements to-day, but if the Canadian National Railways did not share in this deal to take over the Alberta railways I am afraid we would have almost to let the government out in connection with all its promises. Now, however, we can ask the Minister of Railways to go ahead with the surveys, in cooperation with the other bodies if he wishes, which were promised us here some two years ago after the report of the committee investigating the whole question, and we can ask the Prime Minister and the government to carry out the promises made by the Prime Minister

in Edmonton in 1924, when he said this outlet would be built just as soon as it was humanly possible to do so.

As I understand them, the advantages of the joint ownership scheme are about as follows: We will have in the Peace River country, through the cooperation of the railways, an absence of destructive competition in the building of railways. That means that we should be able to keep away from wrong locations and duplication such as we have had in many parts of the prairie provinces. I think it was demonstrated two years ago that by properly laying out the railways in the Peace River country we would have 6,000 economic acres of land to every mile of railway as against 5,000 acres in the prairie provinces. Another advantage is that we will have a one-line haul to every point touched by the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railways throughout Canada, and of course we will get away from any private monopoly.

The disadvantage, I suppose, may develop as suggested by the hon. member for North Vancouver last night; it is that the two companies may disagree in other parts of Canada and that such disagreement may be reflected in the development of the Peace River country. In that case, however, having the government interested in the matter, we would expect the government to act as the arbiter and see that justice is done the settlers of that district.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member has not any faith in the government.

Mr. STEVENS: Not very much.

Mr. KENNEDY: Yes I have, but that does not mean that I think they are perfect.

Mr. STEVENS: It gets rather discouraging sometimes.

Mr. KENNEDY: I am willing to support the government any time they are right, but I will criticize them any time I think they are wrong; that is what I was sent here for. If there is any way in which provision for a coast outlet can be included in this bill, then I will be happy to support that provision.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word or two with reference to the statements which have been made by the members who have a more or less direct interest in the bill now before the house, providing for the joint acquisition, by the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National railways, of the Alberta lines formerly owned by the provincial government. In connection with this whole question of railway facilities for the Peace River district and the provision of a western outlet, I sometimes think that the people of the Peace River district and of northern British Columbia might well be delivered from their friends, because, apparently, their friends in this parliament are unable to agree as to the remedy for the condition which they describe.

Mr. KENNEDY: The minister suggested a way out two years ago. If he will carry out that suggestion I shall be satisfied.

Mr. DUNNING: When the minister suggested that way out he secured the support of my hon. friend only, and I am afraid that that support is not sufficiently strong nor steady nor constant to warrant the government proceeding on the basis of it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Has the government never proceeded without support?

Mr. DUNNING: The member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) in his address of last evening revealed an intimacy with that part of the country dealt with by the provisions of this bill which suggested an entirely new conception of the Peace River railway situation. He insisted that the Pacific outlet should be Vancouver, as against the view of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Brady), who desires that the outlet be Prince Rupert. I am sure that if the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) were to express his views he would prefer an entirely new outlet at Stewart. I am quite sure that the railway authorities of this country—I am speaking now of those responsible for the management of the two great systems—who will be jointly operating this property, will endeavour to decide these questions in the economic interests of the railways as well as in the economic interests of the country to be developed. I am sure that the people of the district concerned will be likely to receive better results from a study made by those men than from the, shall I say, somewhat divergent views of those who sit in this parliament, sincere though they be.

I do not intend to say anything which might be quoted at any time in the future as a commitment or endorsement of the idea that we should build six hundred miles of railway northeasterly from Peace River crossing to Great Slave lake on the Mackenzie river. As most of the members of the house know, I have very great faith in Canada's northland, but I can see sufficient railway construction ahead in what may be described as the present Peace River proposals without embarking at this time in a northeasterly direction towards Great Slave lake. However,

I would say to the hon. member for North Vancouver that I believe I shall live to see the day when there will be a railhead on Great Slave lake tapping the resources of that great northern area, but I think it is decidedly premature to talk about it in connection with the acquisition of these railways, the nearest point of which is six hundred miles distant from Great Slave lake.

The second criticism is that of the acquisition jointly of these lines by the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific Railways. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy) has recited, not unfairly, the circumstances leading up to the position in which we are now placed. I do not criticize the government of Alberta, because, as owners of the lines, they had a perfect right to negotiate and to do the best they could. I might, conceivably, criticize the way they carried on those negotiations, but it was their own business, and I acknowledge their right to do it their own way. On the other hand, I hardly think it fair that the Peace River country should be circularized, through the newspapers and otherwise, with statements regarding this government, and its actions with respect to the Peace River railway. Many of these statements have been distinctly contrary to the facts, and I know the hon. member for Peace River would not himself be responsible for the misrepresentations and, in some cases, the absolute falsehoods which have been indulged in, as is illustrated by a copy of the Grande Prairie Herald, which I hold in my hand. The main insinuation is that in some way Sir Henry Thornton was prevented by this government from offering for these railways as much as they were worth to the Canadian National system. In reply to all such insinuations and statements I can only say that Sir Henry Thornton was placed in exactly the same position in connection with the negotiations for the acquisition of these lines as he was in the case of all the other acquisitions, bills for the authorization of which will be before parliament. That is to say, he was given an absolutely free hand to negotiate, in order to reach, if possible, an arrangement which he, as the chief railway executive, could recommend to this government and which would be satisfactory to the vendors in each case. Having reached that point, the next step was to come to the government in order to have the purchase negotiations and tentative arrangements approved. Sir Henry Thornton was at no time prevented, directly or indirectly, by this government from offering for the Alberta railways what in his judgment they were worth to the Canadian National system. I say this to dispose of that point once and for all.

With regard to the criticism as to the joint acquisition, may I say that the suggestion that an offer be made jointly by both the great railways came to me first by a telegram from Premier Brownlee of Alberta. Being disappointed with the last offer made by the Canadian National Railways independently, Premier Brownlee wired me expressing the view that possibly more satisfactory terms could be secured by both railways acting jointly. At that time I did not have much faith in any result coming about from such a step, but in response to his request I got the two railways together and suggested that an examination should be made of the situation from that point of view. The result was a slightly more favourable offer by the two railways jointly than had been made by the Canadian National individually. As the hon. member for Peace River has said, the joint offer was declined and matters rested there for some time until, finally, the Canadian Pacific Railway made a much larger offer, but a proviso was attached to that offer that the Canadian National Railways should be invited to participate on a fifty-fifty basis in the acquisition of the properties if they so desired.

Mr. HEAPS: Was it not the Alberta government which suggested that proviso, and not the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. DUNNING: I am content to allow both interests to claim the credit, or whatever else may be involved in that.

Mr. KENNEDY: As a matter of fact the Canadian Pacific Railway Company suggested that to the government.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member for Peace River is probably in a better position to know that than I am. That proviso was contained in the offer, and as a result of it the Canadian National Railways was given that opportunity. A careful examination was made by Sir Henry and his officers and it was determined by them to recommend to the government that a half interest be taken, and this is provided for by the bill now before the house. What would be the alternative? That is the important reply to the hon. member for Vancouver North. The alternative would be that the Canadian Pacific would themselves own all of these northern Alberta lines; the Edmonton and Dunvegan railway, the Central Canada railway, the Alberta Great Waterways railway would be entirely owned by the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way. My hon. friend from Vancouver North says that that would be all right; that here is plenty of room in that country for another line; that the Canadian National could build through there on its own. As my hon. friend from Peace River has said, for the Canadian National to build in from the natural point from which it would have to build, provided that it were invading the territory, the existing lines being in the possession of the Canadian Pacific, would involve a very large expenditure. If my memory serves me aright, it would involve an expenditure of $14,000,000 to get into that country before a start was made in building branch lines to serve the country and gather the traffic, and from the moment they started building branch lines from their main stem, they would be duplicating in each case for a considerable distance the lines presently existing there.

Canada has a railway history. That railway history is replete with instances of wasteful duplication of railway building. As is well known by the members of the house, I have set my face strongly against wasteful, uneconomical duplication in so far as we can control it in the future, and certainly I cannot see that it will be economical for the people of the Peace river, or the people of Canada generally, to have both companies building into the Peace river district and duplicating the facilities. It is all very well to say that the Canadian Pacific spends its own money, but the Canadian Pacific requires to pay interest on that money out of freight rates paid by the people of Canada. The public must pay, and in that connection I have found the presidents of both railway systems responsive to the argument that so far as possible they shall keep out of each other's way in their extension programs and thus avoid wasteful duplication. There are difficulties of course. Both presidents have active, keen, efficient organizations, each one striving to make the best for itself, and naturally they are competing fairly keenly all along the line. But in spite of that, I think we can say that during the past three years, and in the programs which have been forecast this session for the future, there is a disposition to avoid the economic mistake of wasteful duplication. The alternative, I say, in answer to the criticism of the hon. member for Vancouver North, is that the Canadian Pacific would own these lines and the Canadian National would have to choose whether it would stay out of that area for a considerable time to come or duplicate existing facilities at much greater cost to the country than the passing of this bill would involve.

May I say this with reference to the argument of my hon. friend from Vancouver North that the people of the district will not be well served because of those two corporations uniting and controlling the transportation of the country? I have in mind the fact that the legislature of Alberta, containing the representatives of the people most intimately concerned, has unanimously—I believe I am correct in saying unanimously—endorsed this legislation. The agreement by its terms was required to be submitted to the legislature of Alberta and to the parliament of Canada. So far as I was able to learn how the matter was discussed in the Alberta legislature, there was no opposition on the basis of the argument advanced by my hon. friend from Vancouver North. Had such an argument been advanced strongly by a considerable proportion of the members of the Alberta legislature that injury would be done to their people by such an arrangement, we would have been bound to take cognizance of it in dealing with the bill here. But in view of the fact that the people on the ground and most interested have endorsed this project, I think we can take it for granted that their interests have been fairly well protected in the agreement which has been reached.

As to the further argument that, both railways being represented fifty-fifty on the board of directors, it will mean a deadlock, supposing there is a proposal by one of the partners to build a branch line in a certain direction and the other party does not agree, of course the answer is that there will be nothing binding—

Mr. GUTHRIE: I rise to a point of order. What particular motion is before the chair, might I ask?

Mr. SPEAKER: Number 11.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: That the Speaker do now leave the chair.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is not debatable.

Mr. DUNNING: We have been debating it since yesterday afternoon, and this is my first intervention in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is debatable because it is on the orders of the day.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall be glad to finish my speech in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would not be debatable if it were not on the orders of the day, under rule 38.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Go on, then.

Mr. DUNNING: The only complaint I have is that three hon. gentlemen who spoke yesterday and to-day were in order, and I am not.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We are anxious to get on.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall be just a few minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing order 38 reads:

The following motions are debatable:—
Every motion (a) standing on the order of proceedings for the day.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not, of course, want to impede my own legislation. But on the other hand, neither do I think it is wise that arguments from three different directions should be advanced in connection with a very important financial and transportation measure without the facts being set forth in reply. I know the house is well disposed to allow this bill to pass along, and I promise not to prevent its progress for many more minutes.

The last point I want to make is the one to which I was referring before the point of order was raised. As regards the argument advanced that branch line construction will be prevented, because of disagreement between the partners, my answer is that there is in the agreement nothing which would prevent either partner from proceeding to build a branch line owned by itself from any point on the joint enterprise. That is the best answer I can make to the argument that the people will not receive branch line service because of disagreement between the two partners. Either partner, after securing a charter from the proper source, which is this parliament, may build a branch line from a point on the jointly owned property if the two partners cannot agree to build a branch line as part of the jointly owned enterprise. This is not provided in the agreement, but it is possible since there is nothing to prevent it, and this parliament has the power to grant charter rights.

Mr. MATTHEWS: Would they be guaranteed running rights over the existing lines?

Mr. DUNNING: The agreement itself, of course, contemplates that. Either party may operate over existing lines. I think that is all that I have to say at this time. I feel sure no one will expect me to make any commitment regarding future construction of a western outlet, I would, however, say in reply to my hon. friend from Peace River in that regard, that the final settlement of the ownership by these two great railway corporations of the Peace River line will ensure a careful and continuous study on their part, from the point of view of their own wellbeing, of what it is best to do with regard to a western outlet.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee on the bill, Mr. Marcil in the chair.

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GRAND MERE—EAST BURRILLS

The house in committee on Bill No. 166, to amend an act respecting the construction of a Canadian National railway line between Grand Mere and East Burrills, in the province of Quebec—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Power to construct and complete line described in schedule.

Mr. GEARY: I think the minister might give some explanation to the committee as to the largely increased cost in this particular case.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend remembers, of course, the discussion in the railway committee, but the house generally is not aware of that. When the bill was before the house previously, some question was raised, I think by the leader of the opposition, as to whether, in view of the high cost, it would be possible for the Grand Mere-East Burrills project to earn interest upon the outlay; whether it was economically sound. Since then I have had that question carefully investigated, and I find that on the basis of presently existing traffic the economies effected will be equivalent to 7½ per cent upon the total cost, inclusive of the increase provided for in this bill. The section of the railway referred to is one of the busiest sections of the Canadian National system, and the traffic can be expected to increase as time goes on and, consequently, to produce an even greater return upon the investment.

The two causes for the increased cost in this case were the increased cost of right of way and the increased cost of the grading due to a very much larger quantity of material to be moved. Quoting from the engineer's report:

Over one mile in length of the line was through the town of Shawinigan Falls, about in the middle of which provision was made for a yard requiring more than normal width of right of way. Not only did it cost more to buy the right of way through Shawinigan Falls but the whole right of way proved to be over double that figured on. In practi-

cally every case a process of law had to be resorted to in order to settle the prices paid. Presumably one reason why excessive prices were asked was because the railway was not wanted by the farmer through whose land it passed as he would get no service additional to what he already had.

The increase in quantities of material required to be moved was due to the nature of the material itself. Generally speaking the overburden on top of the rock which only outcropped in a few places on the line, was a stratum of sandy material about eight or nine feet in depth under which was brown or blue clay. In most cases this lower material was blue clay of a very wet and soft consistency, which when disturbed at all became unstable. This instability in cuttings caused sliding or sloughing-in of the materal into the cuttings, and where embankments were made from it, it slid or squashed out. This condition varied considerably in individual cases. Some of the material was so bad that the embankments could not be made from it, and other material had to be brought from a greater distance to take its place.

A description of the largest and worst cutting will give an example of how this material acted. The cutting in question was located about a mile from the west end of the line and immediately west of a rock tunnel on the line. It was about nine hundred feet in length and at the deepest part was sixty feet in depth. The material was so soft after having been dug with a steam shovel that when dumped out of the cars used for hauling it, it ran like thin porridge and proved utterly worthless for filling material. In fact, substantially all of it was deposited off a few feet of trestle built alongside a gully and it immediatey flowed or moved from this gully until it reached the St. Maurice river about a mile away.

We estimate that by reducing the gradient to one-half the existing gradient and by doubling the load behind a standard locomotive, the economies effected will be sufficient on the basis of existing traffic to pay 7½ per cent on the whole cost of the undertaking.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ROSEDALE SOUTHEASTERLY

The house in committee on Bill No. 168, to amend an act for the construction of a Canadian National railway line, being a joint section from Rosedale southeasterly in the province of Alberta—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Marcil in the chair.

On section 1—Schedule amended.

Mr. DUNNING: Mr. Chairman, I explained this bill when it was before the house for second reading. It has since been to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, and now returns to be finally dealt with here. There is no change in the amount of money, but there is a change in the method of expenditure on the line.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUEBEC ORIENTAL AND ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAYS

The house in committee on Bill No. 173, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Laflamme in the chair.

On section 1—Authority to purchase Quebec Oriental and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railways.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw to the attention of the committee the fact that in November, 1927, an investigation of the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, as regards their proposed acquisition by the Dominion government, was held by two reputable officers of the department, who submitted a report. This report is signed by R. C. Henry and another gentleman whose signature I cannot make out, but he describes himself as assistant engineer.

Mr. DUNNING: W. H. McGann.

Mr. STEVENS: I thank the minister for his assistance. I suggest that Mr. McGann improve his signature. In the report certain facts are set forth. It is obvious that these two officers discharged their duty with great care and skill. They review in detail and with great ability all the facts of the case, and they conclude their report with these words—I am quoting paragraph 15—

It does not appear that the acquisition of these lines could ever become profitable to the Dominion government.

That ought, I think, to have influenced the committee and the government and the Canadian National Railways' management in regard to this matter before taking these lines over.

Mr. DUNNING: It did.

Mr. STEVENS: I was not a member of the committee and was unable to attend its sittings and there deal with the matter. So I shall have to take this opportunity of draw-

ing attention to the report. Before referring to a few facts set forth in the report, may I ask the minister if he will be kind enough to tell me whether in the acquisition of this line by the Canadian National Railways they assume the mortgage indebtedness?

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. STEVENS: They do not. Will the minister tell me what will become of the mortgage indebtedness?

Mr. DUNNING: The line is in the hands now of trustees for the bondholders, that is, in the hands of its own bondholders, who are of course the holders of the bonds secured by mortgage. They must give a complete discharge. All the negotiations which have been undertaken have been between the management, Sir Henry Thornton personally, and the trustee for the bondholders, Sir William Plender, of a firm of chartered accountants in London, England.

Mr. STEVENS: Then I understand we are purchasing this line from the trustee of the bondholders?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: The first and second bondholders?

Mr. DUNNING: The whole business.

Mr. STEVENS: Is that fact set forth in the bill; if so, just where? I am asking for information.

Mr. DUNNING: In sections 2 and 3.

Mr. STEVENS: The report to which I refer shows that this railway has received in cash subsidies and in lands, which were sold for a certain figure, $3,750,000, of which the Dominion government contributed about $1,800,000. In other words, we—the Dominion and the provincial government of Quebec—have already put into these lines $3,750,000. We are proposing now to pay $3,500,000 for them, which will discharge the bonded obligations of $3,750,000. These are just rough figures. I notice that in this report the two experts to whom I have referred state:

> The estimated cost of reproduction, less depreciation, arrived at by using present day prices, is $7,000,000.

I do not think the committee should be misled into the opinion that it is worth $7,000,000. That is, physically to reproduce the line in first class shape would cost $7,000,000.

Mr. DUNNING: No, not in first class shape; in the condition in which it now is.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, to reproduce it.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. DUNNING: In its present condition. My hon. friend said "in first class shape". That is hardly correct.

Mr. STEVENS: The reproduction value.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: That would be the physical value of the property, not having in mind the earning value.

Mr. DUNNING: That is it.

Mr. STEVENS: They say the scrap value of the railways is estimated at $530,000. There is a vast difference between the two.

Mr. DUNNING: Always is.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, always is. But it might be well to keep in mind this—that these railways, in spite of the receipt of cash subsidies amounting to $3,750,000, have been unable to pay their operating and overhead expenses, and this to such a degree that the bondholders are willing to sell. I have already referred to the advice of the experts who say that it does not appear that the acquisition of these lines could ever become profitable to the Dominion, and notwithstanding this the National Railways are acquiring the property. In the face of the financial obligations to which reference was made yesterday, I submit to the minister that this is a very questionable action on the part of the National Railways and, in the light of this report, disposes us to scrutinize with greater care than we have done in the past the suggestions of the railway. I say that with regret, because I have said to the minister on two or three occasions, and said it gladly, that we have been reposing tremendous confidence in the management of the National Railways in any recommendations they make. But I cannot reconcile—

Mr. DUNNING: I do hope my hon. friend will turn the searchlight with equal force on each one of the succeeding bills which have to do with purchases. I think it is proper and right that he should.

Mr. STEVENS: I am picking this bill out because I know that there is an adverse report, and if there are adverse reports in regard to the others the fact ought to be disclosed.

Mr. DUNNING: I will discuss the word "adverse" later.

Mr. STEVENS: I am quite willing to leave it at that. But let me repeat what I was saying. We have received the recommendations of the management of the Canadian

National Railways with a great deal of favour in this house in recent years, and I should like to voice this opinion, that the National Railways management must be very careful in recommending a purchase of this character in the teeth of a report of the nature to which I have referred. I submit to the minister that there are features of this purchase, disclosed in this report, which make me very doubtful indeed of the wisdom of proceeding with the purchase.

Mr. MARCIL: I am glad the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has discussed this bill. This is an undertaking which dates back many years. I will not go over the history of it because I do not wish to delay the house. But I may observe that in 1882 Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways while Sir Hector Langevin was chief of the province of Quebec, and the latter advocated and obtained the authority of parliament for the construction of a branch line of the Intercolonial railway from Matapedia towards Gaspé along the north shore of the baie de Chaleur. Parliament acquiesced in the proposal and the undertaking was commenced by the Dominion government as the construction of a branch line of the Intercolonial. The first twenty miles were accordingly built under contracts given by the Department of Railways. Unfortunately, about the same time the legislature of Quebec had incorporated a local company called the Baie de Chaleur Railway Company, with which was connected Mr. Robitaille, a former representative of Bonaventure in this house, Mr. Riopelle, another member of this house and a former representative of that county, and Mr. C. N. Armstrong, a noted promoter in the province of Quebec. These gentlemen induced the Dominion government to give up the undertaking and to hand it over to the local company known as the Baie de Chaleur Railway Company and composed of those whom I have named. The misfortunes of the people of Gaspé and Bonaventure commenced from that time in 1884. The people there had witnessed, and had contributed to, the construction of the Intercolonial railway which runs through the Matapedia valley in my constituency and crosses the river Matapedia into New Brunswick and the maritime provinces. They who had contributed their share to the construction of this railway, linking up Quebec with the maritime provinces, were left to one side and this undertaking of the local company was carried on purely through subsidies granted by the Dominion government and by the legislature of Quebec. So long as the subsidies lasted the undertaking was carried on as best it could be, with the help of the municipalities and of the farmers, who gave right of way without compensation. As a matter of fact many of those farmers are unpaid to this day. When I had the honour of being elected for that constituency in 1900 I found the railway stranded at Caplin, eighty miles from Matapedia, the railway subsidies exhausted, and the road not operated for six months of the year during the winter. I therefore undertook to secure the consent and approbation of the parliament of Canada to extend railway facilities to the people of that peninsula who were among the oldest settlers of Canada, descendants of people who settled when Jacques Cartier discovered Canada. I sought to give them some of the benefits which we had been providing for the rest of the country in a matter of railway accommodation. The hon. the Speaker (Mr. Lemieux) and myself have witnessed during thirty-two sessions the construction of continental and branch line railways all over Canada and now we merely ask for approval for one simple proposal, namely, that this branch line, running 200 miles from Matapedia to Gaspé, connecting with the Intercolonial railway, and receiving all its business from the Canadian National Railways—it can do business with no other railway—be utilized as a branch line, as it was intended to be regarded the day it was constructed. With the aid of subsidies voted in 1901 the line was extended to Paspebiac, one hundred miles from Matapedia. His Honour the Speaker had the distinction at that time of being the representative of probably the only constituency in Canada without a mile of railway, and naturally he undertook to bring about the extension of that line as originally planned by those great leaders of public opinion, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Hector Langevin, and later by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He endeavoured to have it extended to Gaspé. The charter was passed, the usual subsidies were voted, and in addition a subsidy of $250,000 was granted by the house towards the construction of numerous iron and steel bridges across the river emptying into baie de Chaleur. An English company undertook to build the railway and completed the work in 1911, when it had reached Gaspé. Shortly after that, in 1914, this house passed what was known as the Branch Lines Act, a measure which authorized the government of Canada to acquire every branch line of 200 miles connecting with the Canadian Government Railways, at that time largely the Intercolonial railway. They took over a dozen lines in the maritime provinces and

in Quebec, but this railway was left to one side. In 1914 the war came on, and that was put forward as an excuse for doing nothing. Nor was anything done until 1921, when the Liberal party returned to office and the argument was again taken up by the people of these two counties asking that this railway should form part and parcel of the Canadian National Railways and be given the same treatment as had been meted out to others throughout the country.

Now I am speaking not for one party but for the whole population of that district; I am representing the views of all political parties, religions and creeds. And I am glad to know that I am speaking also on behalf of the Conservative party, because two years ago, on the 2nd of August, 1926, the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, who then undertook the campaign which led him to his defeat in the month of September, opened that campaign in my constituency at Carleton.

Mr. STEVENS: That was the cause of the defeat?

Mr. MARCIL: Yes. He was accompanied by Mr. Patenaude, his first lieutenant in Quebec and they were ferried across from Bathurst in New Brunswick by Mr. Angus McLean in a tug, landing at Carleton. Fortunately a correspondent of the Canadian Press accompanied Mr. Meighen on that occasion and reported his remarks which are to be found in the Montreal Gazette of August 2, 1926, and I desire merely to quote that part of his address referring to this railway situation. He congratulated the people on the progress they had made in that hard country, where they have long winter seasons and large families to keep up, and after referring to the fact that from these two constituencies 1,200 boys were sent to the front during the war, he went on to state:

> One could not help realizing that there might be indeed a gratifying development if there could be found a method of extending to this district, as yet relatively thinly populated, something of the help which the Dominion has been able to give to other parts of the Dominion. I know that your resources are many and precious. You have splendid timber resources. You have mineral resources. Your agricultural resources are as yet only tapped. It will be impossible that these will progress as you expect, unless something is done to help with the transportation of your commodities. . . . . I am quite aware that there are difficulties in the way. I never could be convinced that it is not going to mean considerable outlay over a considerable time. But I intend to give sympathetic consideration to this question. I am going, as it were, to put my head into it. I hope to say to the people of this province—I promise I will say to them whenever I occupy the post of Prime Minister by the verdict of the people—that whatever is done for any part of the Dominion, the same measure of generosity, the same measure of justice will be given to the province of Quebec and to every part of the province of Quebec.

Some days later he appointed my opponent, Doctor Paquet, as Minister of Health and Soldier's Civil Re-establishment, notwithstanding his campaign at that time which had become notorious. On August 23 Doctor Paquet was sworn in to this portfolio as a member of the Meighen administration, and stated publicly that if within two years this railway situation was not settled and the railway linked up with the Canadian National Railways, he would retire from the House of Commons and resign his portfolio.

Matters went along until 1923, when the Speaker of this house, acting for his constituency and for my own, called upon the government to have this situation investigated by the railway commission. On that occasion I had the honour of accompanying the commission as far as Gaspé; they were accompanied by their entire staff and spent about three days investigating the situation. In their report is included a statement by Judge McKeown, who spoke on behalf of the commission, confirming the statement made some years previously by Hon. F. B. Carvell when he was chairman of the commission. On July 21, 1920, Mr. Carvell said:

> It is, therefore, quite evident that this road is in very much the same position as the branch lines in New Brunswick, excepting that, in my opinion, it goes through a better country as a rule than do the New Brunswick roads. There are more people to patronize it, more business to be done, the road-bed is in better condition, and it offers a better guarantee of business than any of the other branch lines with which we have been dealing during the past three years.

Mr. STEVENS: What year was that?

Mr. MARCIL: July 21, 1920; Mr. Carvell went there to investigate certain matters in connection with the operation and service given by the road. Mr. McKeown subsequently reported on the situation and came to the same conclusion, that these railways should be taken over by the Canadian National system. The proposal made by the company at that time was that the road be taken over at a price of $4,000,000. Judge McKeown thought the price not unreasonable but did not consider the time opportune to proceed with the proposition. However, he agreed with the findings of Mr. Carvell that the country was entitled to better service than it had been receiving.

In 1923 the Bishop of Gaspé, His Lordship Monsignor Ross, who was appointed Bishop of Gaspé some six years ago, at our

suggestion called a huge meeting of the people of both constituencies to discuss this situation with Sir Henry Thornton and his staff. That was late in the season and the available halls were not sufficiently large to accommodate the crowd, so His Lordship permitted the use of the largest church in the peninsula. The meeting took place between Sir Henry Thornton, the bishop and representatives of the county and both constituencies; there were present English and French, Tories and Grits, and this matter was threshed out for about three hours. Sir Henry Thornton was impressed with what had been said and he stated that he hoped the time was not far distant when he would be called upon to operate these roads. He also confirmed what Judge McKeown had said in 1925 with regard to the successful operation of the important industries located on these railways, which were hampered by the fact that they were unable to get a satisfactory through service either for freight or for passenger traffic, which unity of operation and control could secure. That result was necessary to the development of that part of the country, no matter how it might be attained.

At present our people are in this position: They have to pay freight on the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway; they have to pay freight on the Quebec Oriental railway, and then their products must be transferred to the Canadian National railway to reach other parts of Canada. There is a large pulp mill in Chandler, and when I accompanied Judge McKeown on his investigation we were told that if a through rate to Chicago could be secured the production of the pulp mill would be doubled. That is just one instance. Now we have mining developments in that country; we have farming and we are hundreds of miles away from the closest market. We cannot get our products to market under the rates which are available to people on the other side of the bay, who are on the main line. We ask merely for the same treatment as is given to other parts of the country. If the Canadian National Railways desire to overcome the deficit east of Levis they can do so only by developing that part of the country through which these lines run. The Gaspé peninsula has an area of 10,000 square miles, the size of a couple of ordinary European kingdoms, and the surface of that territory has been hardly scratched. We have a population of about 60,000 law abiding people, but I am sorry to say that the young men have been compelled to leave these constituencies for the United States or other parts of Canada in order to secure a livelihood. Our industries all have gone, one after the other; the wood is being rafted across to Bathurst, where it is manufactured by the Bathurst Lumber Company. The same thing has happened at New Richmond and Nouvelle; the wood is taken to Dalhousie, Campbellton and other points in New Brunswick where they have the advantage of through rates and where they are able to do business on a fair basis. We merely ask that we be given the same advantages, and we are quite convinced that this parliament will not refuse us.

If I had the time I could read many resolutions which have been adopted by the board of trade of the city of Quebec and by other associations asking that the condition be remedied and stating that the time has now come when this railway should be taken over. In nearly every case where we authorize branch lines in the west the cost runs about $35,000 per mile; we are securing this railway for $17,500 per mile, which is exactly 50 per cent of the capital which has been invested. When this matter was being discussed in the railway committee Sir Henry Thornton was heard, as well as other officers of the railway, and it might not be amiss to quote from what Sir Henry Thornton said on that occasion. A question was put in the committee as to the possibilities of return. I have had the honour of voting for many railways in this country and the question as to whether a railroad would or would not pay has never been brought up. The questions have always been as to whether it would increase the population or whether it would serve the population already in the country.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the hon. member quoting from?

Mr. MARCIL: I am going to quote from Sir Henry's remarks in the railway committee.

Mr. GARDINER: Recently?

Mr. MARCIL: Yes, when this bill was under consideration. Sir Henry Thornton said:

> There are two aspects to this situation. First, the purchase price of the railway as compared with the immediate returns; secondly, the prospects of the railway as an earner in hands which will indicate that an effort will be made to secure the assistance of the people of the Gaspé peninsula in creating traffic and development. That is a situation which always confronts the Canadian National Railway, as a state-owned property, in this sense, that it stands in a somewhat different relationship to the various communities which it serves than does a purely privately-owned company, in that it must give greater regard to the assistance of communities in their development.

Now, the principle which underlies the purchase of this property is not much different from the principle we have followed in building branch lines throughout the west for development purposes.

Mr. GEARY: Is the hon. member quoting Sir Henry Thornton?

Mr. MARCIL: Yes. Sir Henry continues:

It happened that in this case the railway is already built. In the west the railways were not built, but we were pledged to embark upon new construction, but the underlying principle in each case is to give to each one of the communities a service which offers prospective traffic and an opportunity for the community to develop. As I said, in this case we are purchasing a railway already built, in the west we are building new railways; the principle is naturally pretty much the same.

The hon. member who has just put a question to me was present in the committee and cross-questioned Sir Henry pretty thoroughly with regard to this matter. That deals with the economic aspect of the question, with which, not being an engineer, I am not familiar. But there is another portion of Sir Henry's remarks which I would like to quote, as follows:

The purchase price is $3,500,000, which was arrived at after negotiations with the trustees, and represents the cost of reproduction now less depreciation less subsidies paid. The Gaspé railways were exploited by Alfred M. Carpenter, at one time proprietor of the Charing Cross bank—

That is an error, as Mr. Carpenter never operated the railway. Sir Henry continues:

—which became bankrupt a great many years ago, and the property has since been operated by trustees for the bond holders.

That briefly represents the historical and physical conditions, and I can say that the negotiations were carried on by myself with Sir William Plender, a well known chartered accountant in London, England, who represents the trustees.

After some negotiations with him, it was agreed to purchase the property for $3,500,000, subject to the approval of parliament. That represents 50 cents on the dollar invested.

This territory has, for a long time, suffered from inadequate transportation facilities and, for that reason, has been unable to participate in the development which has taken place elsewhere in Canada. The population is an exceedingly thrifty, hardworking population, of the best of our French stock.

It was felt that if the railway fell into hands which would foster development in the peninsula, lend its efforts with the people of the peninsula for development purposes, coupled with the possibilities of a large tourist traffic, that a considerable impetus would be given to development in the Gaspé peninsula, and it was for those reasons that it was thought desirable by the Canadian National Railways to take over the line.

As my time is limited I will not be able to go into this matter much further. The hon. member for Vancouver mentioned a report which was made by the Canadian National railway officials, the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

It does not appear that the acquisition of the Quebec Oriental Railway by the Canadian government could ever become profitable.

There is only one railway official of that opinion, and no matter how important the opinion may be it is merely an opinion and it deals with the future. I have been in the house for thirty-two years and I have heard many false prophecies made by very outstanding men. I was up in the press gallery when it was predicted that the Canadian Pacific Railway would never pay for the grease used in its operation. That prediction was made by some very eminent men, and many other false prophecies have been made in the house.

The Gaspé peninsula has an area of 10,000 square miles. It contains abundant lumber, minerals and other natural products—mines are being developed now for the production of zinc and lead—as well as abundant fisheries. It has a magnificent harbour which is the closest in North America to Liverpool, being only four days' sail from Gaspé. This harbour was large enough to shelter in 1914 the thirty-three warships and transports carrying the first contingent to England, and to have had in 1866 the honour of sheltering the convoy of His Royal Highness Prince Edward, afterwards King Edward VII. The people of this Gaspé peninsula have contributed their mite to the upbuilding of Canada. They are prepared to continue to do their share in the future, and are asking only for fair treatment at the hands of parliament. I know the hon. member for Vancouver and his colleagues on the other side would be acting in accordance with the wishes of their political friends in those two constituencies if they would give consideration to this bill. We are simply asking that justice be done. The demand is not unreasonable and I hope there will be no further trouble and that the bill will be adopted. The manner in which these people have been treated has not been a credit to Canada, and I hope the house will allow the bill to pass.

Mr. MacLAREN: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words in reference to this bill. I happen to know the Gaspé peninsula and the railway in question. I wish to repeat in the House of Commons what I said in the railway committee, namely, that I support the taking over of this railway. Why? This is a section of the country which is most at-

tractive, contains a fine population and, I believe, has a future. But in any case it is a large section which is not adequately served at the present time and I think, on the policy that we have been carrying out elsewhere throughout the Dominion, it is time that we gave a fairly good service to Gaspé. I have taken an interest in this area and the people there have waited patiently a long time. Therefore I have pleasure in supporting the bill.

Mr. GARDINER: When this bill was before the railway committee we secured a good deal of information in regard to the history of the railway. The hon. member for Bonaventure just a few minutes ago gave the committee some information which is evidently a transcript of the address that Sir Henry Thornton delivered before the committee. I want to call attention to a very peculiar incident that occurred in the committee at that time. There is a record made by the reporters of the proceedings in connection with this bill in the railway committee. We have never before had any of the business of the railway committee recorded by the reporters this session or for many sessions past; but in view of the fact that Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for Bonaventure were very much interested in the acquisition of this line by the Canadian National Railways, no doubt Mr. Speaker took the opportunity of seeing to it that the reporters were present for the purpose of taking down the speeches delivered by Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for Bonaventure. That, of course, is not allowed to the ordinary member of the house; but, Mr. Speaker, being in a privileged position, took advantage of his privileges on this occasion. I want to protest against anything of that description being carried on. There is no question in my mind that Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for Bonaventure will have these speeches printed and broadcast. I do not know whether this will be done at the expense of the public or not, but the country will have to pay for the reporting staff in any case. These two hon. gentlemen will broadcast these speeches in their constituencies, naturally, for their own benefit. I merely make this statement that I object to anything of that description being carried on where certain members have privileges which other members do not secure. It is not fair.

Coming to the question of this railway, from the evidence given before the committee I am satisfied that it will be probably twenty years before this railway pays back a dollar of the capitalization. I am not opposing the acquisition of this railway because I recognize the fact that we have in Canada many sore spots for the healing of which we must make provision such as we are doing by this bill. In the interests of the people of Canada as a whole and of confederation, the house must stretch its conscience sometimes in that regard.

There is another point that I want to bring before the committee, and it is this. If I understand the matter correctly, neither the Intercolonial nor the Transcontinental railway is included in the present capitalization of the Canadian National Railways; the Canadian National is not responsible for the capitalization of either of those two lines. Some two years ago we passed the Maritime Freight Rates Act for the purpose of taking care of the Canadian National in the maritime section, and also for the purpose of reducing freight rates to the extent of 20 per cent of the rates in force at that particular time. I opposed that proposal then because I thought it was poor economics, but in view of the fact that the house finally passed the legislation, I accept that as the best judgment of the house and I am quite willing to support the principle now. But as regards this railway and the next three which are on the order paper, not one of them will be a paying proposition. We cannot hope that for some time to come these four lines will pay even the actual running expenses.

Mr. POWER: How soon does my hon. friend expect the Hudson Bay railway to pay?

Mr. GARDINER: The Hudson Bay railway will, I hope, pay its way within five years, but let me point out to my hon. friend that it is in a very similar position to these and I will explain my position in regard to it a little later on. A moment ago I stated that I do not believe these four lines, taking them as a whole, will pay their way for many years to come. That means that the country will have to pay the losses incurred by the Canadian National Railways under the Maritime Freight Rates Act in connection with these four railways. But, as I stated before, I maintain that these districts are sore spots, and if this house can heal those sore spots, it is our duty to do so.

Another point of importance is that under this legislation the capitalization of these lines will be charged up against the Canadian National and I protest against that procedure. If you are going to buy these railways, then buy them out of moneys provided by the treasury of the country. It is not fair to load up our national system with a number of deadhead railways and then expect the

national system to make enough money to pay the interest charges on the capital invested. In view of the Maritime Freight Rates Act, and in view of the fact that the Intercolonial railway and the Transcontinental railway are not charged up against the capitalization of the Canadian National, it is only fair that we should place these four railways on the same basis and relieve the Canadian National of the amount of their capitalization.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is surely not clear there. The Maritime Freight Rates Act does just what he suggests should be done.

Mr. GARDINER: But not so far as capitalization is concerned. The capitalization will be charged up against the Canadian National system.

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister please explain the matter then?

Mr. DUNNING: The interest upon the capital invested is a fixed charge which is taken into consideration in determining the payments to be made under the Maritime Freight Rates Act for the deficits incurred under the act.

Mr. GARDINER: It takes care of the deficits.

Mr. DUNNING: Of the interest on the capital.

Mr. GARDINER: If that is so, I am glad indeed to hear it, and so far as I am concerned, as long as these lines are not charged up against the capitalization of the Canadian National, I have no objection to the house taking this attitude towards these four lines, that, as I stated before, they are to all intents and purposes national problems which we have to solve, and so heal these sore spots.

Mr. STEVENS: Before we leave that point, may I ask the minister whether what he says is correct? How is it that this line is included in those recited by Sir Henry Thornton as being part of the provision for capital expenditure next year? On page 117 of the report of the special committee, Sir Henry Thornton is reported as saying, enumerating certain things all of which I shall not read:

The Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic, Quebec Western Railway, $3,500,000.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend evidently did not understand my answer to the hon. member for Acadia. Certainly the money requires to be raised to pay for these railways which we are now discussing, but the interest charge on that money from year to year becomes a fixed charge on a railway included within the area covered by the Maritime Freight Rates Act and, therefore, the interest charge upon the capital is not an ordinary charge upon the system as a whole but becomes a part of the deficit under the Maritime Freight Rates Act if a deficit exists from year to year.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand from the minister that the interest charges will become part and parcel of any deficit which will occur under the operation of the Maritime Freight Rates Act.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the original capital necessary to take over these lines be charged against the Canadian National railway system? Will it become part of their capital account? That is the point.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not quite sure what my hon. friend has in mind. What I was anxious to provide was that the system as a whole should not be prejudiced nor placed in a more difficult position because parliament in its wisdom, or lack of it, out of its desire to heal these sore spots to which my hon. friend referred, decided to do a certain thing. So far as that phase of it is concerned, the Maritime Freight Rates Act undoubtedly covers the point because the interest charge is part of the fixed charge and becomes part of the deficit which is made up annually by a vote of this parliament. So far as the whole capital structure of the Canadian National railways is concerned, most certainly all sums represented by actual physical assets are included therein, and I do not think that there can be any exception taken to that.

With reference to the criticisms, my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre made a perfectly understandable criticism on the basis of an economic report made in connection with this line by the Director of Economics who is now Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals and one of the engineers of the Canadian National railway system. I would point out to my hon. friend in that connection that economic surveys, of which this was merely one, were made in connection with all of the lines with which we are dealing in the various bills before the house, and my hon. friend will find the particular comment to which he made reference in the reports on others of these lines as well as the one presently under discussion.

As I said yesterday in connection with these matters, we are linked with the past, and we

are dealing with these matters because we are linked with the past, and because the past carries with it certain obligations. My hon. friend from Bonaventure has indicated to us some of the obligations which are involved in connection with the lines now under discussion and I am very glad, I may say, to be able to propose to parliament the carrying out of at least one of the pledges made by the Conservative party at the last election. If I can help in that particular, I am very glad to do so.

Mr. MANION: The minister apparently forgets that the county turned down the proposition.

Mr. DUNNING: I think my hon. friend should say that the county declined the bribe.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister is scarcely fair. From the reading of the document by the hon. member for Bonaventure it would appear that Mr. Meighen, who was then the leader of the party, stated that the matter would be given sympathetic consideration. He made no pledge, and my hon. friend knows that.

Mr. DUNNING: But his candidate in that constituency, one of his ministers, a member of the Privy Council of Canada, speaking with all the authority attached to his cabinet position, said: If this road is not taken over in two years, I will have to resign.

Mr. STEVENS: He did not resign.

Mr. DUNNING: He never got the opportunity.

Mr. MANION: Since the minister used the word "bribe," does he consider this a bribe at the present time?

Mr. DUNNING: No, and I regret having used that word, although I used it only in a good-humoured sense. It is quite proper for a political party to give indications to the electorate with regard to any policy which it proposes to put into effect. I regret having used the word. It is not usual for me to use language like that. It is rather more characteristic of some hon. gentlemen I see on the other side.

Mr. MANION: Of whom, for example?

Mr. DUNNING: "A political bribe" is not infrequently used by hon. gentlemen opposite in argument.

Mr. GEARY: Suppose we get on with the discussion.

Mr. DUNNING: I have only this to say, particularly to my hon. friend from Acadia. I think it would be fair in dealing with a matter of this kind to imagine the condition of the Gaspé peninsula without a railway at all. It is easy to conceive of it as a similar area in western Canada, and I venture to say that my hon. friend from Acadia, with those around him, would be one of the first to support a proposal to build a line into such an area containing the resources and population which this area contains. Looked at from that point of view, we are getting a line of railway which conservatively is worth as much as a new branch line.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. DUNNING: Physically, yes. My hon. friends cannot at one time use the report of the experts when they desire to criticize, and then refuse to accept that same report in regard to intrinsic values. At any rate, we are getting this property at $17,500 per mile. Will any of my hon. friends stand up and say that we could build a branch line of the lowest standard for anything like $17,500 per mile?

Mr. GARDINER: That is not the point at issue. The point is whether these lines will pay or not. We expect that a branch line in western Canada will pay and the railway companies say that they will not build unless they can see profits ahead. That is the attitude that Sir Henry Thornton takes in regard to a number of branch lines in western Canada right now.

Mr. DUNNING: If we would only put ourselves in the position of thinking of this great peninsula without any railway at all, I know that my hon. friend would be one of those who would argue that a railway into an area possessing such resources and such population would pay, and I would honour him for it. I am adopting the position that if there were no railway there, then this parliament would undoubtedly be willing to authorize the construction of one, and to build one would cost twice as much as we are spending to buy the one already there. I am not in a position to say that this railway will pay, but I have sufficient faith in the Canadian National organization to know that they can bring about quite an improvement in the traffic returns of that railway by applying to the development of the peninsula which it serves the power of a great organization both in the development of trade, in the development of tourist traffic, and in the development of manufactures.

It is difficult, Mr. Chairman, to deal with these old matters. When the provinces of Canada met with the Dominion government in Ottawa, province after province raised

these railway problems, not from the point of view of their economic soundness as proper acquisitions for the Canadian National railway or the Dominion government, but from the point of view of their historical connection and the obligations in a Dominion sense attaching to them. The Dominion government undertook as a matter of policy that the Canadian National management should be asked to look into these various situations and, if possible, to negotiate ways of dealing with them. May I point out to the committee that if the Gaspé railway had happened to be owned by Mackenzie and Mann in 1918 instead of by the poor shareholders of the defunct Charing Cross bank, it would to-day have been a part of the national system, and there would not have been a word of complaint about it, but because the owners happened to be the poor shareholders of the defunct Charing Cross bank instead of Mackenzie and Mann, this railway was left outside.

Mr. EVANS: Does the minister think that Mackenzie and Mann would ever have constructed that road?

Mr. DUNNING: Mackenzie and Mann constructed many a railroad through less promising territory than the Gaspé peninsula, and my hon. friend can think of some instances himself if he will reflect for a moment or two. The point is, after all, we have these railway sore spots. They have been there for years. The file in the Department of Railways and Canals relating to the Gaspé peninsula is a foot thick and goes back pretty well to confederation. The ministers of railways back as far as Sir Charles Tupper helped to promote it, and I think we are doing a good thing for Canada, and we are not harming the Canadian National system in the slightest degree by including these lines within the terms of the Maritime Rates Act.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not know whether the minister intended it or not, but I am afraid he did put me in a wrong light. The minister knows very well that I did not object to the buying of this railway.

Mr. DUNNING: Quite so.

Mr. GARDINER: I thought possibly some of his remarks might carry the implication that I objected to its purchase.

Mr. DUNNING: Not at all.

Mr. GARDINER: I said I supported the purchase on general principles for the benefit of Canada. I have nothing further to say so long as the Canadian National system is protected.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. GEARY: Mr. Chairman, as a member of the railway committee which had this bill under consideration, I feel that having considered it very carefully, with practically all the information now submitted to the house before that committee, I must follow the course I then pursued, that is, approve this bill. But I think the Minister of Railways cannot contend for a moment that this is a good business buy. The railway will not pay within any reasonable time that we can anticipate. It is a more or less decrepit railway, old fashioned in its weight of rails, in its bridges, trestles, structures, and equipment.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the weight of rail?

Mr. GEARY: Sixty pounds to the yard, whereas they are now putting in one hundred pound rails.

Mr. DUNNING: Not on branch lines.

Mr. GEARY: From eighty to one hundred pounds. However that may be, the cost of reproduction to-day is the cost of the physical reproduction, less depreciation accrued over the years since the lines were first put in place. But that does not take into account the conditions I have referred to, the inadequate, obsolescent—or whatever you may call it—condition of the railway to say nothing of its not having been kept in proper repair. Sir Henry Thornton says it will cost $147,000 to patch the railway up so that it may take care of the present traffic.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is very close as to the amount, but my understanding of Sir Henry Thornton's statement is that it would require that sum to bring the railway up to normal branch line standard.

Mr. GEARY: We need not quarrel about that. It is simply bringing up to branch line standard a railway that does not handle a great deal of traffic anyway. I do not think it is any use for the minister to attempt to take any comfort in the reflection that we are building branch lines in the western provinces that may not pay on their actual construction cost. Those branch lines fit into the system as a whole and contribute to the general traffic. I do not think we can get very far by comparing this acquisition with a new branch line constructed in the western provinces. But I think the minister is on sound ground when he says there is some obligation on us to take this road over viewing it from this other angle, that we should not forget the frank statement of the railway officials concerned, that in buying the road we are relieving the English bondholders to some

extent of an obligation which this country was under to them for financing the railway. This factor had a good deal of influence on my judgment. Now, there has been in times past a lot of criticism on the part of English investors of Canadian financial methods, and it is not thought by Sir Henry Thornton, and I judge by the minister and others associated with him, to be advisable to incur any more of such criticism. There is no doubt that if we sat tight on this proposition and let the bondholders come to us, we could squeeze them down to a lower figure. But I am not complaining of the action of the railway officials in giving what under all the circumstances is a fair figure. I do not think it is the part of this government to wait for the road to drop into our basket for practically no consideration at all. To my mind those two considerations are preeminent. One, that we have an obligation to these people. There is no good reason why we should leave the Gaspé peninsula out of our calculations. That obligation I think we should fulfil. The other consideration I have already adverted to, namely, the impression to be left upon English investors in regard to money which they have bona fide placed in a railway enterprise in Canada.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think there is no doubt in our minds that we are buying as a matter of business what is a very bad business proposition, and certainly my vote was not influenced in committee at all by the supposition that we are getting a money making property. I think, as an hon. member expressed it, it is about one of the worst things we have ever been obliged to do, but we have to do it. That expresses the opinion of many members in regard to this matter. I find no fault with the government for yielding to pressure, if it can be called pressure, for the reasons I have outlined, but I cannot say they are justified in their action by any consideration of the dollars and cents involved in the transaction.

Mr. MARCIL: Since the reports of the experts of the Canadian National Railways was made I have received a letter from Mr. J. S. Gordon, general manager of these two railways, giving the returns for last year. Let me quote from his letter:

> Our revenue for 1928 for the two railways was $609,240 with expenses of $548,910, leaving a net operating revenue of $60,330. Of course this balance of $60,330 is debited with such items as hire of equipment, taxes, etc., but in railway accounting, these items are regarded as non-operating expenses.

Mr. Gordon states that within the last twelve months considerable development has taken place in the Gaspé peninsula. The Madawaska Corporation has gone in there and erected a mill which employs hundreds of men. They have leased a mill at Restigouche, and they have cut during the past winter 50,000,000 feet of lumber. So the traffic will increase with this steady development.

Mr. GEARY: Everybody will be pleased if that works out.

Mr. MARCIL: In the centre of the peninsula, near Grand Cascapedia, there is a zinc and lead mine which has been declared by the geological survey here to be the equal of the Jobson deposits in Missouri, one of the richest of the kind in North America. For these reasons, and for the still greater reason that these people are entitled to fair treatment on a equal basis with all parts of Canada, I again urge that the house pass this bill.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): What is the relation between the fixed charges and the maritime freight rates? Why should those fixed charges be added to the maritime freight rates?

Mr. DUNNING: Under the terms of the Maritime Freight Rates Act the deficit on all of the roads within that region are paid by a vote of this parliament to the Canadian National Railways. Now, the deficits are arrived at by taking the revenues and deducting them from the expenses including the fixed charges. The fixed charges in the area covered by the Maritime Freight Rates Act including interest on the bonds outstanding —as for instance, in connection with the Halifax and Southwestern railway—in fact interest on the outstanding bonds of any of the lines which are now part of the Canadian National system in that area is taken into account. If my memory serves me aright, there is no interest involved in connection with any portion of the Intercolonial railway, but there are interest charges connected with parts of privately owned systems which come into the area in question. I mentioned the Halifax and Southwestern as an instance of what I mean in that regard. This line and each one of the others which will come before the committee shortly will have fixed charges attaching to them. I do not claim that these roads, at least immediately, will be profitable to the Canadian National. By the terms of the Maritime Freight Rates Act this country as a whole bears the interest charge on the capital. The Canadian National Railways administer the property under the terms of the maritime rates act.

Mr. STEVENS: Will not the minister admit that the interest on capital expenditure we are now authorizing amounting to some $3,500,000 will be simply carried in the Canadian National accounts, with the large interest charged on its total indebtedness to the government? It will not be segregated in any way.

Mr. DUNNING: It will be segregated in the accounts in accordance with the terms of the maritime rates act. That is to say, the Canadian National will receive from the Finance department, under the vote which is made each year under the maritime rates act, an amount equivalent to interest charge on the bonds against this particular property and against all other properties in the maritime rates area.

Mr. STEVENS: Paid out of a vote of the government.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): My understanding is that the Duncan report was in favour of a 20 per cent reduction in freight rates in certain areas in the maritime provinces. That reduction was made and became chargeable to the Dominion treasury. If that is right I cannot see the relation between that and interest on capital charge.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not referring to the Duncan report, which is not legislation.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): I know.

Mr. DUNNING: The legislation is the maritime rates act.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Based on the report.

Mr. DUNNING: It carries out the Duncan report. In placing that legislation before the house I carefully explained just the feature of it which is now under discussion. It was well understood and in succeeding sessions has been the subject of discussion when the estimates relating to it have arisen. The recommendation of the Duncan report in that connection is familiar to hon. members. It is provided that the cost of this relief shall be definitely borne by the Dominion government, who will make the necessary reimbursement to the Canadian National Railways without impairing the financial results of the operations of the system.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the 20 per cent reduction.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. But there is somewhere—I cannot lay my finger on it at the moment—a reference to the machinery for working out the problem in the area in question.

Mr. STEVENS: It does not apply to this interest.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

The house in committee on Bill No. 174, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Saint John and Quebec Railway—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Authority to purchase St. John and Quebec Railway.

Mr. MacLAREN: When the Transcontinental was built it was run diagonally across the province of New Brunswick, terminating at Moncton, which is an inland town. The Transcontinental therefore gave no direct access to the sea—an indirect access, it is true, but not the shortest nor nearly the shortest route that could be selected. Consequently the province of New Brunswick felt that the Transcontinental did not afford a sufficiently direct outlet to the sea for transportation and therefore proceeded to have constructed this railway which is called the St. John and Quebec Railway. It was built down to the valley of the St. John river, a valley very well known to the country as fertile for both fruit and grain. This railway was partly built in 1914, when the war broke out; then difficulties arose. The government did not wish to proceed with any railway construction beyond what was absolutely essential, and work on this line ceased. The original idea was that the railway should run from St. John and join the Transcontinental at Grand Falls, but this involved the construction of two bridges and at the request of the Dominion government the plan was modified and resulted in the construction of a railway from Centreville to Westfield, so that while the railway is called the St. John and Quebec railway it does not touch either St. John or Quebec; it is suspended between the two, as it were.

Mr. VENIOT: Like Mahomet's coffin.

Mr. MacLAREN: That is the present situation, but it will be changed in future if the government follow this idea. I would like hon. members of the house, including my hon. friend the leader of the group to my left, to look at this not as a deadend railway but as one with a promising future.

Mr. DUNNING: How soon?

Mr. MacLAREN: Just as soon as the government decides to carry out this program by extending the railway eighteen miles further into St. John and on to Grand Falls. Then we will have transcontinental transshipments of grain to the port of St. John, which is a very large item. The minister need not shake his head.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not shake my head; I merely looked surprised.

Mr. MacLAREN: I will not delay the house except to say that this was the original idea, and I believe it will persist. The faith of the whole province was behind the construction of this railway; they considered that the plans were based on solid ground, and I am of the same opinion. It was because of the war and at the request of the Dominion government that the railway was not completed, but it is still active; it passes through numerous towns and a great deal of construction will not be required to finish the work. When that is done the government can send grain over its own lines by a shorter route than is available to-day. This bill will afford relief to the province of New Brunswick because it will enable the Canadian National Railways to take over a line which the province has not felt able to complete.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. MacLAREN: I second the motion.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

KENT NORTHERN RAILWAY

The house in committee on Bill No. 175, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Kent Northern railway—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Mr. DUNNING: Of course this and the next bill are both subject to the same criticisms made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre with respect to the first bill of this kind which we considered.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INVERNESS RAILWAY

The house in committee on Bill No. 176, respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Inverness railway—Mr. Dunning—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

REFUNDING OF MATURING FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 253, respecting the Canadian National Railways, and to provide for the refunding of certain maturing financial obligations.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. GEARY: May I ask the minister if these obligations now being refunded carry the guarantee of the government?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. GEARY: To the full extent?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the bill been printed?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT

The house in committee on Bill No. 42, to amend the Insurance Act—Mr. Robb—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE

EVIDENCE RESPECTING QUEBEC ORIENTAL RAILWAY

Mr. SPEAKER: In explanation of what has been referred to by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) I would state that it was I who authorized one of the reporters to attend and report certain proceedings of the railway committee, but it was done at my own expense.

Mr. GARDINER: We will accept Your Honour's explanation.

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, May 16, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Seventh report of the select standing committee on banking and commerce.—Mr. Hay.

REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA TABLED

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to table the correspondence between the governments of the United States and Canada with respect to the clearance of vessels carrying shipments of liquor to United States ports. This includes the report of the anti-smuggling conference held in Ottawa in January of this year.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GOLD SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. Has the Minister of Finance refused to permit the banks to ship gold to the United States?
2. If so, under what authority?
3. Would it take sixty million dollars to bring the Canadian exchange back to parity?
4. Is there sixty million dollars in gold in the central gold reserve?
5. Why did the department change its form of statement of "Circulation and Specie" as of the date of December 31st, 1928?
6. Was the reserve ratio 55.3 or 28.4 as of March 31, 1929?
7. Can Dominion notes including "legals" be redeemed in gold?
8. If not, are we then on a gold basis?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. No.
2. Answered by 1.
3. To determine any definite amount is impossible, as exchange rates vary according to demand and supply, the extent of which is not known in advance by any financial institution.
4. The Dominion treasury holds $61,600,304 in gold; the banks have $16,630,866 of gold in the central gold reserves and, according to last bank statement, hold in addition in their own vaults in Canada, some $40,000,000 in gold.
5. The change was one of arrangement only to show separately notes issued under the Dominion Notes Act against gold reserves and notes issued under other authority against securities. In practice, notes outstanding against securities under the Finance Act are not utilized as a call for gold.
6. The ratio of gold to notes issued against gold deposits was 55.3 per cent at March 31st, 1929.
7. Yes.
8. Answered by 7.

WESTERN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

READJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF THOSE DISMISSED AND REEMPLOYED

On the order being called for the third reading of Bill No. 252, respecting certain employees of the postal or railway mail service of Canada—Hon. P. J. Veniot (Postmaster General):

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): When this matter was under discussion in the house certain information was to be furnished to me in order that I might be able to ascertain exactly what amount of money was involved. That information the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) now tells me became available only to-day, and I should like an opportunity to study the effect of this measure upon the employees in question before the motion for the third reading is put. Might I ask that the bill stand until to-morrow?

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): Yes. Stand.

WAYS AND MEANS

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved concurrence in the resolutions adopted in the committee of ways and means respecting the War Revenue Act.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have to move an amendment to the motion, as follows:

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following added thereto:

the said resolution be resubmitted to the commitee of the whole with instructions to amend the same by striking out section 4 thereof.

Section 4 of the resolution deals with the tax imposed on the transfer of mining and other shares. This tax was originally enacted in 1920. It was essentially a war measure. As matters now stand, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) has indicated that he has a very substantial surplus. This tax in its operation is unjust, inequitable and unfair. In addition it is a tax that is essentially imposed upon provincial resources. The Dominion succeeds in obtaining an income tax from provincial companies operating in the development of the resources of the provinces, and this tax imposed upon the transfer of shares is a form of taxation that in my opinion should be left wholly available to the provinces. It should not be a tax resorted to by the Dominion at all. It is double taxation. It imposes a tax on industry; it retards development; it is unjust and inequitable in its operation, as indicated by many hon. members of this house; it is a tax which I think cannot be defended. It is for that reason, sir, that without making any extended address to the house at this time I move this amendment at the first available opportunity, before the resolution is finally adopted by the house.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is quite right in saying the tax was first introduced under the special War Revenue Act assented to on July 1, 1920. It was amended in 1922. It is well that the house and the country should understand at once what my hon. friend is proposing by this amendment. I imagine there has never been a time within recent years when there was so much speculating on the stock exchanges throughout the country as there has been during the past year. I submit there is a general feeling all over the Dominion that the national treasury might very well profit somewhat by this speculation. If a man is disposed to take a gamble on the market and risk his money, is it not reasonable to suppose that he might at least put a little of it in the national treasury to take care of the obligations of the country? My hon. friend now proposes to wipe out this tax entirely because a few people have objected to a certain readjustment of the taxation on the transfer of mining shares. Well, the revenue from this source is only a penny's worth compared with the revenue we get from these special taxes. Although there has been so much speculating on some of the stock exchanges where they deal largely in these mining shares, the revenue we have been getting from the business is very small, and the revenue we will receive under the revised taxation will be comparatively very small.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the reason we want to wipe it out.

Mr. ROBB: On transfers of shares and bonds of every kind, good, bad and indifferent, the total revenue received in 1926-27 was $282,576.50. We improved considerably on that in 1927-28, when we received $615,354. Where did these taxes come from? They did not come from the province of British Columbia, where there is a great mining area, because the records show that in 1926-27 all we received from the Vancouver stock exchange was $1,672.32. In 1927-28 we received from the same source $7,263.44. What did we get from the Toronto Standard mining exchange? In 1926-27 we received $47,393.01.

Mr. MANION: But the Toronto mining exchange deals in British Columbia shares too.

Mr. ROBB: Possibly. Does that make it any better?

Mr. MANION: No, but the minister said he did not get much from British Columbia.

Mr. ROBB: Well, let us add the two together. All we received was $47,393 from the Toronto Standard exchange and $1,672.32 from the Vancouver stock exchange for 1926-27. It is true that in 1927-28 we received $121,114.70 from the Toronto Standard mining exchange and $7,263.44 from the Vancouver stock exchange. But we received from the Montreal stock exchange in 1927-28, $280,061.57, and from the Toronto stock exchange, $132,756.60. I am sure my hon. friend has not considered this or he would not move an amendment to strike out this tax in toto, simply because some people who wish to speculate in mining shares object to the tax.

In the debate the other day the complaint was largely on the ground that what are called "penny" stocks—the lower priced stocks—would be unfairly discriminated against. Now under this taxation in its amended form if a man wants to take a flyer in the market and buys a thousand shares at 50 cents or less, it will cost him only a dollar. But to save him that dollar my hon. friend proposes to wipe out the tax on a thousand shares at $100 each from which we would receive $40. I submit to my hon. friend that this is not very good economics. No person who wants to speculate in a thousand shares

at 50 cents or less is injured if he has to pay a tax of one dollar. If he is ready to take a gamble of that kind, surely he should not object to putting a dollar in the national treasury.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the minister does not mind if I ask him a question?

Mr. ROBB: Oh no.

Mr. BENNETT: I suppose he is aware that all the provinces are taxing these transfers of shares. My objection goes essentially to that feature, that it is their business, and as they impose these taxes we should not be duplicating that form of taxation. We did it for the first time right after the war. I say it is a war measure that should now disappear so that we may let the provinces have the field to themselves.

Mr. ROBB: But the provinces are only taxing these mining and oil shares.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh no.

Mr. ROBB: You are right, they do tax the others.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not all of them.

Mr. ROBB: The provinces of Quebec and Ontario do.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think all the provinces do.

Mr. BENNETT: I think so.

Mr. ROBB: Yes. The time may come when we should have a readjustment between provincial and federal taxation, but meanwhile I ask, is it good judgment on the part of the hon. leader of the opposition, in order to save the purchaser of one thousand 50 cent shares one dollar in taxation, to wipe out a tax that we hope will give us at least as much as it did last year, when we collected $615,000.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the reply of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) meets the case at all. He selects one item and indicates that there is to be a loss of revenue. He has already stated that the revenue at present is not a serious matter, that is, the total for 1927-28 was, I think, $615,000. What is it that the minister proposes to do? I think the house should get this clearly in its mind. He is repealing a stamp tax which was launched during the period immediately following the war when this country was put to extremes in order to get further revenue for unexpected and new expenditures arising out of the war.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: The problem still exists.

Mr. STEVENS: Since that time the minister has come to the house year after year boasting of increases in revenues. Here is an item which is producing a revenue of between six and seven hundred thousand dollars. He is promising to wipe that out and substitute for it a very onerous tax—not simply a stamp tax on documents, that is what it amounted to before, but a tax on property, because it is the exchange of property, that he is now taxing. Our contention is that, as applicable to mining, this proposal aims a serious blow at the development of this national, basic, industry. It will affect mining, not because it is a stamp tax but because it is an actual tax upon property, that is the share ownership in mines.

Now, this year the government has refused to assist two very important requirements of the people; one, technical education, and the other, the extension of the good roads system. In connection with the mining industry of Canada, in practically every province, particularly in northern Ontario, northern Quebec, northern Manitoba and British Columbia, the provincial governments are being called upon, I venture to say, to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars for roadways and other facilities in these new mining districts. The government have refused this session to give any assistance to the provinces in the matter of new highways—absolutely refused it. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) indicated that he considered a contribution of that kind to the provinces to be a vicious principle; he will not charge me with misquoting him in attributing that phrase to him. I say, they have absolutely refused to give any assistance in that direction. And now the minister says that he will tax the mining industry and obtain a large revenue therefrom.

Mr. ROBB: Not the mining industry.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, that is where we differ. The minister is making a distinct change in principle in this tax. He is repealing a section which is essentially a stamp tax. I have already pointed this out, but the minister does not realize the seriousness of it: he is repealing what is essentially a stamp tax, an ordinary stamp upon documents. That is what he has in the existing law, and he is substituting for it a heavy, an onerous tax; it is undoubtedly an onerous tax. My hon. friend from South Timiskaming (Mr. Lang), my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Lawson), my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) and one or two other hon. gentlemen

have produced figures that are incontrovertible, showing clearly that in many cases the new proposal will render business impossible. I venture to say that the outcome of this will be, if it goes into force even after the amendment the minister introduced the other day, that mining concerns will have to abandon the issue of low priced stocks—that is, stocks at five and ten cents a share, which is the basis on which the mining industry in this country has been built. There is no use in our talking about stopping speculation; this will not seriously affect speculation in stocks in a large way, although it will affect speculation in the cheaper or penny stocks. In other words, it will largely deprive the mining industry of Canada of the opportunity to secure capital to carry on its operations.

The other day the minister was impressed, I think, with the arguments, particularly of the hon. members whom I have mentioned, in the presentation of the subject; the hon. member for South Timiskaming in particular went into the matter carefully. But the minister is persisting. I have tried to discover a motive and I think I have found it. The minister proposes to impose this onerous tax this year and to put it into force, and he will come to the house next year and cut the tax down to half or a quarter, or wipe it out, and then tell the people how he is reducing taxation. That is the only excuse for his putting on this tax; there seems to be no other. The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) applauds that; he says "That's fine." He endorses it.

Mr. JACOBS: Does not my hon. friend think, as a veteran politician, that that is good politics?

Mr. STEVENS: I think it is rotten politics; I think it is disgraceful politics. The minister has done this in regard to the sales tax and has got away with it. He raised the sales tax from 3 to 4 and to 6 per cent, and then he lowered it gradually to 2 per cent, and every year he took full credit for the reduction. He intends this year to increase the present tax to a degree which is not warranted and which he knows is not warranted and he will come back next year and cut the tax down and tell the people of the mining districts how he is reducing taxation. He will tell my hon. friend from South Timiskaming, "It is all right; there is no election this year, but next year there is an election and I will cut the tax down."

An hon. MEMBER: That is right.

Mr. STEVENS: An hon. gentleman says that is right; I am glad they are endorsing it. My hon. friend from South Timiskaming spoke most effectively on this question the other day. We had not heard his voice in the house before but we were glad to hear it then. He made an incontrovertible case—what for? For the new mining district of northern Ontario. Now I had a wire—I am sorry it is not here—which reached me the other day from Vancouver, urging me strongly to oppose this proposal, not because the people there were opposed to paying a fair tax on the transfer of stocks; not at all. The people there have never squealed at reasonable taxation. But my correspondent points out actual cases on the stock exchange in Vancouver where an individual sells a small block of cheap shares, and under this proposal, after paying the tax, he will have very little left and in fact will incur an actual loss on the transaction.

Mr. ROBB: Right there, will my hon. friend say that $1 per 1,000 shares is unreasonable?

Mr. STEVENS: I say that $1 per 1,000 shares at 5 cents a share is too much. One dollar per 1,000 at 50 cents a share is not too bad, but it is the 5 cent shares I am discussing particularly. On this the tax will amount to 2 per cent. Will any hon. gentleman say that is a fair tax on a transaction of that character—a tax of 2 per cent? Will anyone say that is fair in a transaction which is taxed both ways? That sale having gone through, the moment a transfer is made again another tax is levied, and so on. Moreover, there is the provincial tax with commission on top of that. It makes the transaction impossible. And our contention is that the minister has no right to invade that field. The minister asks me whether I think this tax on 1,000 shares at 50 cents is too much. But that is the maximum of that class. Come down to the 5 cent shares and it is shown conclusively that the tax is utterly unreasonable. And some of the best mines in this country—Teck Hughes is one—were financed in their early stages on the 5 cent basis. The minister proposes a tax of 2 per cent on 5 cent shares, but that is not the whole story. Assume that this share is sold three or four times in the year: that means 10 per cent. And so you might go on through the various transactions.

The minister is wrong in his conception of this matter. The tax is exceedingly onerous. The very question which the minister asks me shows that the tax is unfair, because the man who sells shares of the 50 cent class pays exactly the same as the man who sells at 5 cents. That is the unfairness of it. One is a $50 transaction and the other a $5 trans-

action; yet they pay the same tax. If it were fair and equitable the man who sold at 5 cents would not pay the same as the man selling at 50 cents. Take comparisons in a score of different classifications and you find that in every one of these classifications there is a spread which is utterly unfair. I am reminded too of this—it has been pointed out before: 1,000 shares of Noranda at $54 represents $54,000, with a $30 tax. Does not the minister see how unfair the tax is?

I come back to the point from which I started: We are repealing a stamp tax involving a small charge of 3 cents or something like that on the transfer of certain documents. I am not saying that this is entirely equitable, but it is a stamp tax applying to the exchange of documents. But this is a tax on the exchange of property, namely, shares in mines. It might be any other property; it does not matter; we are speaking of mines because that is our chief activity. I submit again that it is utterly unfair; it is a tax that should not be added to Dominion taxation.

The minister has boasted of his $60,000,000 surplus this year; yet he is now increasing a tax which last produced some $600,000, and increasing it to such a degree that it will actually run into millions. There is no doubt that it will run into several millions. That is not the way to impose taxation in a country where the Minister of Finance boasts of his surpluses. If you have a surplus of revenue the proper thing to do is to budget so that your revenue and expenditure shall balance, with a fairly safe margin on the revenue side. That is proper budgeting. But in a country like this it is not the proper thing to budget for huge surpluses. Certainly a surplus is always welcome, but it is not proper to budget for surpluses. That is what the minister is doing, and I think we are warranted in opposing this measure and in asking the support of the house for the deletion of section 4 from the resolution.

Mr. HEAPS: Before my hon. friend takes his seat, could he inform the house what taxes are imposed on the sale of shares?

Mr. STEVENS: I could not say exactly. There is a tax on the sale; there is a tax on the purchase by the stockbroker in the stock exchange; there is a provincial tax, which is a perfectly proper tax, on the transfer of shares, and there is this tax which the minister is now seeking to impose.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is there any tax on shares when they are first sold?

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: Under the present law the first issue is not taxed; if the first issue is handed to a broker and distributed by him to other brokers there is no tax, but when the stock leaves the broker and goes to the purchaser there is a tax.

Mr. MALCOLM LANG (South Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, for a few moments I wish to deal with the figures given the house the other evening by the Minister of Finance, when he was showing how the proposed tax would work out in creating revenue. As an illustration the minister took the figures from one particular day's sales on the Standard stock exchange in Toronto. On that day there were sold 324,900 shares valued at from one cent to fifty cents per share, with an estimated total value of $81,225. Under the present proposal the tax on the sale of those shares would amount to $324.90. Then there were 186,500 shares sold valued at from fifty cents to $1 per share, and under the present proposal the tax collected on that sale would be $466.25. There were sold 114,900 shares over $1 per share and under $3, on which the tax would amount to $1,149; there were 150,900 shares valued at over $3 but not over $20, on which the proposed tax would amount to $3,018, and his last figures were 29,300 shares valued at over $20 and under $100, upon which the proposed tax would amount to $879.

Just for a moment I would like to compare as fairly as I can the tax which it is now proposed to collect on the sale of these shares with the tax which would be collected if we had an ad valorem tax, which is the only fair tax if we must have any at all. On the day taken by the minister 324,900 shares of stock were sold at from one cent to fifty cents per share. I am going to average those shares at twenty-five cents each, and in so doing I am being more than fair to the minister, because if he will look over the records he will find that in the cheaper stocks the majority sell for from ten to twenty cents per share and then the price goes up to over fifty cents. However, we will take the medium price of twenty-five cents per share and see what tax would be collected at the rate of three-twentieths of one per cent, or fifteen cents on each $100 worth of sales. Just here I might explain how I arrive at the rate of three-twentieths of one per cent. According to the figures given by the minister the total selling price of the shares dealt in that day was $3,886,800, and under the proposed tax the revenue would amount to $5,837.15. If you divide the amount collected into the amount of the sales you get the figure of three-twentieths of

one per cent on the value or fifteen cents on every $100 worth of shares sold, or in other words just five times the old tax which has been in force ever since 1922. That is, it would be five times the old tax of three cents on every $100 of value if that had been collected as an ad valorem tax on all the sales, but as I showed the other night that was not the case. That tax was only collected on a few of the shares and always on the lower priced stock, so that really for the last seven years the revenue under this tax has been derived mainly from the low priced stocks, and that principle will be continued under the proposed tax, as I intend to show; these low priced stocks will continue to bear the heavy load all the time, instead of that load being equally divided over all issues.

As I have already pointed out, on the 324,900 shares valued at from one cent to fifty cents per share there would be collected $324.90, under the present proposal. Taking an average price of twenty-five cents per share, the sale price of these shares would be $81,225, and a tax of fifteen cents per $100 of valuation would bring in only $121 in revenue. In other words, on this first item under the present proposal the minister would collect two and a half times as much as would be collected under an ad valorem tax. Then his next figures were for stocks valued at fifty cents to one dollar, and 186,500 shares of this stock passed over the exchange on the day he took as an example. At an average price of seventy-five cents a share the total sales price of these shares would be $139,875. Under the proposed tax the revenue from those shares would amount to $466.25, while under an ad valorem tax of fifteen cents per $100 of value he would collect only $210. Then we come to the next class, 114,900 shares valued at from $1 to $3, and at an average price of $2 per share the total selling price of these shares would be $229,800. Under the proposed tax he would collect on the sale of those shares $1,149; with an ad valorem tax of 15 cents per $100, the revenue received would be $345.

The next transaction mentioned by the minister was 150,900 shares at over $3 and under $20 per share. I took an average of $11 per share as being the fair price between those two figures. A sale of 150,900 shares at $11 per share would amount to $1,659,900. Under the proposed tax the revenue would be $3,018 and under an ad valorem tax it would amount to $2,490. In that case an ad valorem tax of 15 cents on $100 would be getting off a little cheaper than under the proposed tax.

The next transaction mentioned was 29,300 shares at over $20 and under $100 per share. I took an average price of $60 per share, which makes the value of the transaction $1,758,000. Under the proposed tax the revenue would be $879 while the ad valorem tax would return a revenue of $2,637. The revenue is only about one-third of what it would be with the ad valorem tax while on the cheaper shares the present tax will bring in a revenue of between two or four times the amount which would be received with the ad valorem tax. There is not a vestige of fairness in imposing taxation such as this. I cannot see how anyone would have the effrontery to attempt to justify such an unfair tax. It may be to a lesser degree, but nevertheless it is continuing along the old line of taxing the smaller man at a higher rate than the tax imposed upon the big man. There is no justification for it and I cannot understand why the Minister of Finance insists upon trying to impose this tax. I would like to quote from the remarks of the Minister of Finance which he made the other evening in an attempt to justify the tax upon the speculative stocks, as he called them. As appears on page 2454 of Hansard, the minister said:

> As soon as they begin speculating then certainly the nation has a right to take some share of the profits. If I were representing a mining section of the country I might take a onesided view of the matter. But this is in the interests of the mining industry, and in support of that statement I shall quote the opinion of the Northern Miner.

I will give that quotation later, but at present I desire to deal with the minister's first statement. I do not agree with the minister because whether you call it speculating or gambling, if there were not people who were optimistic enough to speculate—

Mr. BENNETT: Take a chance.

Mr. LANG: —in an endeavour to bring forth the treasures from the mineral lands of this country, then there would be no mining production or mineral development. This tax is being imposed upon the prospectors. They are the first ones to speculate or gamble; they speculate not only with the few dollars which they have, but they gamble with their time and with their energy; they risk their health and everything else in an attempt to bring about the mineral development of this Canadian nation. Such a statement as that made by the minister is entirely unfair to the people who are doing the pioneer work for this great industry.

If a tax is to be imposed it should not bear too heavily on those who take the risk of

the initial speculation, the first gamble, which must precede any real development of our mineral resources.

I will continue with the quotations made by the hon. minister from the Northern Miner. As every hon. member of this house knows, that paper is one of the most reputable mining journals which we have in Canada. The Journal was first published in Cobalt during the early days of mining in that section of the country, and continued to be published there until a few weeks ago when it was moved to Toronto. This quotation which the minister read was apparently from an editorial published during the early part of this year, and is as follows:

> While the business of company promotion by brokers has lagged lately, reducing the prospector's claim market, fortunately he has never been in such good position to sell first-class discoveries. Dozens of big mining organizations will listen eagerly to his story if he has a good one to tell, and will send engineers hopping by plane to examine. If his show stands up money is waiting, on the nail. Easy going, long distance deals are completely out of fashion. The prospector can get quick action if he is willing to deal with the big companies.
>
> Competition for good ground is so keen that he is sure of good terms.

Then it goes on:

> On the whole, it has probably been a good thing for everybody that the promotional game has been slack. Buyers have had a chance to catch their breath and promoters a chance to realize and act upon the new conditions.

Then it says:

> The public was overloaded with half-baked propositions.

I take no exception at all to the minister having quoted that editorial to the house. If you take into consideration the time at which the editorial was written, it is a perfectly fair one and I agree with it in every respect. If I do not miss my guess, that editorial was probably written just soon after one of the worst financial disasters happened in connection with one of the oldest and supposed-to-be one of the best-established brokerage firms in the city of Toronto. I have no doubt in the world that editorial was written after that firm suspended operations. That was the Heron Company which closed its doors some time early this year. If the Minister of Finance was looking for something to justify taxing penny stocks in order to keep poor, innocent individuals from being rooked in that sort of game and losing their money, he picked the wrong editorial to support any argument of that kind, because everyone knows to-day that this firm was dealing in one of the high-priced stocks.

betting that the stock was going to go down instead of up, betting probably illegally by going short on International Nickel, one of the best stocks that we have in the country. It was because of that manipulation that the Heron Company had to cease operations, and this caused one of the worst financial disasters that we have had in Canada and a lessening for the time being in the number of people investing in mining stocks. But in my opinion and, I think, in that of every fair-minded man who gives the subject any consideration, that only goes to prove again that mistakes are made in the manipulation of high-priced stocks just as in connection with the cheaper stocks. I will leave that editorial by saying simply that if the Minister of Finance thinks so much of the views of the editor of the Northern Miner, I can put his mind at rest at once as to what the editor of that paper thinks about the present proposed tax. He thinks it is absolutely unfair; that it is not fair to the mining industry and particularly to the ones who do the pioneer work and of necessity have to get their money from the cheaper class of stocks. To tax the low-priced stocks more heavily than the higher-priced stocks is, in the opinion of the editor of the Northern Miner, a mistake, no matter who it is made by. The Minister of Finance also said:

> The Monetary Times of January 11 quotes Mr. Norman Urquhart, president of the Standard stock and mining exchange of Toronto, as follows:

And then he gives the quotation. I did not know at the time, but I understand that Mr. Urquhart was one of the gentlemen who were here representing the brokers from Toronto, asking the Minister of Finance not to impose a tax such as this. I am pointing this out just because the minister quotes Mr. Urquhart, and Mr. Urquhart feels that this is not a fair tax and that it should not be imposed upon the people notwithstanding the statement he made which the minister quoted. Mr. Urquhart's statement is a perfectly fair one coming as it did and when it did. We have had two or three unpleasant incidents in connection with mining this year, and for the life of me I cannot understand how any person could think they could improve conditions by imposing a tax on the people. Nothing bears out such an idea. An incident that happened just shortly before this statement by Mr. Urquhart, one of the Toronto brokers, was in connection with the Jackson-Manion dealings. This caused a flutter in mining circles and among mining investors in this country. Taxing cheap stocks has nothing

to do with regulating that sort of thing. We have a Companies Act in Ontario and I expect there are somewhat in all the other provinces similar acts which are supposed to cope with situations of that character, call them "blue-sky" laws if you will. In connection with the Jackson-Manion affair, the managing director and the mine manager are to-day before the courts on a charge of conspiracy or collusion to defraud the investors in that mine. That is all I want to say about that. But it is absurd for anyone to get up before an intelligent body of people and endeavour to leave the impression that by imposing a heavier tax on the smaller-priced stocks, they are going to do anything to make safer the investment of the people who want to put their money into stocks of that kind in order to help mining development in Canada. I do not think that is an unfair statement for me to make.

The minister says further:

> Then I have another statement made by one of the most prominent bankers in the city of Toronto, where I suppose more mining shares are sold than in any other city of Canada.
>
> This statement was made by Mr. Bogert, general manager of the Dominion Bank, in his annual report.

This is a perfectly fair statement by Mr. Bogert, and I have no fault to find with it. It is an optimistic, not a pessimistic statement. It is just what one would expect from the head of a financial institution of that kind. In the paragraph which the minister quoted there is not one word to lend any colour for any person to think that good would be done by imposing a heavier tax on the sale of shares, and particularly a heavier tax on the sale of the smaller-priced shares than upon the higher-priced.

Then the minister crosses over to England to tell us that they have a graduated scale of taxation on shares. Everyone must and does know that the people of the motherland are carrying a heavier burden of taxation than probably any other people in the world. They are doing that because of the vast obligations which have been staring them in the face ever since the war. I think it would be entirely unfair for any of us in this house to pass any opinion upon the sort of taxation which the British people in their wisdom have imposed upon themselves, and I say again that their taxation has absolutely no bearing upon the case with which we are dealing at the present time.

Before leaving this tax schedule which I made up from the figures which the Minister of Finance himself gave the other evening, I would like to summarize it. The amount of the sales for the day he quoted was $3,866,800. On that amount, if this tax goes into effect, he would collect $5,837. I worked out what rate of taxation that would represent, and it works out to 15 cents on each $100 of value sold. The old tax that we have had since 1922 and which will remain in force until it is replaced by this new one, if it goes into effect, amounted to 3 cents on every $100, not of value, but of par value, and as was pointed out so well the other evening that tax was collected on only a very small proportion of the total volume of business done. The tax was falling on the small investor all the time, and if this new tax goes into effect it will still be the small investor who will have to pay the bulk of the taxation. You would think that after this house had looked into the matter and found out that for the last eight years the small investor is the one who has been most heavily taxed, we would now give him a little advantage to make up for the disadvantage which he has been suffering in the past. But no, a new tax is being brought down under which the small investor is going to continue to be taxed at the expense of the few and bigger investors.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I understand that the first sale of shares is not taxed, but only succeeding sales. How can the succeeding sales be of any benefit to the mining company?

Mr. LANG: I will answer that as best I can. I do not think that it has yet been made absolutely clear to this house that all of the first issue of stock is entirely free from taxation.

Mr. ADSHEAD: How can succeeding sales benefit the company?

Mr. LANG: Very often when a new company is formed, some one undertakes the underwriting of a certain amount of the treasury stock. For example, I cited a case the other night of a company selling one million shares at 5 cents a share in order to raise $50,000. On the sale of that stock they would be taxed $1,000 under this proposed tax.

Mr. HEAPS: Not on the first transfer.

Mr. LANG: All right. Whoever underwrites the stock guarantees to the treasury of the company 5 cents a share for that one million shares, in order to raise $50,000 for the company. Then the underwriter sells the stock to the public, and that stock is taxed. That is the way it works out.

Since this proposal was brought down by the Minister of Finance, I have received a letter from British Columbia—I am not

familiar with conditions there, but the British Columbia members will know whether this is correct or not—stating that in British Columbia, where the mining industry has been undergoing great development in the last year, they raise the money for the initial development pretty nearly all through selling these cheap priced shares to the public, and to a far greater extent than we do in Ontario.

Mr. CLARK: Absolutely correct.

Mr. LANG: That is the information I have. The mining industry in Ontario is older, and we have mining people who have money and have been interested in mining for years who will speculate or gamble on the further development of the minerals of our province, and we do not so often go to the public with cheap priced stocks to raise the initial development money. Probably a syndicate of five or ten men will put up $50,000 or $100,000, after they have had their engineers look over the property and they are satisfied that the geological conditions are such that the property has a chance and may develop into a mine. It is always a gamble in the first instance. I do not care how good a prospect may look, it is nothing but a gamble, and anyone who has had anything to do with mining knows that. But what is the use of saying, just because it is a gamble and people might lose their money, the government might as well take some of that money because the stockholders might lose it anyway. Is not that an awful argument to put up?

Mr. ADSHEAD: I did not put it that way. If my hon. friend will permit me, I bought some oil stock in the Macleod Oil Company some years ago at $1 per share, and the company got 75 cents out of every dollar received from the sale of the shares. They developed a well, and later on I sold the stock for $10 a share. I got $10, but what I want to know is how that benefited the company.

Mr. LANG: One would need to know all the details of the deal before expressing an opinion. The hon. member benefited all right, and that is the main thing. He gambled and in that case won. In a lot of other cases he might not be so lucky.

Mr. HEAPS: Under those circumstances what objection would there be to the hon. member for East Calgary paying a tax to the government?

Mr. LANG: If he wants to pay a tax I do not object, but I say that as long as you tax the cheaper priced stocks more heavily than the higher priced stocks you are doing something that is absolutely unfair and something that cannot possibly be justified. I said when I was speaking on this matter the other evening that I was not a bit afraid of the minister putting on too high a tax if he made it an ad valorem tax. Let it rest fairly and evenly on all the people who are paying the tax. Let it be a tax on the value of the transaction. That is all I have been asking for. That is why I ventured to work out what this rate of taxation would be over the day's business. It would be just five times what it was before. I do not know what the minister is budgeting for in this tax, I do not know how much money he expects to get from it; he has not told us; but I do feel sure that any person who considers conditions in this country to-day will agree with me that there is not a doubt in the world that an immense volume of business will be traded in this year, so that one can hardly estimate it. Last year on the Toronto stock exchange there was a turnover of $600,000,000 dollars. That is only one of the exchanges. There are also the Montreal, the Calgary, the Winnipeg, the Vancouver and the other stock exchanges throughout the country. Undoubtedly vast developments are going on. There is no doubt there will be ten times that value traded in, and a tax of 15 cents on the $100, an ad valorem rate, would bring into the treasury millions of dollars this year.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): I think, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend (the Minister of Finance) has made an entire mistake as to the meaning of this amendment. He seems to assume that it would do away with the tax on shares altogether; that was his argument. He told us the amount of revenue he received last year from this tax, and he suggested that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition surely did not want to do away with the tax altogether. That is not the purpose of the motion at all. The motion is quite plain and simple, as the hon. minister will see if he will take another look at it. It proposes that the bill should be sent back to the committee to strike out section 4. If that is done, then the present act remains as it is. It seems to me that the Minister of Finance might very well give the matter further consideration, after which I think he will be disposed to agree to the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition. It is quite evident that the feeling in the house and in the country is against this idea of increasing taxation on the cheaper shares. I congratulate the member for South Timis-

kaming (Mr. Lang) on the fine case he has made out for not increasing the taxation on this class of shares.

Let me cite what would be a very hard case if this legislation were put into force. In the list of investments of a man who had dealt very largely in mining shares there were two mining stocks that had to be sold under 2 cents a share; one realized only 1½ cents. That is all the executors could get for them. The minister says: "All right, you have had bad luck, it is true, but although this estate is getting only 1½ cents on each share I am going to take a cent of it for the treasury." Surely the minister cannot think that is fair. I would put the argument of the member for South Timiskaming in this way. The resources of this country cannot be developed unless people with money are willing to take a chance, not only the prospector who goes out and spends his time and money, and perhaps ruins his health in trying to discover new mines, but the men who are willing to risk their money in what may be a losing proposition. But if they are successful the minister surely ought not to tax them out of existence. He should not impose a tax of this kind that will deter those people and in turn hinder the development of our mineral resources. It is wrong in principle altogether. I agree that this tax ought to be on the basis of the value of the securities, and it certainly is not right that the cheaper stocks should have to pay more in proportion than the more expensive ones.

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, fortunately I have before me a record of a day's sales on the Vancouver stock exchange, with the old tax and the proposed tax computed. On this particular day the present tax would be approximately $20. That agrees, I think, with the figures given by the Minister of Finance. Taking a three hundred day year, it would amount to about $6,000. The minister, I think, stated that the tax at present collected is about $7,000. Now, the proposed tax which the minister would collect if the same sales were made on that exchange would be $800. $800 instead of $20—forty times the amount. That is quite an appreciable increase in taxation. If I am not mistaken it is 4,000 per cent. Am I correct? Can it be that the minister hopes to increase taxation by 4,000 per cent? Let me give a few concrete examples from the days' sales. Here is a sale where the value of the stock sold was $312.50. The minister proposes to assess a tax on that of $500, or nearly $200 more than the stock actually sold for. The old tax on the same transaction was $3. Of course, the minister knows that that sale would not be made under such circumstances. That stock would go off the market so far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. ROBB: That would not mean the mine would go off the market.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, and I will show the minister how that particular mine might go off the market. If that company has unissued stock in its reserve—the only means by which it can secure capital to develop what may be an excellent prospect—it must put that stock on the market. Now, I ask the minister how would he finance the company to enable it to go ahead with its development work? To whom would he sell the shares in the company's reserve? Nobody would buy them. This is the answer to the question of my hon. friend from East Calgary. He asked: How do the succeeding sales of shares benefit the mine itself? I will show him. Here is a mine whose stock has depreciated to such an extent that it is selling at 1/16 of a cent a share. That mine may wish to issue treasury shares to go ahead with development. But who would buy those shares? True, it may be said that if I buy them I will not pay the tax on the purchase from the company. But would I buy them? Would my hon. friend from East Calgary buy them? Certainly not, because he knows he could not sell them again without paying a tax in excess of the value of the shares, and he would not buy such stock, neither would the Minister of Finance. This law would preclude the possibility of that company's refinancing and absolutely put it out of business forever. I wonder how my hon. friend would feel if he had paid $1 per share for stock in that company instead of in his successful oil company—if he had paid $1 per share and found that it had depreciated to one-sixteenth of a cent per share, and then have the minister pass a law which would preclude him from the possibility of ever retrieving his depleted fortune.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I have bought some from which I never got anything and never shall.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend is a fair judge, if he is able to purchase shares at $1 and sell at $10 he does not need much information. At any rate, there is a concrete illustration. Of course, that is rather extreme; nevertheless there are many companies with depleted resources who have to refinance, and in nearly every case the price of the stock is depreciated. The Minister of Finance, by passing this bill, will make it impossible for these companies to refinance.

Let me give a few more examples. There was a sale of 100 shares of Royalite valued at $175 a share, or a total value of $17,500. I wonder what my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) thinks that sale will be taxed if the Minister of Finance passes this bill? It will be taxed $4; whereas the Minister of Finance hopes to collect $500 on a sale which involves $312. Here we have the actual day's sales; this is what transpired in the course of a day's sales on the Vancouver stock exchange. I would point out to the minister that he is collecting under the present tax on that sale of Royalite $5.25. Now to the big man who can afford to purchase high priced stock like Royalite, and which is just as speculative as any other stock on the market, and perhaps a great deal more so, because it has appreciated in value some 2,000 per cent, the Minister of Finance says, "All right; any of you big speculators who can afford to buy these valuable shares at $175 a share can go ahead. If you have $20,000 to spend in that way I will charge you only $4." But to the little fellow who has only $300 to spend he says, "If I can get it from you, I will charge you $500." That is what the Minister of Finance says, in effect.

Let us go further. Here is a sale of Capitol Oil: the present tax is 6 cents and the proposed tax $10. In the case of Beaver Silver the present tax is 12 cents and the proposed tax $2; while on a sale of Kootenay King the present tax is 39 cents and the proposed tax $5. I do not know whether that belongs to the Minister of National Health (Mr. King). He might be able to help Kootenay King if he would devote his attention to the measure under discussion. Then, take two properties with which no doubt every hon. member is familiar, two mines—Big Missouri and Reeves McDonald. On a sale of Big Missouri of $1,500 value, at $1.50 a share, the present tax is 30 cents, and the Minister of Finance proposes to collect $10. In the case of Reeves McDonald, where the total value is $6,250, at $1.25 a share, the minister collects now $1.89 and he proposes to collect $50. I am going to take this case as a basis of further remarks. I assert that the Minister of Finance will drive practically every new promotion of similar mining companies in British Columbia at least, to Seattle or Spokane in the United States. He will make it impossible for these companies to finance in British Columbia. Reeves McDonald was refinanced and issued some of its treasury shares to the public in the month, I believe, of January of this year. These shares were issued at $1 each. They are now selling around $1.25 on the Vancouver stock exchange. A sale took place on the day in question of 5,000 shares of Reeves McDonald at $1.25, with a total value of $6,250. The tax thereon is $1.89 as compared with the proposed tax of $50. Now what I assert is this: There is not an hon. member in this house who will buy stocks, where the value is around $5,000, if he has to pay to this country a tax of $50. He will not buy them.

Mr. RALSTON: Did that stock have a par value?

Mr. CLARK: One dollar.

Mr. RALSTON: How then does my hon. friend get a tax of $1.89?

Mr. CLARK: The present tax.

Mr. RALSTON: I thought my hon. friend said the old tax would be that.

Mr. CLARK: No, the present tax; that is—

Mr. RALSTON: The present tax is 3 cents a share.

Mr. BENNETT: Three cents on $100 par value.

Mr. RALSTON: Which is 3 cents a share.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It could not be 3 cents a share.

Mr. RALSTON: Read section 58.

Mr. CLARK: In any case it is perfectly clear that the proposed tax will be $50. Now what will be the effect of that? Will the Minister of Finance tell this house—

Mr. BENNETT: It is 3 cents on $100.

Mr. RALSTON: Read section 58.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Three cents on every $100 par value.

Mr. CLARK: Then I am correct. I checked up a number of these and found them to be correct and I assumed that they were all correct. I think they are. I should like very much indeed to put the whole statement on Hansard for the information of the Minister of Finance or of any other hon. member of the house, because I think it will be of great value.

The statement follows:

Stock	No. of shares	Price	Value	Proposed tax	Present
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Snowflake	1,000	0 51	510 00	2 50	0 15
Whitewater	100	1 80	180 00	1 00	0 03
Whitewater	100	1 80	180 00	1 00	0 03
Grandview	300	0 42	126 00	0 20	0 03
Golconda	200	0 89	178 00	0 50	0 06
Mohawk	5,000	0 4½	225 00	5 00	0 39
Snowflake	500	0 51	255 00	1 25	0 09
Topley Rich	200	0 60	120 00	0 50	0 03
Snowflake	100	0 52	52 00	0 25	0 03
Snowflake	50	0 52	26 00	0 12½	0 03
Snowflake	500	0 51¼	257 50	1 25	0 09
Rufus Arg	500	0 27½	135 00	0 50	0 15
Snowflake	250	0 52	130 00	0 62½	0 06
Woodbine	500	0 16½	82 50	0 50	0 03
Woodbine	250	0 16½	41 25	0 45	0 03
Marmot Metals	1,000	0 09½	95 00	1 00	0 15
Whitewater	250	1 75	437 50	2 50	0 09
Mohawk	2,000	0 04½	90 00	2 00	0 15
Mohawk	1,000	0 04½	45 00	1 00	0 09
Woodbine	1,000	0 15¼	152 50	1 00	0 06
McLeod O	50	5 45	272 50	1 00	0 03
George Enter	1,000	0 2 1½	215 00	1 00	0 15
Woodbine	1,000	0 16¼	162 50	1 00	0 06
Devenish P	500	0 59	295 00	1 25	0 09
Cotton Belt	100	0 50	50 00	0 25	0 03
Fabyan Pete	1,000	0 10	100 00	1 00	0 30
Topley Rich	200	0 61	122 00	0 50	0 03
B.C. Mont	50,000	1–16	31 25	50 00	0 30
B.C. Mont	500,000	1–16	312 50	500 00	3 00
B.C. Mont	1,000	1–16	0 62½	1 00	0 03
B.C. Mont	5,000	1–8	6 25	5 00	0 03
Capitol O	10,000	0 01	100 00	10 00	0 06
Home O	100	23 00	2,300 00	3 00	0 03
Royalite	100	175 00	17,500 00	4 00	5 25
Royalite	50	175 00	8,750 00	2 00	2 64
Grandview	10,000	0 40	4,000 00	10 00	1 50
Bowena Copper	300	0 10⅓	31 50	0 30	0 09
Bayview	1,000	0 05¾	57 50	1 00	0 09
Big Missouri	100	1 32	132 00	1 00	0 03
Beaver Silver	2,000	0 16	320 00	2 00	0 12
Bluebird	100	0 15	15 00	0 10	0 03
Cork Prov	1,000	0 14½	145 00	1 00	0 09
Cotton Belt	100	0 63	63 00	0 25	0 03
George Copp	50	7 25	362 50	1 00	0 03
Georgia River	1,500	0 35	525 00	1 50	0 45
Golconda	150	1 70	255 00	1 50	0 06
Georgia River	100	0 20	20 00	0 10	0 03
Independence	1,000	0 09¾	97 50	1 00	0 30
Grandview	100	0 49	49 00	0 10	0 03
Indian Mines	1,000	0 05	50 00	1 00	0 30
Intern. Coal	500	0 35	175 00	0 50	0 15
Koot. Flor	300	0 14	42 00	0 30	0 03
Koot. King	5,000	0 47	2,350 00	5 00	0 39
L. & L	1,000	0 03¼	32 50	1 00	0 09
Marmot Gold	500	0 06½	32 50	0 50	0 06
Mohawk	500	0 05½	27 50	0 50	0 06
Morton Wols	500	0 07	35 00	0 50	0 06
National Silv	1,500	0 21	315 00	1 50	0 24
Noble Five	200	0 66	132 00	0 50	0 03
Premier	100	1 96	196 00	1 00	0 03
Reeves McD	200	1 95	390 00	2 00	0 12
Snowflake	1,000	0 54	540 00	2 50	0 15
Woodbine	500	0 06	30 00	0 50	0 03
Whitewater	100	0 85	85 00	0 25	0 03
Advance O	100	9 00	900 00	2 00	0 03
A.P. Cons	250	4 70	1,175 00	5 00	0 09
Assoc. Oil	200	5 40	1,080 00	4 00	0 33
B. C. Montana	10,000	1–8	12 50	10 00	0 06
British Dom	300	1 35	405 00	3 00	0 09
Commonwealth	100	1 10	110 00	1 00	0 03
Calmont O	250	4 15	1,037 50	5 00	0 09

Stock	No. of shares	Price	Value	Proposed tax	Present
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Dalhousie O.	50	5 70	285 00	1 00	0 09
Devenish Pete.	210	1 22	266 20	2 10	0 09
Fabyan P.	600	0 13	78 00	0 60	0 18
East Crest.	100	4 85	485 00	2 00	0 15
Freehold.	100	1 78	178 00	1 00	0 06
Hargal O.	50	2 60	130 00	0 50	0 06
McLeod O.	50	5 60	280 00	1 00	0 03
New McD. Seg.	100	4 75	475 00	2 00	0 03
Mid West.	100	1 00	100 00	1 00	0 03
Home O.	90	24 00	2,160 00	2 70	0 03
Ill. Alta.	100	1 75	175 00	1 00	0 03
Mayland O.	50	13 15	657 50	1 00	0 03
Mill City.	300	9 00	2,700 00	6 00	0 09
Royalite.	5	178 00	890 00	0 20	0 27
Mercury.	100	1 78	178 00	1 00	0 06
McD. Seg. Ex.	100	7 75	775 00	2 00	0 03
Turner Valley.	100	1 25	125 00	1 00	0 03
Regent O.	500	0 68	340 00	1 25	0 15
South West Pete.	50	7 00	360 00	1 00	0 12
Spooner.	40	4 10	164 00	0 80	0 03
Sterling Pac.	25	3 10	77 50	0 50	0 03
United O.	100	19 25	1,925 00	2 00	0 03
Lowery Pete.	100	5 10	510 00	2 00	0 18
Big Missouri.	1,000	1 50	1,500 00	10 00	0 30
Reeves McD.	5,000	1 25	6,250 00	50 00	1 89
Snowflake.	500	0 50	250 00	0 50	0 09
Richmond.	5,000	0 01	50 00	5 00	0 75
Silverado.	1,000	1 25	1,250 00	10 00	0 30

As I have shown, the Minister of Finance proposes to collect $50 on a sale of $5,000, and I once more assert that no member of this house, no Canadian, is going to participate in financing of that character. Fifty dollars is too high a tax to pay on one transaction. That means that these shares will not be marketable. Let me tell you what is going to happen. Take the Reeves McDonald property, which lies in West Kootenay. It is on the boundary line, practically adjoining Pend d'Oreille, which is in the United States, but it is financed in Canada. Now if this tax had been in force when these two properties were promoted, where does the minister think the promotion would have taken place? Unquestionably it would have been in Spokane, in the United States; after all that is the nearest city to these properties and that is where the promotion would have taken place. That is also where future promotions in British Columbia will take place, because the public will not tolerate a tax of $50 where the sale price is only $5,000. The shares will become unmarketable and no man will purchase stock from the underwriters, no matter how promising the properties may be, if he knows that when he sells his stock he will have to pay a tax of $50. These shares turn over ten or twenty times a year, and at the end of the year that $5,000 might pay a tax of $500 or even $1,000.

I am confirmed in my statement with regard to the financing of these properties by the oldest and most experienced men in the industry in British Columbia. I have received from them telegrams and letters, and they all assert that there can be no question that so far as new promotions and new developments are concerned they must necessarily take place in the United States because our people will not subscribe to them if they are to be taxed in this way. As I have said repeatedly on the floor of this house, in British Columbia since the war we have financed our mining development from our own savings, and the present enactment will create a handicap which will prohibit any future development of that kind. That will leave only one place where in future these promotions may be undertaken; that is the United States, in either Spokane or Seattle.

In addition to that, the trading which is now going on in the Vancouver stock exchange will be transferred to the United States, because you will find that a number of these companies with shares of low market value will perhaps wind up their affairs and reincorporate in the United States. They will list their stocks in that country and they will be traded in no longer on our exchanges. In that case the minister cannot hope to collect the tax which he proposes to impose on these lower priced shares. However, I am speaking for the industry rather than for the companies already in existence; I am looking to future developments. I want future development to take place here in

Canada and to be financed in Canada; I want the Canadian people to benefit by the development, and I say they cannot do so if the Minister of Finance insists on passing through the house the measure now under consideration.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, the unfairness and iniquity of this tax as far as the mining industry is concerned has been abundantly established by the data and the arguments submitted by hon members on both sides of the house. I rise for only a moment in order to place on record a telegram which has been just received by the hon. member for West Kootenay (Mr. Esling) from Mr. S. W. Miller, head of the large brokerage firm of Miller and Court Company, Limited, Vancouver. This organization has been instrumental in successfully establishing some of the most important mining enterprises in British Columbia; it is not only a concern interested in the promotion of these enterprises but it is very much concerned in developing the industry. After expressing his appreciation of certain arguments advanced by the hon. member for West Kootenay, Mr. Miller says:

> For last fifteen years we have used our time and money to promote development of British Columbia mining, and should the government's present tax pass it is our intention to withdraw absolutely from the mining promotion business. You can appreciate what reaction a move of this kind would have on the mining development of our province.

Apart from the rights of the provinces with respect to taxation of mining enterprises, apart from the question of the division of the field of taxation, in the face of the data which has been submitted and in view of the incontrovertible facts and the judgment of men who understand the business, in this case I think the minister, with that breadth of judgment which he ought to display, should depart from the attitude of obstinacy which the people of Canada will believe to be actuating him if he persists in his present course and reconsider the proposal now before the house. If necessary he might delay proceedings at this time in order to study the facts and obtain full knowledge of the situation so that the best efforts of the government may be devoted to the mining industry of Canada.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I would like to say just a word in order to see whether I clearly understand the situation both with regard to the original proposal of the Minister of Finance and the proposal which was later brought before the house and which is the subject of the amendment now under consideration. The original provision, under which I understand both the Department of Finance and the Department of National Revenue have been working, is section 58 of the Special War Revenue Act, which provides:

> No person shall sell or transfer the stock or shares of any association, company or corporation, or any bond other than a bond of the Dominion of Canada or of any province of Canada by
>
> (a) agreement for sale;
>
> (b) entry on the books of the association, company or corporation;
>
> (c) delivery of share certificates or share warrants or bond endorsed in blank or payable to bearer; or
>
> (d) any other method whatsoever;
>
> unless in respect of such sale or transfer there is affixed to or impressed upon the document evidencing the ownership of such stock or shares or bond, or a document showing the transfer or agreement for the transfer thereof, an adhesive stamp, or a stamp impressed thereon by means of a die, of the value of three cents for every one hundred dollars or fraction thereof of the par value of the stock or shares or bond sold or transferred.

The exception is section 61 which provides:

> The first delivery by a corporation or company of such shares, or debenture stock, in order to effect an issue, or the first issue of a bond, or a sale or transfer of any bond between any recognized dealers or brokers shall not be subject to the tax imposed by this part.

That means that this tax shall not be imposed upon the original issue of these shares by the company, and I understand that this provision is to be still in force.

Mr. STEVENS: If the company makes an issue which is sold through a firm underwriting that issue, when the underwriting firm sells to the public the stock is taxable.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is quite right, but in that case the underwriters are in the position of the public as the purchasers of the stock. We can talk about underwriting as we like, but that does not consist of simply guaranteeing the sale of the stock; it means an agreement to buy stock, an agreement that the so-called underwriter will put into the treasury of the company the number of dollars required for the purchase of that stock, and that transaction is made free of any tax. Let us get that straight, and I say that the underwriters are in no different position from the public; they are the public in that they are the purchasers of the stock.

Mr. LADNER: In a business sense, although technically the underwriter is the purchaser, is he not really the agent of the company for the sale of the stock?

Mr. RALSTON: I never heard of an underwriter being the agent of the company;

the underwriters are brokers who come along and propose to purchase the stock because they expect to make a profit out of it by selling to someone else.

Mr. STEVENS: They propose to market the stock.

Mr. CAHAN: Is not the underwriter the one who guarantees to purchase in case other purchasers are not found?

Mr. RALSTON: It depends on the underwriting agreement altogether.

Mr. CAHAN: That is the only kind of underwriting agreement that I ever heard of.

Mr. RALSTON: That may be, but my point is that the underwriter is the purchaser. If my hon. friend is correct, and the underwriter is not called upon under his underwriting agreement to purchase, the stock is sold direct to the public, and comes under the same heading as a sale to the underwriter world.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. RALSTON: Absolutely, because it is the first issue by the company.

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly not.

Mr. RALSTON: I am going to say what I have to say but I will make it just as brief as I can. That is my view, and I submit it to the consideration of the house. I say that the first transfer by the company, whether it is to the underwriter or to the public or to anyone else, is free from tax, and the purchaser who gets it, whether a so called underwriter purchasing en bloc, or individuals, they would not have that tax to pay and the industry would not be subject to that burden. The tax is upon the various subsequent transactions back and forth between people who are swapping shares with each other on the stock exchange.

Mr. CLARK: Could I interrupt the minister?

Mr. RALSTON: My only point—

Mr. CLARK: I just wanted some information, but I will not ask for it.

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member need not be so short about it.

Mr. CLARK: You interrupted me.

Mr. STEVENS: That is his habit.

Mr. RALSTON: It seems to me that under the latter part of section 58 it is not an ad valorem tax but a specific tax. My hon. friends may not agree with that, but section 58 appears to impose a specific tax on shares of stock of a par value of $100 or any fraction thereof, and it does not seem to be a percentage tax at all. I do not know how it has been administered, and I am not very much interested in that, but when you read these words:

> an adhesive stamp, or a stamp impressed thereon by means of a die, of the value of 3 cents for every one hundred dollars or fraction thereof of the par value of the stock or shares or bond sold or tranferred.

it will be seen that a 3 cent stamp is required on the stock certificate, whether it be of a par value of $100 or less, which means a tax of 3 per cent on the par value. As I understand the present amendment, it is proposed to bring it back—

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is 3 cents on $100.

Mr. RALSTON: I was endeavouring to prepare my hon. friends for the shock when I told them that I thought they would disagree with my statement. Upon reading that section I think there is fair ground for saying that this is a specific tax and not an ad valorem tax. It is a specific tax of 3 cents per share for every share of a par value of $100 or fraction thereof.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is not 3 per cent; it is 3 cents in $100.

Mr. RALSTON: It is one-third of one per cent, and I thank my hon. friend for the correction. If the amendment should pass it would bring this tax back to that situation.

The thing which is complained of is the taxation on the so-called penny shares, or the small priced shares. The minister first proposed that he would tax all shares selling at $3 or under at the rate of one cent per share; this would include a $3 share and go right down to the one-sixteenth of a cent per share mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark). It was pointed out that that one cent per share tax would be a pretty heavy tax on the small priced shares, but the minister now proposes that instead of that tax he will impose a one cent tax on shares selling at over $1 and up to $3. That means that there will be a tax of from one per cent to one-third of one per cent on those shares. As to the shares selling below one dollar, the minister now proposes that instead of imposing a one cent per share tax he will impose a tax of a quarter-cent per share on shares selling at not more than a dollar but over 50 cents. That means that the maximum tax would be one-half of one per cent and the minimum tax would be one-quarter of one per cent. Surely

that is not something which would ruin the mining industry, as my hon. friends suggest. Then the minister proposes to impose a tax of one-tenth of a cent per share on shares selling at 50 cents or less. I do not think that that can be regarded as a very heavy tax, because it is less than the tax imposed at the present time. The rate on a 50 cent share would be one-fifth of one per cent and as the price of the share decreases the proportion goes up and the percentage of taxation is a little larger. When you get down to shares selling for one-sixteenth of a cent per share it means a pretty stiff tax, but I do not believe that there are many sound mining companies in this country whose shares are selling on the market at anything like one-sixteenth of a cent per share. Such companies are the ones who have sold their shares and put in their development, and the development has resulted unsuccessfully. The people who invested at that time have found themselves with shares on their hands and I do not think it would make very much difference to them whether their shares sold for one-sixteenth of a cent per share or one-sixtieth of a cent per share. The only thing they can do is to hold on to their shares with the hope of improvement in the situation, and I do not think the house would be very much concerned with that special situation.

Mr. CLARK: It would make it impossible to refinance.

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. CLARK.: How could they get new money?

Mr. RALSTON: I thank my hon. friend for that suggestion. Although I am the last one to advise about it, I would suggest in an amateurish way that the method of refinancing should be for the people to value their property and issue such number of shares as could be sold at say 50 cents, and which would be taxed one-fifth of one per cent. Instead of issuing perhaps 5,000,000 shares for a property valued at only $50,000, the number of shares should be reduced and their value increased. The difficulty in the past has been that some mining companies issued their shares in millions and sold them at between 5 and 10 cents to people, if I may say so, who had no business to buy them but who were attracted by the large number of noughts on the face of the stock certificate and the very small amount of money they had to part with to purchase that imposing looking certificate. With all due respect to those who are interested in the mining industry, I do not believe that the people who are most interested in the mining industry are keen on seeing big lithographed stock certificates put out bearing amounts of hundreds or thousands of dollars on the face of them and selling, let us say, at 50 cents or a dollar or $2 per share. I suggest that it is much better to have the issue so limited that the certificate will sell at a price which will permit of a fair taxation of one-fifth of one per cent, or something of that kind, and regulate the number of shares to be issued by the amount of money which is required.

That is my answer to the question of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard with reference to refinancing. If a company has millions of dollars par value of stock in its treasury at a dollar per share, then they had better pass special resolutions and take the necessary procedure to increase the par value and decrease the number of shares so that they will sell at 50 cents or $1 at least in order that the tax rate may be small, instead of leaving the par value at $1 and selling the shares at one or two cents.

Mr. CLARK: What does the minister say about a tax of $50 on stock which is worth $1.25 a share and which has a total value of, say, $6,250. Is that a fair tax?

Mr. RALSTON: It is less than one per cent. A tax of $50 on a transaction amounting to $6,250 does not seem to me to be so terribly unreasonable. It does not shock me.

Mr. CLARK: What does the minister think of a tax of $4 on a sale of Royalite of $17,500?

Mr. RALSTON: Perhaps that is not enough, but that is no argument that this tax is too much.

Mr. CLARK: Why not make it equitable?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friends have not suggested that at all.

Mr. STEVENS: We have suggested it a thousand times.

Mr. RALSTON: What my hon. friends are suggesting is to go back to the old three-cent arrangement whereby Royalite would have a lower tax than it has to-day.

Mr. CLARK: If the minister would make some suggestion along the line of making the tax equitable, it would not be long before we on this side of the house would accept it.

Mr. RALSTON: I am dealing with the amendment and it seems to me the mining industry is not going to suffer very seriously on account of this tax. If stock flotations are properly issued, I do not think there will be

any difficulty about selling the stock. I am not very much impressed with the threat by some persons that they are not going to finance in Canada; in other words, that they are not going to play with the mining industry in this country, because this small tax is imposed. I do not think that argument should be allowed to influence us here, and the natural resources of Canada, if we may judge by what has happened recently, can be taken care of pretty well in Canada if necessary. I am quite sure it has not been fully apprehended that all the discussion about large taxation has had to do with the transfer after the industry has procured its capital and not with the original flotation.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): I will take up only two or three minutes of the time of the house in replying to the remarks made by the Minister of National Defence. I think he has unconsciously misled the house in regard to underwriting. I have been connected with the underwriting of two or three companies and it is generally done in this manner. As he says, a group of brokers take the stock at a certain price. But they have to sell it to the public and whether they pay the tax when the stock is being transferred to them at the outset or after they sell the stock to the public, the public have to pay the tax just the same, and it has the same depressing effect upon the stock as if it were the first issue. The underwriters take the stock at, say 15 cents, and they sell it to the public at 20 or 25 cents because they have to take the risk: they have to put up perhaps $100,000 to finance the mine. They know and take into consideration that they have to collect the tax from the public, because the public have to pay it eventually. It depends upon how much the public have to pay for the stock whether they will take it or not, so that the tax has a marked effect on the small mining ventures.

Mr. RALSTON: What does my hon. friend say about changing the par value of the issue so that instead of selling at 15 or 20 cents, it will sell at 50 cents a share?

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend has not the psychology of mining. Many people will not buy shares at 50 cents; they prefer to take their chances on the penny shares.

Mr. RALSTON: I am afraid it is those people who are being exploited.

Mr. MANION: They are not being exploited.

Mr. JACOBS: They are the table maids and office boys who are swindled by such shares as those.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. MANION: The people who bought Teck-Hughes at 15 cents, or McIntyre at 17 cents, and many other stocks at low prices, were not swindled.

Mr. JACOBS: What about the twenty thousand other companies?

Mr. MANION: Of course they cannot all make fortunes, otherwise there would not be any risk in the thing at all.

Mr. JACOBS: My hon. friend knows there has been more money lost in mining than has been made.

Mr. MANION: Is my hon. friend's argument that this whole scheme is for the purpose of stopping mining speculation and development altogether?

Mr. JACOBS: To a certain extent.

Mr. MANION: That is apparently what my hon. friend's argument is, and it is what this tax is going to do to a certain extent. It is going to stop a certain amount of this mining speculation. Some of it would be better stopped, but any man or woman who buys mining stock at a low price should know that he or she is playing a gambling game. I have gone into many of them on a small scale, and I have always kissed my money good-bye. If anything came back I said that it was "found" money, and that is exactly what these people do. Not many times did it come back, but sometimes it did.

Mr. JACOBS: That is gambling, pure and simple.

Mr. MANION: But it has helped to develop some of the mines of the country. You cannot stop gambling. People will gamble on horse races, and I would rather see them gamble on the mines where they are helping to bring about a good deal of development with their money.

Mr. JACOBS: But in mining they do not have a run for their money.

Mr. MANION: Oh, yes, they do. My intention in rising was to reply to the Minister of National Defence. While he to a certain extent ridicules the old tax, it was much more equitable than the new one. The complaint we are making is that the new tax is inequitable. For example, the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark) and various others have clearly demonstrated the inequity of this tax. When I was discussing this matter the other day I gave certain instances, and I have no intention of repeating

them to-day, but one that I pointed out was a $30 tax on $54,000 worth of Noranda, and a $10 tax on $1,020 worth of Kirkland Lake, the number of shares in each case being the same. That is not an equitable tax. The thing is unfair; it is an unfair method of imposing taxes. The hon. member for West Kootenay (Mr. Esling)—and I will give the hon. gentleman credit for it—gave me a most extraordinary example and it illustrates it to an extreme, but to quite a possible, degree. He pointed this out to me a few minutes ago —and it will illustrate the matter better than anything that has so far been given. Take $1,000 and buy two shares of any stock that is worth $500 a share. For instance, Smelters was worth $500, although it is quoted at about $400 just now. The tax on that at the proposed rate would be eight cents on $1,000. But take the same $1,000 and put it into a stock selling at five cents a share, and the tax would be $20. In other words, there is a tax of $20 on $1,000 in the penny shares, and a tax of eight cents on $1,000 in the expensive shares. The expensive shares are the ones bought by the rich people, while the others are bought by the people who can afford to take a small flyer, as the expression is. Therefore the whole result of this tax is to hit the small man.

Mr. RALSTON: Hit the small share.

Mr. MANION: The small man buys the small shares because the poor man cannot afford to buy $500 stocks.

Mr. RALSTON: He can buy less.

Mr. MANION: But he does not do it. Many men will not buy $1,000 or $500 worth; they will buy $100 worth, and it is the small man putting in $10 here or $50 there or $100 elsewhere who, as was well pointed out by the hon. member for South Timiskaming (Mr. Lang), finances these new mines, some of which turn out profitably. I do not agree with the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) who suggests they are largely flim-flam games. No doubt there has been a certain amount of crookedness going on, and I do not dispute that for a moment. I did not happen to take any part in it that I know of. What we on this side of the house object to is the inequity of the tax, and I think we have demonstrated that pretty clearly. We object to the depressing influence it will have on new mining deals; to the fact that it is a greater tax on the poor man than on the rich man; and to the fact that while the Minister of Finance is continually talking about decreasing taxation, about revising taxation downwards, this is a revision of taxation upwards to a large extent. In every way it is inequitable and unfair, and it is a tax that should be voted against by every member in the house.

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale): There seems to be a great misunderstanding in regard to this question. I am opposed to the proposal of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) whether it applies to the penny stocks or otherwise, because it seems to me it is just another case of interfering with the legitimate development of business and discouraging the investor at all times. Others may call it what they wish, but I claim that this is a nuisance tax, and it is establishing a very vicious principle which I hope this house will not support. We have had several nuisance taxes in this country. Some of them have been abolished, and I had thought it was the intention of the government to eliminate all of them, because unscrupulous people in all walks of life and in all parts of the world take advantage of them. I think this government should be known as the gold-digging government, because they have devised more means than anybody else of taking money out of the pockets of the people, throwing it into the melting pot, and then wasting it in all parts of the country. No one knows better than the Minister of Finance that he is going to dig millions out of the pockets of the people and discourage investment if he carries out this proposal. At the same time he is making innocent people believe that he is reducing taxation. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty hard to reduce and increase taxation at the same time, but the Minister of Finance is a fairly good window-dresser; he has succeeded in making certain innocent people believe that he has reduced taxation, but anybody who is alive to the situation knows better. This new tax is confusing; it will not be understood; it will mean extra cost to the mine operators; it will encourage dishonesty in mining development, and I hope that no member of this house will support it. I was a few minutes late coming into the house and I did not hear the resolution moved by my hon. leader (Mr. Bennett), but I am satisfied that it was along the right lines.

Mr. J. E. LAWSON (West York): I would ask the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) two questions arising out of the discussion this afternoon. The minister rather skilfully advocated the reorganization of the companies selling the cheaper priced stocks. When I call to his attention the fact that on one stock exchange in the province of On-

tario there are approximately 100 stocks selling under $1 a share, does he seriously advocate that all these companies should reorganize and refinance in order to avoid the burden of taxation being imposed upon the cheaper priced stocks by this proposal of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb)?

Mr. RALSTON: I am not suggesting reorganization. The question was asked, if the stock of a certain company should go down to $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent a share and the company should want more money, what would be done about it, and I was suggesting that the par value of the stocks should be revamped to sell in larger denominations, at a higher price. My hon. friend has not met the case at all because it is the 50 cent stock and not the $1 stock that is the one really complained of. I would ask him how many stocks of bona fide mining companies in Ontario that should be selling stock are selling stock below 50 cents a share?

Mr. LAWSON: I shall be very glad to give the information to the minister if he will give me time to go to my room and get the record. I would point out to him that the same argument which he advances in regard to stock selling at $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent a share must be applicable, only in a lesser degree, to a stock the price of which has gone down to 2 cents a share.

The second question I would ask the Minister of National Defence is this: If I use $1,000 to buy the shares of a 2 cent stock, I could buy 50,000 shares, and the tax on that under this new proposal would be $50. But if I use the same $1,000 to buy two $500 shares, the tax on that would be 8 cents. What argument would the Minister of National Defence advance to justify the imposition of a tax that charges me $50 on my investment of $1,000 in the one case, where I buy shares at 2 cents each, and charges me only eight cents on my investment of $1,000 in another class of stock?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I rise to a point of order. It may be very interesting for the hon. member for West York (Mr. Lawson) to be conducting an examination across the floor of the house of some hon. gentleman who has already spoken, but those of us who would like to see the business of the house expedited do not propose to sit here much longer while this cross-examination is going on. I rise to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that members who have already spoken should not be permitted to speak again.

[Mr. Lawson.]

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point is well taken. An hon. member can speak only once in the debate, but if a question is asked and the house consents the minister may answer.

Mr. LAWSON: May I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that I have not spoken previously in this debate. My hon. friend must have reference to the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. RALSTON: I think that was understood. My hon. friend should have addressed his inquiry to me while I was speaking.

Mr. MANION: He was making his argument by way of inquiry.

Mr. RALSTON: It is rather new in this house, but I suppose it can be done.

Mr. SPENCE: Nothing new here.

Mr. RALSTON: I repeat—

Mr. GUTHRIE: What about the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point is well taken. If the minister does not receive unanimous consent he may not reply.

Mr. J. F. POULIOT (Temiscouata): This tax proposal, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) has been considered from the viewpoint of the purchaser of shares. My friends on the other side of the house say that this tax will affect poor people who buy the lower priced shares. But there is another viewpoint. The purchaser is not the only one to be considered in this case. There is also the seller. I have personal knowledge of the fact that the promoters of mining stocks sold at a low price are often engaged in a huge swindle, and they try to get the money of poor people or, as my hon. friend from Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) said, of office boys and people generally in poor circumstances. I have noticed several times in our part of the country promoters who have come from the cities to try to sell mining stocks, and they tell the people that shares which they can buy at only 25 cents will go up and they will make a fortune within a very short time. Afterwards the people who buy the stock hear no more about their money. Very seldom does it happen that these low priced stocks turn out well. There are exceptions, of course, but as a general rule the selling of these low priced stocks to very small investors is just for the exploitation of the people.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the hon. member prohibit the man of small capital from taking a gamble according to his means?

Mr. POULIOT: Not at all, but I say that big swindlers encourage such gambling in order to take money out of the pockets of the people. It has happened often in my own experience. A man opened a stock broker's office in my home town and went to gaol for swindling his clients.

Mr. McGIBBON: Are there many like that down there?

Mr. POULIOT: No, they come from outside and they never stay very long.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Nothing advanced this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, convinces me that the legislation we are presenting is not in the public interest. Hon. gentlemen opposite object to this tax on the ground of inequality. Based on that argument, where will you find any greater inequality than this? For instance, my friend the leader of the opposition may send a registered letter containing $100,000 out to Calgary, and my colleague the Postmaster General will charge him 12 cents—10 cents registration and 2 cents postage. Yet if I send a letter containing merely $20 to Valleyfield my colleague will charge me the same rate.

Mr. STEVENS: But that is a stamp tax.

Mr. ROBB: Or my colleague from Vancouver Centre may issue a cheque for $10,000 on which he will have to pay a tax of 2 cents; while if I issue a cheque for only $100 I have to pay the same tax. I submit the legislation is fair, and I cannot support the amendment.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Bennett) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park), Arthurs, Barber, Bell (St. John-Albert), Black (Yukon), Black (Halifax), Bowen, Boys, Brady, Cahan, Cantley, Chaplin, Charters, Clark, Cowan, Dickie, Edwards (Waterloo South), Embury, Ernst, Esling, Fansher (Lambton East), Fraser, Gott, Grimmer, Guthrie, Hubbs, Kaiser, Kellner, Kennedy, Ladner, Lang, Lawson, Lucas, Macdonald (Richmond-West Cape Breton), Macdougall, MacNutt, Macphail (Miss), McGibbon, McQuarrie, McRae, Matthews, Perley (Sir George), Quinn, Rennie, Ross (Kingston City), Ryerson, Senn, Simpson, Sinclair (Wellington North), Smith (Cumberland), Smoke, Spence, Spotton, Stewart (Leeds), Stinson, Tummon, Wilson, Young (Toronto Northeast).—58.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead, Allan, Bancroft, Beaubien, Benoit, Bettez, Bird, Blanchard, Blatchford, Bock, Bothwell, Boucher, Boulanger, Bradette, Brown, Cannon, Cardin, Carmichael, Casgrain, Cayley, Denis, Desaulniers, Deslauriers, Dionne, Donnelly, Dubuc, Duff, Dunning, Elliott, Evans, Fafard, Forke, Gardiner, Garland (Bow River), Gervais, Girouard, Glen, Goulet, Gray, Hall, Hay, Heaps, Heenan, Hepburn, Howden, Ilsley, Jacobs, Jenkins, Johnston (Long Lake), Kay, King (Kootenay East), Lacombe, Laflamme, Langlois, Lapointe, Lavigueur, Lovie, Macdonald (Glengarry), MacLean (Prince), McLean (Melfort), McDiarmid, McIntosh, McKenzie, McMillan, McPherson, Marcil, Millar, Milne, Morrissy, Motherwell, Neill, Parent, Perras, Power, Prévost, Ralston, Rinfret, Robb, Roberge, Robitaille, Rutherford, Sanderson, Séguin, Sinclair (Queens), Smith (Stormont), Spencer, Steedsman, Sylvestre, Taylor, Telford, Totzke, Vallance, Verville, Ward, Young (Saskatoon), Young (Weyburn).—96.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

King, Mackenzie, Morin (St. Hyacinthe), Tobin, Morin (Bagot), Mercier (Laurier), McPhee, Veniot, Thorson, Ross (Moose Jaw), Euler, Howard, Bennett, Ryckman, Harris, Peck, Geary, Macdonald (Kings), Hanson, Stirling, Plunkett, Manion, Casselman,

Pouliot,	Lennox,
Delisle,	Short,
Lanctôt,	White (Mount Royal),
Bowman,	Hodgins,
Edwards (Ottawa),	Garland (Carleton),
Baldwin,	Johnstone,
Fontaine,	Anderson (Halton),
Malcolm,	Stevens,
Gershaw,	White (London),
Bouchard,	Pettit,
St-Père,	Maybee,
Mercier (St. Henri),	Bell (Hamilton),
Rhéaume,	Church,
Fiset,	MacLaren,
Bissett,	MacDonald,
Descoteaux,	Thompson,
Guérin,	Maloney,
Odette,	Robinson,
Dussault,	Cotnam,
Lacroix,	Rowe,
Raymond,	Bell (St. Antoine),
Boivin,	Hocken,
Bourgeois,	Price,
Foster,	Jones,
Chevrier,	McGregor.

Mr. BENNETT: I was paired with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Morin). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MANION: I was paired with the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the Minister of Trade and Commerre (Mr. Malcolm). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Howard). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. TOBIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto-Scarborough (Mr. Harris). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. VENIOT: I was paired with the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto South (Mr. Geary). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. POULIOT: I was paired with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Lennox). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. McPHEE: I was paired with the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Macdonald). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Plunkett). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. ROWE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GERSHAW: I was paired with the hon. member for London (Mr. White). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Main motion agreed to on the same division reversed.

Mr. Robb thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 278, to amend the Special War Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

WAYS AND MEANS

EXCISE ACT AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The resolution before the committee appears in votes and proceedings of May 8, and reads:

Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Excise Act, being chapter 60 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, by repealing subsection (a) of section 219 and substituting therefor the following:—

"On every pound of malt manufactured in Canada, subject to excise regulations with respect to coomings and absorption of moisture in warehouse as provided by the order in council on the seventh day of February, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one, three cents; provided that malt may be removed from a malt house to a distillery in bond, and the duty on such malt may be remitted upon proof satisfactory to the department that such malt has been used solely for the production of spirits, in which production no other material than malt is used; and provided further that malt used, in any licensed bonded manufactory, in the manufacture of malt extract or other similar medicinal preparation approved by the department or in the preparation of any malt food product approved by the governor in council may have duty thereon remitted under such regulations as the department establishes."

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): It will be observed that the only change from the existing act is the addition of the words:

or in the preparation of any malt food product approved by the governor in council.

The explanation is that the Malted Milk Company of Canada desires to operate a factory for the purpose of manufacturing malted milk. It is represented that on part of the ingredients, whole malt, there is an excise tax of 3 cents a pound and on crushed malt 5 cents a pound. It is proposed to give them this free for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT: The only objection is the old story—government by order in council.

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes; this medicinal preparation has to be approved of by the governor in council.

Mr. ROBB: I would point out to my hon. friend that this has been in the act many years. It was originally put in to protect the treasury.

Mr. BENNETT: This extends it to another item?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Robb thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 279, to amend the Excise Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, considered in committee and reported.

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 212, to amend the Customs tariff.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Before the bill is given second reading I should like the minister to make a more adequate explanation of what is meant by using the words "of a class or kind not made in Canada," or "not manufactured in Canada," with respect to some nine or ten items in the tariff. Am I to understand that the policy of the administration is to call a halt now; that anything not made in Canada now they will permit to come in free or under a very low tariff, and that hereafter this country is to become economically dependent upon other countries for those commodities it may require but which are not now manufactured here? I observe that in some nine or ten instances the words "not made or manufactured in Canada" occur, and an explanation of exactly why these words are used would do much to enlighten many people who are inquiring as to whether the government has reached the stage where it does not propose hereafter to encourage the manufacture in Canada of goods not now produced in this country.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): My hon. friend is asking me to go into the history of the tariff schedules of Canada since the days of Sir Leonard Tilley. These words have been used in the tariff schedules from time to time, and I suppose the same rule applies now as prevailed then.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUG ACT AMENDMENT

The house resumed from May 10 consideration in committee of Bill No. 4, to amend and consolidate the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act—Mr. King (Kootenay)—Mr. Marcil in the chair.

On section 6—Unlawful for physician, etc., to prescribe a drug except for medicinal purposes.

Mr. BENNETT: Am I correct in my understanding that as the matter now stands this bill represents the considered opinion of the committee, in some instances unanimous and in others with some differences of opinion, and that medical men constituted the committee as far as that was possible?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. When we were considering this bill the other evening I moved an amendment to section 6, which consisted of the addition of a subsection. This provision is applicable to other sections of the act, but as I explained at that time, previously we had no trouble under this section, since we were fortified by a judgment of the appeal court of Ontario that upon trial by indictment and conviction the minimum sentence was three months' imprisonment, and that the judge had no discretion but to impose this sentence. Quite recently, however, and since the bill came back from the special committee, an appeal court of another province has decided differently; that court held that under section 1035 of the Criminal Code it is within

the competence of the magistrate or judge to impose a fine and refrain from imposing imprisonment. After consultation with the Department of Justice it has been decided that this point should be cleared up, and they advised the amendment which I moved the last time we were in committee.

Mr. BENNETT: How will it read now?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amendment is as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the criminal code, or of any other statute or law, the court shall have no power to impose less than the minimum penalties herein prescribed.

That is the only amendment.

Section 6 as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

FISH INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT

The house in committee on Bill No. 25, to amend the Fish Inspection Act—Hon. Mr. Cardin—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section—Extension of application of act.

Mr. CARDIN: This bill provides for an amendment to the Fish Inspection Act in order to include fish-curing establishments, as was recommended by the Atlantic fisheries commission. The bill has been before the standing committee on marine and fisheries, which has approved it. Section 2 deals with the publication of the regulations in the prefix to the annual statutes. The Department of Justice has represented to us that the printing of these regulations in the statutes delays the publication of the statutes. In view of the fact that these regulations are printed in the Canada Gazette it has been decided not to have them published in the statutes.

Mr. ERNST: I do not desire to make any comments with reference to this particular bill, but I should like to take this opportunity of referring to a kindred bill, No. 26, which was before the committee a couple of times. There does not seem to be any disposition on the part of the officials of the department to have the provisions of that bill become effective. Could the minister give us some information in that regard?

[Mr. J. H. King.]

Mr. CARDIN: The hon. member is certainly mistaken as to the intention of the department. The government is absolutely serious in the bill which has been presented to the house and which is now before the standing committee on marine and fisheries.

Mr. ERNST: Apparently it is going to die there.

Mr. CARDIN: I understand that the committee has appointed a subcommittee to look into the evidence and recommendations of the Atlantic fisheries commission with a view to making a report to the whole committee. There has been no undue delay in the consideration of that bill as far as the government is concerned, and I can assure the hon. member that we are desirous of having that bill before the house as soon as possible, and before the session closes.

Mr. ERNST: That bill referred to the trawler question, and a subcommittee was appointed to look into the evidence taken before the royal commission. The minister must realize that to do this will require a period of some months—because the evidence was very voluminous, consisting of thousands and thousands of pages—and will make it impossible to present the bill to parliament during the present session.

Mr. CARDIN: I am sure that the subcommittee will not undertake to read every word in the evidence. They are familiar with the conditions and it will not be necessary for them to read the whole evidence in order to make a report.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION

LOAN OF $10,000,000 FOR TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 37, to provide for a further loan to the harbour commissioners of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 2—Loan of $10,000,000 to corporation for construction of terminal facilities.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the minister will state what this is intended to be used for.

Mr. CARDIN: It might be of importance to give a short statement of the expenditures that the harbour commission propose to make out of this appropriation of $10,000,000, if it is granted. The first item is $2,000,000, for the construction of three new berths for the unloading of grain and general cargoes in the harbour. Prior to the present the Tarte wharf was used for the unloading of tramp steamers, but since the development of the grain trade in the port of Montreal and the increase in the storage capacity of elevator No. 3, it has been found impossible to use the Tarte wharf for the purpose for which it was previously employed. It is proposed now to build three new berths at the Laurier wharf, and these three berths will be used in connection with the extended facilities at elevator No. 3. It is expected that the three new berths on this wharf will bring a return of about $80,000 and that on account of the increase in the grain traffic in that section of the harbour there will be an increase in revenue of about $50,000, so that the engineers and technical experts of the commission estimate that the return on this expenditure of $2,000,000 will be $130,000.

The second item provides for an expenditure of $2,000,000 for the reconstruction of two old wharves, King Edward and Alexandra, in the centre of the harbour. These wharves are used at present by the bigger vessels of 16,000 to 20,000 tons coming into the harbour of Montreal. These wharves were built thirty years ago, and the engineers of the harbour commission have been for several years representing to the commission that it is absolutely necessary to rebuild these old wooden structures.

Item No. 3 provides for an expenditure of $1,500,000 for the extension of the electrical system beyond the canal. The property of the harbour commission is divided by the Lachine canal and the electrical system of the section of the harbour east of the canal is operated by the Canadian National while the other, or main section of the harbour is operated by the electrical system of the harbour commission. Last year the harbour commission handled 150,000 revenue cars in the main section of the harbour and in the section of the harbour beyond the Lachine canal 50,000 revenue cars were handled by the Canadian National. It is a source of great inconvenience to have one section served by the electrical system of the harbour commission and the other by the Canadian National. The idea is to extend the electrical service of the main section of the harbour to the eastern section beyond the canal.

Mr. BENNETT: To electrify the whole thing?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes. The present condition has been a source of great inconvenience and loss of revenue. It is expected when the system is extended to that section of the harbour, the revenue from the railway traffic on the harbour will be about $200,000. I think there is a justification for that expenditure.

Item No. 4 is an extension to the grain conveyor system. It must be remembered that the grain handled in 1926 amounted to 136 000,000 bushels, and in 1928 it reached the important figure of 218,000,000 bushels. The construction of the addition to elevator No. 3 makes it necessary to develop the conveyor system in order to cope with the greater traffic in the harbour.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the amount to be spent on that?

Mr. CARDIN: The amount suggested is $1,000.000. Item No. 5 provides for an expenditure of $500,000 for industrial wharves. It has been found necessary for the commission to build additional wharves.

Mr. BENNETT: Are there any election wharves in that?

Mr. CARDIN: Not to my knowledge, and I can assure my hon. friend I do not rely on that.

Mr. BENNETT: He will not overlook that. These wharves are, I suppose, where freight is collected.

Mr. CARDIN: They are supposed to be. Several companies in Montreal are using certain sections of the harbour for their establishments. The commission have leased at the present time a certain area of the harbour to companies which are using these wharves for their industries. It has been found necessary, as I said, to build additional wharves in order to meet the daily requirements of industries in the city of Montreal. These wharves will be leased at a price that will take care of the capital expenditure and the interest on the money invested in building them.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend means the interest and sinking fund to take care of the capital?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes. The commissioners are not going to build these wharves unless they are sure of a revenue of 6 per cent.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that the rate now?

Mr. CARDIN: That is the rate now for all the industrial wharves which are leased by

industries in the city of Montreal. The revenue expected from that source will be $30,000 on an expenditure of $500,000.

Item No. 6 provides for an expenditure of $2,000,000, the object being to build new berthing facilities in the harbour of Montreal. It has been found that the port is in need of new development and new berthing facilities. Two alternative projects have been recommended to the commission by the engineers, either to make a new development in the upper section of the harbour, or to make a development in the lower section of the harbour, in what we call the Maisonneuve section.

Mr. BENNETT: What constituency would that be in?

Mr. CARDIN: That constituency is represented at the present time by Mr. Robitaille. Item No. 7 relates to the acquisition of lands as a result of a decision of the privy council. As the committee will remember, action was taken two years ago against the harbour commission of Montreal by a proprietor who contended that the commission had taken over part of his property without any compensation to him at all. The question came before the courts in this country, and later an appeal was taken to the privy council, and the privy council decided that the commissioners had no right to deprive the owner of his right of ingress and egress to the St. Lawrence. It has therefore become necessary for the commission to compensate these owners, and $1,000,000 is provided for this purpose.

Before taking my seat, I might add that the receipts from the harbour of Montreal have been increasing year by year. For the last year ending December 31, 1928, the total revenue of the harbour was $5,589,327.12. Other items are as follows:

The total operations	$2,810,052 08
Interest to government on loans advanced	2,023,448 94
Interest on over-draft at the bank	3,865 48
Sinking fund	477,100 06
Total	$5,314,466 56

This leaves a net balance of $274,860.62.

Mr. BENNETT: Are any allowances made for depreciation?

Mr. CARDIN: I think that is taken care of in the sinking fund.

Mr. BENNETT: No, not in the sinking fund.

Mr. CARDIN: No. The result of last year's operations in the harbour of Montreal has been very satisfactory. Business is going to continue to grow in the port of Montreal as the country prospers and as the importance of the harbour from a national point of view is realized. Under these circumstances I think I am justified in asking the committee and parliament to grant to the harbour commission the loan which this bill provides for.

Mr. BENNETT: What money has the minister on hand unexpended from previous advances?

Mr. CARDIN: About $2,000,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Then $10,000,000 will not be spent this year?

Mr. CARDIN: Oh no. The program covers at least three or four years.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the total amount now in the sinking fund?

Mr. CARDIN: It is $1,460,000.

Mr. GARDINER: In giving an outline of the expenditure the minister stated that the harbour commission would have to pay compensation for property rights by virtue of a judgment given by the privy council. Is this merely to pay this gentleman for taking the waterfront from him, and if so, what extent of waterfront are we expected to pay for?

Mr. CARDIN: The amount of $1,000,000 which we are providing in this bill is not the exact amount which will be required. We do not know the exact amount, but basing their judgment on the valuation which was made during the court proceedings the commissioners think that that amount will be sufficient to compensate the proprietors. At least one other proprietor is in the same position. Action was taken by one proprietor, but there are others; I am sure that there is at least one other property owner in the same position. If we pay to Mr. Tetreault the amount of money that he might claim as a result of the valuation made during the court proceedings, we shall have to pay the same amount to another proprietor who is in the same position. The commissioners believe that this amount of $1,000,000 will be sufficient to cover all the claims made by Mr. Tetreault and others who are in the same position.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand that it has been the practice of the board not to buy land back from the waterfront, but rather to sink cribs and make their own property by filling in. It appears to me quite a large item to pay $1,000,000 merely for waterfront

rights, which do not include any land. I presume the minister has under his hand details as to the extent of this waterfront, and I would like some information on that point.

Mr. CARDIN: I regret very much that I am not in a position to give my hon. friend that information, but it must be remembered that in the port of Montreal the land along the St. Lawrence river is of very great value, and it does not take a large extent of property to run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. To make the position a little clearer, I do not contend that this $1,000,000 will be required to pay merely for the shore part of the property. It may be found advantageous, instead of buying only a certain amount of property, to buy the property entirely which adjoins the works of the harbour commission. The commissioners in fixing this amount have contemplated the possibility of buying the whole property of Mr. Tetreault, for example, instead of buying only a small piece of his property along the shore. In that case it might be more advantageous for the harbour commissioners to buy the whole property for the development of the port. But I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I am not in a position to give my hon. friend the information he requires in regard to the length of the property.

Mr. GARDINER: Probably the minister can secure that information at some future time and give it to the house.

Mr. CARDIN: Certainly.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Interest on debentures during construction may be charged to capital account.

Mr. BENNETT: The reason I asked the minister as to whether or not this money is required this year is that, as I understand it, the debentures are issued from time to time as the government advances the money; but obviously if all the money is advanced at one time the board will be paying a larger amount of interest than it is receiving, and there will be a loss to the board. What is the method of payment of interest during construction?

Mr. CARDIN: I understand the interest is taken out of the advances made by the government.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—No loan until plans approved.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I notice that no loan is to be paid in respect of the construction of terminal facilities "unless such detailed plans, specifications and estimates have been submitted to and approved by the governor in council." Is a fair wage clause included in the specifications?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is it a clause approved by the Minister of Labour, such for instance, as that used by the Department of Public Works?

Mr. CARDIN: I understand the wages paid on all these contracts are approved by the Minister of Labour. In fact a case was brought to my attention a couple of years ago with respect to complaints in regard to wages, and I think the wages were fixed to the satisfaction of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is the minister sure? Would he consent to the clause being amended in this way?

That there shall be included in the said specifications a fair wage clause satisfactory to the Minister of Labour.

Mr. CARDIN: I hesitate to do that, although nobody is better disposed towards labour than I am. I should not like to establish a new fair wage clause in the place of one that has been so satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Will the minister assure the house that the fair wage clause is satisfactory to the Minister of Labour?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Sections 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR COMMISSION

LOAN OF $10,000,000 FOR TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 66, to provide for a further loan to the Vancouver harbour commissioners.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

Section 2—Loan of $10,000,000 to corporation for construction of terminal facilities

Mr. GARDINER: Explain.

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. Chairman, the expenditure which the harbour commissioners propose to make out of the loan of $10,000,000 will be:

1. For the redemption of the commissioners' matured mortgage notes issued for the balance of the purchase price of Hastings mill site and incidental expenses therewith—

Mr. BENNETT: How much?

Mr. CARDIN: That is $1,950,000.

2. Developments on site of the Hastings mill property:

(a) Wharf for vessels in coastal trade and grain jetty, for commissioners' operation, $350,000.

(b) Wharf for vessels in coastal trade, fish wharf and fish storage, also cold storage, for operation by lessees, $1,150,000.

(c) For development of a new ocean pier as warranted by increased business, $3,500,000.

Those sums make a total of $5,000,000 for item number 2.

3. Addition to grain handling facilities, as follows:

At elevator No. 1, to increase its capacity by approximately 3,000,000 bushels.

At elevator No. 2, to increase its capacity by approximately 2,000,000 bushels.

At elevator No. 3, to increase its capacity by approximately 2,500,000 bushels.

These additions to the grain handling facilities involve an expenditure of $3,000,000.

These two items represent a grand total of $9,950,000.

Last year the grain deliveries at Vancouver amounted to 97,250,548 bushels. To get an idea of the development and progress of the port of Vancouver we have only to remember what the deliveries were in 1924, only 4 years ago. For the year 1924 the figure was only 55,000,000 bushels. This gives an idea of the development of trade at Vancouver. The receipts last year amounted to $2,057,739.02 and the expenditures totalled only $1,682,-470.87. After taking care of operating expenses, interest due to the government, and sinking fund, a substantial balance was left in the hands of the commissioners. Another fact which indicates the development of trade there is that the number of deep sea ships coming into the harbour in 1927 totalled 1,100, whereas in 1928 there were 1,300, an increase of 200. I do not know that I can add anything else which is not known to practically all the members of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the total elevator capacity at Vancouver at the present time?

Mr. CARDIN: 5,325,000 bushels.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Mr. LUCAS: And what is the proposed capacity?

Mr. CARDIN: 7,500,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Does the item of expenditure which the minister has given, $1,-682,000 odd, include interest on the capital expenditure and also the sinking fund, or is it merely for the running expenses of the commission?

Mr. CARDIN: The figure I have, with the heading under which it appears, is: "Operating expenditure, including debenture interest to government, $1,680,000". I think the sinking fund is taken out of that amount.

Mr. GARDINER: You have not these items separately?

Mr. CARDIN: Not in the statement I have.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister also said it was proposed to construct cold storage for leasing purposes. Is there any possibility of leasing all that space on favourable terms?

Mr. CARDIN: The commissioners have assured us that they will get companies or individuals to rent the space.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister has no authentic information as to tentative arrangements?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. GARDINER: Some years ago an elevator was bought for the purpose of subleasing, and it was finally sub-leased—at any rate it was supposed to be sub-leased—to the Oriental Grain Company. I do not know whether the house has ever had an opportunity of discussing the final payment made to that company by reason of the fact that they did not secure the space for which they had contracted. The lease was broken. Can the minister give us any information regarding that transaction?

Mr. CARDIN: At the moment I cannot give any definite information, but I will undertake to afford the hon. member an opportunity to discuss the matter. I am ready to bring down all the details we have. This is a special case and I have not the figures before me at the moment, but I shall endeavour to submit them at some other time.

Mr. BLATCHFORD: I may say that two years ago this house insisted that the case be taken to the courts in British Columbia and there the company received a settlement for $133,000 odd.

Mr. GARDINER: I think the information given to the house by the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Blatchford) is startling. Fortunately for Vancouver and for Canada as a whole we have now a new board of commissioners at that port, and I trust from the experience we have had with the old board that the new commission in making leases will not get into a jackpot as their predecessors did. I cannot imagine that the people of Canada would appreciate the circumstances if they were aware of them. It appears to us in Alberta that this was more or less a political proposition and that political favourites got a nice rakeoff in consequence of this lease. I trust the minister in the future will pay closer attention to leases of this description.

Mr. BLATCHFORD: When that lease was granted to the British and Oriental Grain Company, the United Grain Growers and the Alberta Pacific Grain Company, who looked over the plant, refused pointblank to entertain a lease. It was considered a white elephant on the waterfront, and the harbour board at that time got in touch with a group of Alberta people who agreed to take the lease over. At a later date the United Grain Growers, after the lease had been cancelled to the British and Oriental Grain Company, took the plant over, and made twice as much profit in one year as the British and Oriental Grain Company had received by way of settlement.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend's argument would be feasible if he had told the committee that the company who made this large profit—I do not mean the Oriental Grain Company, but the other one—had actually done work and earned the money. The hon. gentleman says this was a white elephant. From what we have been told in regard to the amount it has cost the country to settle with the Oriental Grain Company it seems to me that instead of being a white elephant it was highly coloured with gold.

Mr. KELLNER: What question was submitted to the courts? Was it to find out whether the government owed the Oriental Grain Company money, or was it to determine the amount?

Mr. CARDIN: The question submitted to the courts was to ascertain the value of the claim.

Mr. GARDINER: Was the question submitted, in the first place, whether the government or the commission owed the company any money?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Quite sure of that?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4—No loans until plans approved.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I am glad the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) is in the house, because I should like him to assure us that a fair wage provision will be inserted before any monies are granted. We did not have any assurance in that regard in the other case. I should like also to have a copy of that fair wage clause if it is possible to obtain it. In my opinion, also, the enforcement of the fair wage clause should come within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour in order that we might have uniformity in connection with fair wage clauses. We have not unanimity in that respect at present. When difficulties arise in connection with labour we find one fair wage clause here and another somewhere else, and, as the Minister of Labour well knows, when a similar question arose on a previous occasion this session I had some trouble in getting certain fair wage clauses enforced. The fair wage clause in one department was not the same as that in another, and the fair wage clause in which I was interested, and which the Minister of Labour was trying to enforce, was made absolutely useless by just one provision which vitiated the whole thing. I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to assure the committee again that a fair wage clause satisfactory to the Minister of Labour will be inserted here and that a copy of that clause will be furnished me.

Mr. CARDIN: I will give that undertaking, certainly.

Section agreed to.

Sections 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSION

LOAN OF $2,000,000 FOR TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 67, to provide for a loan to the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Sir Eugene Fiset in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Loan of $2,000,000 to harbour commissioners for terminal facilities.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister explain?

Mr. CARDIN: For a number of years the works in the harbour of Three Rivers were taken care of by the Department of Public Works. The main wharves in that harbour were built by that department, and although a few years ago a harbour commission was created at this point certain works were later undertaken by the Department of Public Works, namely the construction of additional wharves. When the commissioners came to the government this year asking for an advance of money for the development of the harbour, it was decided that the money for the works which were started last year, and which will cost between $300,000 and $400,000, if my memory serves me aright, should be provided by such an advance rather than by the Department of Public Works.

The object of the expenditure is to provide first for a quay wall 688 feet long, a pier 500 feet long and approximately 320 feet wide, and an additional quay wall to the inner end of the pier and fronting on basin number one, 375 feet long. Then it is intended to construct another quay wall fronting basin number two 515 feet long, with a short section of quay wall at right angles to this, 135 feet long. There will be thus provided seven additional berths in that harbour, and this amount is necessary for the construction of those wharves, which provide open storage.

When I presented the resolution to the house, if I remember correctly the hon. member for Acadia asked how we contemplated securing the necessary revenue to meet the interest on that expenditure. My answer is that the new development in that harbour will naturally increase the facilities available and will result in a very material increase in the traffic handled. In fact, at present the commissioners are not able to meet all the requests for space on these wharves, and the companies doing business at Three Rivers and in that vicinity have been complaining because the vessels on which their merchandise is carried are delayed in the harbour. In particular, there will be a large increase in the amount of coal imported through this port. The Dominion Coal Company has given a guarantee that this year it will unload 200,000 tons of coal in the harbour of Three Rivers.

Let me repeat that it is impossible at present for the commissioners to meet the demands for space which are made upon them. This committee will realize, Mr. Chairman, that Three Rivers is a very important industrial city; its population now is over 35,000, and its industries are very numerous. When we were discussing the resolution someone suggested that the object of this advance was only to accommodate the paper mill at this point, but that is not the case. Other industries of importance are established in Three Rivers, and we must remember also that Three Rivers serves a very important territory so far as port facilities are concerned. I refer to Shawinigan Falls and the town of Grand'Mere, where there is a large development of water-power and where important industries are being established all the time. So I think the conditions justify the proposals of the harbour commissioners, and I think they are entitled to ask this assistance from parliament.

[Mr. Cardin.]

Mr. GARDINER: Is this the first loan to the new harbour commission?

Mr. CARDIN: This is the first loan to be made by the government.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the minister any information as to the revenues last year?

Mr. CARDIN: The revenue for the year 1928 was $74,142.71. In 1924, only four years ago, the revenue was $39,468.71.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the expenditure?

Mr. CARDIN: The expenditure for 1928 amounted to $34,910.10, leaving a surplus of $40,000.

Section agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4—No loans until plans approved.

Mr. ADSHEAD: When does the minister expect the specifications will be in his possession?

Mr. CARDIN: I understand that the plans and specifications are already in the department.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Then the minister will be able to give me a copy of the fair wage clause?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Sections 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CHICOUTIMI HARBOUR COMMISSION

LOAN OF $2,000,000 FOR TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 68, to provide for a further loan to the Chicoutimi harbour commissioners.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Sir Eugene Fiset in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister give us an explanation of this bill, stating particularly how much has been expended?

Mr. CARDIN: The object of this bill is to provide for an advance of $2,000,000 to the harbour commissioners. Two years ago an advance of $500,000 was made, and at the present time the commission has under construction a wharf extension which will cost $503,626. The present bill is to provide for a loan to make a further extension of 2,400 feet to the wharf, and the expenditure in that connection will amount to a little over $2,000,000. The receipts last year amounted to $18,587.63 and the expenditures to $5,497.13. The commission were able to use only the old section of the wharf; they did not have the use of the facilities which are being constructed.

Mr. BENNETT: What was the cost of management last year?

Mr. CARDIN: I have only the total expenditure, salaries, maintenance and sundry disbursements on revenue account, amounting to $5,497.13. It may be asked as to how the interest on this new expenditure will be obtained. The commission reports as follows as to the expected revenues:

Present wharf, one berth facilities..	$15,000
Coal, 225,000 tons..	25,000
Paper, 70,000 tons..	15,000
Sulphur, 20,000 tons..	5,000
Pulp, 200,000 tons..	25,000
Gasoline, 3,000,000 gals..	30,000
General freight..	20,000
Car shunting, lease of space, moorage fees, etc..	25,000

We must remember that Chicoutimi is the centre of a very large and important industrial activity due to the tremendous development of electrical power in that section. At present 700,000 horse-power is being developed and there is in process of development an additional 800,000 horse-power. During 1930, of the 800,000 horse-power, 250,000 will be developed. Chicoutimi, as is known by the members of the committee, is at the head of the Saguenay river and an aluminum company and other very important industries are located and are being located there as a result of the tremendous development of water-power in that section of Quebec.

Mr. BENNETT: Is there not another harbour they are using?

Mr. CARDIN: There is another harbour which is being used at present, and which is called the Baie de Ha-Ha.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the one.

Mr. CARDIN: When these proposed developments were being considered and when the harbour commission of Chicoutimi was created, the question was submitted to a very competent harbour expert, Mr. Swan.

Mr. BENNETT: Not Mr. Palmer.

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. Swan. He made a very extensive survey of all the territory and in his report he contends that the harbour of Baie de Ha-Ha is not as advantageous as that of Chicoutimi on account of the grade from the level of the water to the height of land. He said that the grade on which the trains would have to go from the level of the harbour to the site of the industrial centre would be very heavy and he contended that this would be an objection. Moreover, the port of Chicoutimi is open earlier in the year. The ice goes out of the harbour of Chicoutimi much sooner than it does out of the harbour of Baie de Ha-Ha. The latter being a bay, there is no current to carry out the ice. Therefore the advice of the expert confirms the belief of the commissioners that the harbour of Chicoutimi is by far the more advantageous of the two. Of course I understand there is a certain amount of dispute between the two localities, but from an engineering point of view there is no doubt that Chicoutimi is by far the better place, and it is also much nearer the centre of the industrial development which is taking place in that section.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister informed the committee that he expected a revenue of $160,000 per annum. He also gave the various items that go to make up the total. Can he inform us when he expects to reach that amount of revenue?

Mr. CARDIN: As soon as the facilities are provided, as soon as the wharves are built, the traffic will commence there because the industries are waiting for the development of these facilities to handle the larger amount of supplies they propose to handle.

Mr. GARDINER: Do I understand that these industries cannot develop until such time as the facilities are provided, or what are they doing with the business now?

Mr. CARDIN: They are handling the business as well as they can, but they are not at the present time importing into Chicoutimi the same amount of supplies that they will be in a position to import when the industries are completely established. These mills are in the course of completion, and the harbour commissioners want to be ready, when the mills are in operation, with the necessary facilities in the harbour.

Mr. GARDINER: I take it that the total expenditure, after this item is passed, will be $2,500,000?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. KELLNER: Has the government lent any money to the Ha-Ha harbour the minister was talking about?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

HALIFAX HARBOUR COMMISSION

LOAN OF $5,000,000 FOR TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 69, to provide for a further loan to the Halifax harbour commissioners.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 2—Loan of $5,000,000 to corporation for construction of terminal facilities.

Mr. CARDIN: In regard to this bill I am not in a position to give any extensive or detailed statements as far as the past year is concerned, because the harbour commissioners were put in possession of the facilities of the harbour only during the latter months of last year. An advance of $500,000 was authorized a few years ago for the harbour of Halifax, out of which there has so far been expended $31,095.65. The elevator up to recently was under the control of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the information we have from that department as to the grain shipped through it is as follows:

	Bushels
1927	1,047,670
1928	2,191,659

[Mr. Cardin.]

A summary of the proposed expenditure which has been submitted to me is as follows:

Miscellaneous, plant equipment	$ 85,000
Deep Water Terminals	
Proposed revetment wall	400,000
Pier No. 4, repairs	8,200
Pier No. 3, repairs	17,300
New Pier No. 2, miscellaneous repairs	62,000
Ocean Terminals	
Marginal Road pavement	80,000
Sheds 23, 24, 25 and 28, permanent foundations and floors	166,000
Pier No. "A", two transit sheds	440,000
Pier "B", construction together with 1 transit shed	3,741,500
1,000,000 bushel addition to the grain elevator	300,000
Land damages	100,000
Total	$5,400,000

Mr. GARDINER: Was there any revenue last year?

Mr. CARDIN: I have no statement as to that, but the revenue would amount to practically nothing, because, as I have said, the commissioners took over the property late last year.

Mr. GARDINER: The revenue from the elevator would come under the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: From the statement of the minister it appears that 1,000,000 bushel additional capacity is to be provided at a cost of $300,000. Does the commission feel that this will be justified? What is the present elevator capacity?

Mr. CARDIN: Speaking from memory, 2,000,000 bushels.

Mr. GARDINER: And you have just filled that elevator once, because the number of bushels passing through last year was 2,000,000. I would recommend that the minister look into that question, because an elevator can handle a great deal more grain in the year than its capacity, and additional capacity should not be built until there is greater volume. A few days ago I inquired whether the elevator had been leased. The minister's information was that he did not think so. Can the minister say now whether any bin room in that elevator has been leased to private parties?

Mr. CARDIN: We have nothing to indicate that the elevator has been leased to anyone.

Mr. GARDINER: Did the minister have the files of the Trade and Commerce department examined to see whether a previous lease had been given by that department?

Mr. CARDIN: No. All the information we have in my department indicates that the elevator is still under the control of the harbour commission. The commissioners, having taken possession of the property only last year, would certainly have advised the department if the elevator had been leased. Such a thing would not have been done without the consent and approval of the department.

Mr. GARDINER: I have received information that the bin room in the elevator had been leased to private parties for the purpose of mixing Canadian and American grain. If that is the case, naturally we would take very strong objection to it. May I suggest that the minister make further inquiries to see whether that is being done?

Mr. CARDIN: Certainly.

Mr. ILSLEY: I have received representations from my constituency concerning top wharfage at Halifax. This is being charged as a result of the establishment of the harbour commission.

Mr. BENNETT: We told you that last year.

Mr. ILSLEY: I would like to place a few facts before the minister for his consideration. The Halifax harbour commission was established, as hon. gentlemen know, as a result of one of the recommendations of the Duncan commission. Prior to the establishment of the commission the wharves at Halifax were owned by the Canadian National Railways. The item of freight in which I am particularly interested is apples coming from the Annapolis valley. Several million dollars worth of apples go through the port of Halifax every year. The charge for top wharfage on apples prior to the establishment of the commission was 4 cents a barrel. The harbour commission has established a rate of 1 cent a barrel, which so far as I can learn is probably the most moderate rate in Canada. But the shippers of the Annapolis valley were not called on to pay top wharfage charges. The Canadian National Railways shared in the transportation of the apples to a slight extent and they charged what they called a switching charge, part of which the shippers paid. The shippers still have to pay their proportion of the switching charge; but the wharves having been taken over by the Halifax harbour commission, a top wharfage charge is now imposed by the commission, which is just that much of an addition to what the shippers all along the Dominion Atlantic Railway have to pay. The charge, as I say, is moderate, and as the whole of Nova Scotia, I think I am safe in saying, was in favour of the establishment of the Halifax harbour commission—certainly I received many resolutions from boards of trade, asking that I support the establishment of the commission—I do not think any very reasonable exception can be taken to the charge. But it is thought that to the extent that it is imposed upon freight coming from points along the Canadian National Railways it should be absorbed by that system. If that situation arises—absorption of the top wharfage rate by the Canadian National Railways, which is quite proper—there should be a similar absorption by the other transportation system, or at least some arrangement should be made so there would be no discrimination between the shippers on the Canadian National system and the shippers on the Dominion Atlantic Railway, which is part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system. I bring these facts to the attention of the minister for his consideration. The matter is of some importance because the shippers of the Annapolis valley send a great deal of freight to foreign countries through the port of Halifax.

Mr. SHORT: The minister mentioned an expenditure of $100,000 for land damages. Has he any particulars as to whom those damages were paid?

Mr. CARDIN: I regret that I have not the details before me, but I will undertake to supply them to my hon. friend.

Mr. SHORT: I should like to bring to the attention of the minister the same matter that my friend from Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) has referred to. Prior to the establishment of the commission I understand there was no top wharfage charge, that it was absorbed either by the railways or by the steamship companies. The constituency which I have the honour to represent in that district ships upwards of 1,000,000 barrels of apples annually. Naturally the shippers protest most vigourously against this charge. I trust the minister will take the matter into consideration and see if some arrangement cannot be made whereby either the railway companies or the steamship companies will absorb this charge. It means quite a tax on the shippers. We were all in favour of the establishment of the harbour commission, but we were led to believe there would be no ad-

vance whatever in the charges. I am glad my hon. friend from Hants-Kings has brought the matter up, and certainly it should receive consideration by the minister.

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. Chairman, I feel sure the harbour commissioners will be most anxious to make the port of Halifax as popular as possible with shippers. They know the conditions of the province and I am confident they will do their utmost to meet any representation made to them by the shippers of Nova Scotia. If they are in need of any advice along the lines suggested by my hon. friends, I shall be quite willing to tender it.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: So far as I know, every public harbour which comes under the direction of harbour commissioners finances itself by certain charges imposed on all shippers. While I deeply sympathize with the shippers through the port of Halifax, I certainly see no reason to suppose that they should be treated in any way different from the shippers through other ports. I have always understood that the money we lend is to be expended by the harbour commissioners to provide improvements for facilitating the shipment of goods, and therefore it is to be expected that the shippers will have to meet a part of that cost. I should like to know whether the suggestion made by the two hon. members from the Annapolis valley is to be treated as an exception to the general rule.

Mr. CARDIN: I think the tariff of rates that the hon. gentlemen have been complaining of is prevailing generally in all the other harbours.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is my impression.

Mr. CARDIN: Although it is desirable that the charges be the same in all harbours, there is always room for certain exceptions according to the locality in which the port is situated. We have to take care of the special conditions surrounding a particular line of trade. But certainly it is expected the harbour commissioners will make their charges high enough to pay the interest on the money we are advancing to them. However, we always try to have the charges as low as possible.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am quite in agreement with the minister that the charges to cover the cost involved should be as low as possible. It has always been my impression that however those charges are absorbed, in the long run the shippers and the consumers of the goods on which such charges are levied must meet them. If they are absorbed by the transportation companies, they will certainly be included in the freight rates, and eventually they will be reflected back in the prices which the shippers will receive for their goods.

Mr. ILSLEY: My main point is that the shippers on the two transportation systems should be treated in the same way; there should be no difference.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT: I ventured last year to express the opinion that Halifax and St. John should be free ports, and it was suggested during the course of the debate that the words "free port" had been misunderstood by myself. If the minister has been following the observations of the trade commissioner at Hamburg, who recently has been making addresses throughout Canada, he will realize that this gentleman has advocated exactly what I then suggested to the house. I suggested that in our export business we were competing with the world by reason of the fact that the home market was by this government handed over to our foreign competitors, necessitating our seeking foreign markets for exports for which we should be able to find markets at home; and as we were driven to foreign markets we have to compete not only with the domestic markets in those foreign countries but, as well, with other competitors throughout the world. This being so, the question of charges—top wharfage and charges of that character in connection with export trade—becomes very important. This gentleman from Hamburg in, I believe, his address at Prince Rupert, pointed out the inevitable result and he further indicated the experience in Hamburg, where he is stationed, giving particulars of the whole matter. I shall not go into this to-night beyond observing that the recommendation of the Duncan report was that these harbours should be put under a commission. I had no doubt when I read that report, nor have I any doubt now about this: It was not intended that these ports should be regarded as commission ports in the sense in which we ordinarily use that term, implying self-sustaining undertakings, but that they should be considered to be national ports out of which, summer and winter, goods might be exported in order that the idea which was behind the confederation of the maritime provinces and the other parts of the Dominion should be carried out. That idea was that the export traffic of the country should find its way to the ports of the world through Halifax and St. John, during the winter at any

rate, although during the summer, as it was then pointed out, the harbours of Montreal and Quebec afford many facilities in that direction. The conditions to which the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) has alluded indicate clearly that what I anticipated has happened, namely, that the charges imposed for top wharfage have affected the movement of commodities, such as apples in the Annapolis valley, and commodities of that kind. Whether the traffic originates on the Canadian National Railways or on the Dominion Atlantic, or whether it originates at the port of St. John, the situation is one which, if it continues, cannot but be injurious to the ports and must bring about a condition which will prevent the accomplishment of the purpose intended in the expenditure of the monies in question; because these expenditures are made for these ports as national undertakings; they are ports through which it is intended that Canadian goods shall be shipped to the markets of the world. That is the position as I understand it, and I think the minister must approach the question in the light of the Duncan report from a different angle than he otherwise would. These are not ports of the character of those that are closed during a portion of the year.

Section agreed to.

Sections 3 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Title agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. GOTT: Before you do so, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that in the last seventy-five minutes we have voted money at the rate of a quarter of a million dollars per minute. Bill No. 66 provides for a loan to the harbour commission of Vancouver of $10,000,000; Bill No. 67 provides for a loan of $2,000,000 to the harbour commission of Three Rivers; Bill No. 68 provides for a loan of $2,000,000 in connection with Chicoutimi; and this bill, No. 69, makes provision for a loan to the Halifax commission of $5,000,000. This represents a total of $19,000,000. In 1914 plans were drafted for a breakwater at the town of Leamington in the riding of South Essex, which I have the honour to represent, and that proposal involved an expenditure of $300,000. But although continued representations have been made to this government no favourable consideration has ever been given to the harbour there. I wish to direct this to the attention of the minister so that possibly, in preparing his estimates next year, he may favourably consider a constituency whose colour has not been at all times Liberal.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What about Halifax?

Mr. GOTT: South Essex used to be Liberal. I may say that I have written to the deputy minister asking that minor repairs be also made to the wharf at Amherstburg and I trust that favourable consideration will be given this matter.

Mr. CARDIN: That is something that comes under the Public Works department, but I will undertake to bring the representations of my hon. friend to the knowledge of my colleague.

Mr. CANTLEY: I wish to refer briefly to the harbours of Halifax and St. John, and particularly Halifax, in relation to the report of the Duncan commission in its recommendations respecting these harbours. The report recommends that these ports be developed just as the railways and the canals in Canada were developed. Now we all know how the railways of Canada were developed and particularly how the canal system of this country was developed and is maintained. These undertakings were carried out at the cost of the Dominion as a whole and are to-day operated without any tolls whatever. Not only does that apply to our own traffic; it applies also to the traffic of our neighbours to the south of us. Now we in Nova Scotia are in this position: this country is giving to the people to the south of us facilities which enable them to bring in their coal and steel, using for their transport our canals free of all toll charges, to compete with the maritime provinces in Montreal and other cities of central Canada. To balance to some extent the disabilities under which we were labouring in this connection and in some other respects, the Duncan commission made this recommendation with reference to the maritime ports. It is no answer to the recommendations of that commission to say that the government have appointed a commission to regulate, to govern and to operate these harbours when they make no provision for so doing except through tolls levied on the traffic of these harbours. And that is exactly what has happened under the harbour commissions of St. John and Halifax. This was not what was intended or recommended by the Duncan commission, to whose report I have referred. So long as the present condition of affairs prevails we in the maritime provinces will continue to protest against a situation which is very far from that recommended by the Duncan commission. I wish again to call the attention of the minister and of the committee to these facts.

Mr. RALSTON: I want to say just a word in regard to this matter. My hon. friend and I do not agree, but since he feels it necessary to put his views on record, I feel that I should not allow the opportunity to pass without once more reminding this committee of the exact situation.

My hon. friend has referred to-night, as he did previously, to the terms of what is now known as the Duncan report. I only desire to direct the attention of the committee to the passages in that report which already have been referred to and which I say with all due respect do not bear out the contention of my hon. friend. The report states clearly that the recommendation is that there shall be statutory commissions appointed. As I had occasion to point out previously the gentlemen who made that report were not unskilled in the use of the English language; they were men with full ability to make their meaning plain, and from cover to cover of the report there is no suggestion that the statutory commissions which were recommended should be different in any degree from the statutory commissions already established at Vancouver, Quebec, Montreal and other places. So clear is this that in the report itself, following the recommendation, Sir Andrew Rae Duncan and his associates expressly refer to the fact that they had an opportunity for a private session with the Montreal harbour commission, and they go on to say:

> ...and, by hearing from them the steps they took to survey and stimulate production in their immediate territory as well as wider afield, we are confirmed in our view as to what harbour commissions (constituted of business and experienced persons) at Halifax and St. John could do in stimulating the trade of the maritime provinces.

Then they go on to reiterate their recommendation. Quite contrary to what my hon. friend has said, I am of the opinion that the suggested commissions were similar to those of which Sir Andrew Rae Duncan and his colleagues were fully aware, and if anything more were needed to substantiate that belief I find it in the case which was made before the Duncan commission, during which the gentleman who spoke for the city of Halifax advocated commissions similar to those already established in Montreal and Quebec. Let me just read a portion of the representations which were made. This gentleman said:

> Probably the quickest way to bring this to the attention of the commission would be to glance through the annual reports of the harbour commissions of Quebec, Montreal and Vancouver, and you will find in reading their reports that the minds of the commissioners are centred principally on the two things: Port development and solicitation of traffic; and inevitably they make a great deal of the improvement in the quantity of traffic moving through the port each year.

There was not a suggestion that fair tolls should not be charged in connection with the business but rather it was thought that the work of these commissions should be principally in improving business and soliciting traffic. Further, this gentleman said:

> We have no objection to their solicitation of traffic, and believe that they are acting wisely as trustees for that property, which belongs to the Dominion government; but we do claim, as I stated before, that a similar body should be constituted for the port of Halifax and not with any idea of taking traffic away from Montreal or any other port, but rather in the hope that it will at least offset the competition of these other ports which are being developed by the aid of government money.

I do not think there can be any question but that the ports were to be on the same basis, and the aid of government money means just exactly what we are doing to-night, namely the voting of a substantial loan to the harbour commission for the purpose of developing and improving the facilities of that port. No one has suggested that tolls are to be charged which will retard the development and use of these ports. Rather the reverse is the case; after all the Dominion government is advancing this money in order that these facilities may be improved and traffic developed, and tolls are to be charged as they are charged on the railways, namely the rates to be according to what the traffic will bear—

Mr. McGIBBON: "A Daniel come to judgment."

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know what that means; that is not my name. Perhaps the hon. gentleman refers to my hon. friend who preceded me. I only desire to point out that my hon. friend from Pictou referred to the railways and canals, and said Sir Andrew Rae Duncan also referred to them. He dealt with the canals; let me deal with the railways. The railways were developed through the advancing of large sums of money by the Dominion, but no one has suggested that the railways should not charge tolls. Money is being advanced in the same way to this harbour commission, and I think tolls are properly collected so long as they are not in excess of what the traffic will bear.

That brings me to the question of the free port, brought up by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. I do not think he intended to suggest that there should be no tolls paid

at all. Reference was made last year to the free port of Hamburg. It was pointed out that there is a certain area in which goods are not required to pay duty, but Hamburg charges tolls far in excess of those charged at the Atlantic ports of Halifax and St. John.

Mr. CANTLEY: No.

Mr. RALSTON: I dealt with that question last year, and I shall not delay the matter by going over it again to-night.

Mr. CANTLEY: I have been there, and I am thoroughly well aware of the conditions prevailing in the free port zone.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend from Pictou will agree that considerable advances have been made with respect to Halifax harbour even in the short time it has been under the administration of the harbour commission. There has been a concentration of effort in connection with the solicitation of traffic, in connection with the arrangements whereby certain large steamship companies are calling and in some cases turning there, in connection with a very substantial increase in the general cargo passing through that port, the figures for which I will not trouble the committee with to-night, and in connection with the movement of grain. All these things have come to pass within the last two years; I believe the harbour commission are entitled to a great deal of credit and I believe if this committee passes this loan the resulting substantial improvement in facilities will bring about a large increase in the production of traffic and will assist the development of the port as Sir Andrew Rae Duncan and his associates had in mind when they made the report to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am absolutely convinced—and I think I could prove to any unprejudiced group of people—that Sir Andrew Rae Duncan meant one thing, viz: that a harbour commission should be brought into being which, as he said, would develop the port. What did that mean? It meant the provision of adequate facilities for port development, and who was to pay for those facilities? They were to be paid for by the Dominion of Canada, just as the Dominion as a whole paid for the construction of our canal system, and these two maritime ports were to be operated as our canal system is operated, free of tolls or harbour dues. As a matter of fact Halifax was formerly practically free of all tolls on its public wharves, and its harbour facilities were maintained at the expense of the Dominion before the creation of this commission, but now, in order to meet the interest on the bonds issued by the commission, of necessity tolls must be and are applied, so to-day Halifax has to submit to a system of tolls which it did not have previously.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend will permit me—

Mr. CANTLEY: Not now; I did not interrupt the minister, but he is the champion interrupter of this house; that is his reputation, and it is not creditable to him.

I repeat, that is the situation, and my point is, always has been and will continue to be that what Sir Andrew Rae Duncan meant was that a commission should be appointed to administer this port. The minister refers to the fact that the Duncan commission interviewed the Montreal harbour commissioners. Of course they did; they did so in order to see how they had developed the harbour of Montreal, not in order to recommend a similar taxing commission for Halifax. In the mind of Sir Andrew Rae Duncan these were to be different commissions altogether; there is no doubt about that. The minister may argue as long as he pleases, but he cannot convince the people of Halifax, the people of Nova Scotia or the people of St. John, New Brunswick, that we have the type of harbour commission which was foreshadowed and intended by Sir Andrew Rae Duncan. That is my answer to the minister.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE YUKON TERRITORY

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 131, respecting the administration of justice in the Yukon territory.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): The explanatory note in connection with this bill says that because of the geographical location of the northern part of the Yukon territory it may be more convenient to carry on the trials of persons charged with indictable offences committed therein before a magistrate of the Northwest territories. The explanatory note refers to the northern part of the territory but the bill does not, and I would regret to see that principle applied to the whole of the Yukon territory.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is not the intention.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): That might not be the case with the present Minister of Justice, but I intend to suggest when the bill goes into committee that it be confined to the northern part of the territory. The administration of justice in the Yukon is swift enough, but it is not carried on as it is in the Northwest territories. Not so long ago we had an account of a trial of a criminal case in the northern part of the Northwest territories. A judge was sent up to try a murder charge and the Department of Justice took the precaution of sending a gallows with him. That may have been a very wise precaution but we do not move quite so swiftly in the Yukon.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the hangman?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I think they found a hangman up there. For these reasons I would like to have the operation of this bill confined to the northern part of the Yukon around the Arctic ocean, and not have it apply to that part of the country where the white people live.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will the hon. member suggest a wording which will meet his views in that regard?

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Sir Eugene Fiset in the chair.

On section 1—Power to order trial.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) suggests that the words "alleged to have been committed north of the sixty-fifth parallel of latitude" be added after the word "offence" in the seventh line. Would the hon. member tell me if that would include Herschel island?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): That would include Herschel island and Fort McPherson.

Mr. STEVENS: Herschel island is away north of that.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Herschel island is in the Northwest territories, and it would be more convenient to communicate with those centres of population than with the southerly parts of the Yukon. If you adopt that recommendation you would be excluding from the operation of the bill all that part of the Yukon which is inhabited by white people and where business is being carried on.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I should like to change the word "supposed" in the ninth line to "alleged." That would make the wording more legal in form.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): The hon. Minister of Justice suggests that the following words be added to the section, "and thereupon the court or judge so named shall have jurisdiction to try such person." The section as amended would read:

1. Whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the Minister of Justice that it is expedient to the ends of justice that the trial of any person heretofore or hereafter charged with an indictable offence alleged to have been committed north of the sixty-fifth parallel of latitude in the Yukon territory should be held in some district or place other than that in which the offence is alleged to have been committed or would otherwise be triable, the Minister of Justice may order that the trial shall be proceeded with in the Northwest territories before the court or judge named in such order, and thereupon the court or judge so named shall have jurisdiction to try such person.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 170, respecting juvenile delinquents.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Sir Eugene Fiset in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the minister will explain the circumstances under which this bill has been prepared. As I understand the matter, it has been very carefully gone over by a representative number of Canadians who are interested in questions respecting juvenile delinquents, and it has met with the unanimous approval of various organizations and experts in that particular line of endeavour. If that be so, the minister might make an explanation that would expedite the passing of this proposed legislation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The bill arises entirely out of recommendations made at a conference of the Canadian Council on Child Welfare, held in October last and attended by persons from all parts of Canada, representing the various agencies connected with the enforce-

ment of the Juvenile Delinquents Act throughout the Dominion. The conclusions of the conference were the subject of a report to the department, and this bill embodies the suggestions made by the conference after a full discussion by judges, men at the head of this organization and officials of the Department of Justice. It is the old act with certain changes and improvements, all made with a view to facilitating the working of the Juvenile Delinquents Act.

Section agreed to.

On Section 2—Definitions.

Mr. JACOBS: If this legislation is to be put into force, and each province is to have the right to change the age, will it not interfere greatly with the uniformity of the law? Why should one province declare that a juvenile delinquent may be eighteen years of age, while another declares that the age shall be sixteen?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no change as to that. That was the old act. A mistake was made in the revision of the statutes, and the change which appears to be made now is simply for the purpose of restoring in that respect what was in the old act. It has always been so.

Mr. JACOBS: That is to say, under the law as it is now each province may declare who is and who is not a juvenile delinquent according to age?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: This is the explanatory note in connection with section 2:

> Under the 1908 act the age is sixteen years. The two provisos are to enable the governor in council to provide by proclamation that the age may be raised to eighteen years in any particular province which desires it, and that such proclamation may have reference to boys or girls only, or to both.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Under the 1908 act the age is sixteen years. By chapter 37, section 1, of the statutes of 1921, that provision was repealed, and it was provided that "child" means a boy or girl apparently or actually under the age of eighteen years. But it was provided that the amendment should come into operation only in such province or provinces as the governor in council might from time to time by proclamation prescribe. The age is sixteen but, as my hon. friend says, it may be changed to eighteen when a province desires the change to be made.

Mr. JACOBS: Does this not seem anomalous?

Mr. BENNETT: Not in any sense to interrupt the explanation of the minister, I think the hon. member for Cartier will find the explanation in subsection (2) of section 3 of the act, which reads:

> Where a child is adjudged to have committed a delinquency he shall be dealt with, not as an offender, but as one in a condition of delinquency and therefore requiring help and guidance and proper supervision.

It was thought desirable by some of the provincial authorities to exercise help and guidance and proper supervision over some children who were older than sixteen years. Hence, sixteen being the standard, it is provided that by proclamation the governor in council may continue those provisions to children of the age of eighteen. That is, I think, the governing section of the whole of this legislation, namely, that a child is in a state of delinquency and is not an offender, but requires help and guidance and proper supervision.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As a matter of fact, only in British Columbia was such a proclamation made raising the age to eighteen. In all the rest of Canada it is sixteen.

Mr. JACOBS: That is to say, in British Columbia they have only as much intelligence at eighteen as in the other provinces they have at sixteen. I should like to hear from the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in regard to that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Paragraph (g) reads:

> "Juvenile delinquent" means any child who violates any provision of the criminal code or of any Dominion or provincial statute, or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality.

Is that not pretty broad?

Mr. BENNETT: It has always been that way.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Municipalities have many by-laws that are more or less trifling, and it is pretty hard to make a delinquent of a child who violates them. For example, there are by-laws that provide that you shall not scatter paper in the park or spit on the sidewalk. Surely you are not going to make a delinquent of a child who violates such by-laws as those.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Such a child would be treated with benevolence and care. If it were an ordinary provision in the criminal code, my hon. friend would certainly be right, but I would call his attention to the fact that the

old act contains the same provisions; the only change is the striking out of certain words, namely:

For which violation punishment by fine or imprisonment may be awarded.

The part which reads—

"Juvenile delinquent" means any child who violates any provision of the criminal code or of any Dominion or provincial statute, or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality.

—was in the old act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: "For which violation punishment by fine or imprisonment may be awarded."

Mr. LAPOINTE: Those are the words that are asked to be struck out. I would hesitate to change the bill, because it was carefully considered and discussed by those most qualified to deal with it.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does the minister mean then that imprisonment is abolished as regards a juvenile delinquent?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will see that in the subsequent provisions of the bill the ordinary imprisonment is abolished. But paragraph (g) is only a definition of what a juvenile delinquent is.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I should like to revert for a moment to paragraph (g) of section 2, which refers to a child who is liable to be committed under the ordinance of any municipality. Suppose a child is haled into court for riding a bicycle on a sidewalk, which is a very common practice; would that constitute delinquency under this statute?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As the leader of the opposition said a few moments ago in reply to my hon. friend from Cartier, I think that the other provisions of the bill will help to a full understanding of the meaning and intent of the act. For instance, under section 3, where a child is adjudged to have committed a delinquency, he is to be dealt with, not as an offender, but as one in a condition of delinquency and therefore requiring help and guidance and proper supervision. It is not for the purpose of punishment so much as for the purpose of helping the boy or the girl in question. The fact that violations of municipal by-laws are included among the offences which may constitute a child a delinquent is really not so serious because, after all, the purpose is simply to provide help and guidance and proper supervision.

Mr. JACOBS: And warning sometimes.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Saskatoon has asked a question that some of my friends here were asking a few moments ago, and I have had some little discussion with those interested. There is no change in the section from what it was before. The child who rode a bicycle on the sidewalk would not be charged as an offender, but merely as a delinquent if thought desirable. If it were not for the provisions of this act he would be charged as an offender. That is the real distinction, and the whole purpose of the bill is that instead of the punishment that would be meted out to an offender, help and guidance and proper supervision shall be given and the child treated as a delinquent, not as an offender.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is based on kindness rather than on anything else.

Mr. BENNETT: On kindness rather than on punishment.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Delinquency.

Mr. McGIBBON: May we have an explanation of this?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I really cannot make it clearer than the wording of the section itself. This is the collective wisdom of those who are dealing with these matters. Perhaps this section is not altogether necessary, but it is more for the purpose of explaining the principle upon which this whole legislation is based.

Mr. McGIBBON: I really think the minister ought to give us some better explanation than that. I have every sympathy with legislation of this kind, but it does seem to me that in all such acts the one object should be reformation, to reclaim those who have transgressed the laws of the country and put them in the way of making of themselves good and reputable citizens. Along with that it must be remembered that punishment is a means to an end, and I am rather afraid that much of the legislation we pass here has not that object in view, but rather that punishment is really punishment, instead of reform.

Mr. LAPOINTE: By the other provisions of the act sufficient punishment is provided, but as my hon. friend says, reformation is the principle underlying this bill. It is very likely that this section is not necessary, but it is harmless, and I believe it embodies a meritorious doctrine.

Mr. McGIBBON: Many such sections as these appear to be harmless when they are passed by the house, but when placed in the hands of the law officers of the country to administer they are found not to be harmless, but rather detrimental, in my opinion, to the growth and development of character.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It will perhaps surprise my hon. friend if I tell him that his objection was mine when this bill was submitted to me by the officers of the department. I also thought that this section, although finely worded, was not necessary, but they said that it was harmless and they would hesitate to advise that it be struck out because it was recommended by the child welfare organizations after very long and serious consideration.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would recommend to the minister that he have the courage of his convictions and strike it out.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am always willing to take the advice of others. On this bill I would prefer, perhaps to take the advice of the different bodies that met here last fall. Perhaps my hon. friend does not believe in them, but I do. There are many other matters on which I should be very glad to take the advice of my hon. friend.

Mr. McGIBBON: Does the minister say that he takes their advice against his own convictions?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Ah well, may be.

Section 3 agreed to.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6—Powers of judge of juvenile court.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is provision made in all places for a juvenile trial?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. ROSS: What about those districts in which great harm is done and where there is no juvenile court?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The act does not apply. It applies only in provinces where they ask that a proclamation be issued to apply the act, and in cities where a by-law is passed to that effect, and where it is proved that the necessary facilities for the enforcement of the act are available.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): But this act arranges for special trials in all cases?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister knows the great harm done by magistrates in country districts who impose sentences out of all proportion to the offences committed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know that. The idea is to extend the act as much as possible, but it does not apply where proper facilities are not provided.

Mr. McGIBBON: This would not apply in Ontario except to such cities as Toronto, Hamilton and London?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot say from memory all the places where it applies, but I know only last week we issued a proclamation applying it in the city of Oshawa.

Mr. McGIBBON: It would not apply in the rural districts?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Section agreed to.

Sections 7 and 8 agreed to.

On section 9—Exceptional procedure when offence is indictable.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Have any representations been made to the Minister of Justice as to the advisability of changing this section?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I know there have been complaints that too much responsibility is imposed upon juvenile courts. This section applies to indictable offences committed by juveniles who are apparently over the age of fourteen years. It is to be noted that discretion is given to the magistrate or to the juvenile court judge to order that the child be proceeded against by indictment. That is in the absolute discretion of the juvenile court. The section proceeds:

> —but such course shall in no case be followed unless the court is of the opinion that the good of the child and the interest of the community demand it.

So that the juvenile court has the exclusive jurisdiction as to whether it shall try the offender or whether there shall be an indictment. In practice it is found that the juvenile court judge is more or less inclined to be very lenient with children who appear before him or her—in some places of course we have women juvenile court judges. Very serious offences are committed by boys who are almost men, and it is the gravamen of the complaints I have heard that in many cases these boys are not punished as they should be owing to the system in vogue in juvenile courts. I suggest there is some-

thing worth considering in these complaints, and that there should be a change made in the section by adding these words:

—or on the application of the attorney general of the province where the offence is committed.

In such a case where the attorney general thought it advisable he would simply make application to the judge, and the judge would be bound to commit that child by way of indictment. The present practice does not work out very well, inasmuch as it is more or less an encouragement to the young hoodlums I am referring to to commit serious offences when they know they will not be adequately punished.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As my hon. friend will notice, this is not a new section. The principle upon which the act is based is that even when children break the law they are still children and should be treated as such rather than as adult offenders. I would hesitate to accept the change mentioned by my hon. friend to take away discretion from the judge of the juvenile court, who is well acquainted with the conditions of the community, and to give that discretion to the attorney general. It is evident that the latter could not devote the same personal attention and personal care to the conditions under which the offence may have been committed and in which the child finds himself as could the judge, or even the committee dealing with the question of children in that community. I believe the act has always worked well so far as this section is concerned, and that we should retain it.

Mr. BENNETT: I am rather inclined to believe that there is something in the observations made by the hon. member for New Westminster. My attention was directed to a case in which a juvenile court judge was always inclined to err on the side of sentimental regard for the delinquent, with the result that certain rather grave offences were treated with a very great lack of seriousness. Would any injury be done to this statute if it provided:

Where the act complained of is, under the provisions of the criminal code or otherwise, an indictable offence, and the accused child is apparently or actually over the age of fourteen years,—

Fourteen years being the age at which intent may be presumed.

—the court or the attorney general of the province in which such court is situate—

Being the words used in section 7,

—may, in its discretion, order the child to be proceeded against by indictment in the ordinary courts in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Code in that behalf; but such course shall in no case be followed unless the court or the attorney general is of the opinion that the good of the child and the interest of the community demand it.

There is no doubt that there must be a very sharp dividing line between the desire to bring about reform by kindly means and the regard for punishment. If an indictable offence has been committed—it must be indictable and the delinquent must be over fourteen years of age—there comes a time when it might well be that the sentiment of the presiding judge would lead to a course which would be injurious to the welfare of the country, and the attorney general, who after all has considerable responsibility under the criminal code, should be in a position to say, "It is quite clear that this is a case in which the ordinary course of justice should be followed, and the case heard as an ordinary charge against the provisions of the code". I do not think any injury can ensue from this, and it is just possible that an untrained legal mind might realize that after all there was the principal officer of the crown to whom an appeal might be made in that regard. It is worth considering. My hon. friend from New Westminster has mentioned the matter, and the minister no doubt sees that there might be a case where it would be desirable to take this view.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If our minds are centred on punishment probably my hon. friend is right; his view is no doubt sound if we are thinking of punishment rather than of reform and improvement. I think however that the judge of the juvenile court is better situated to know whether it is more in the interests of the child and even of society that a boy should not be sent to an ordinary prison. I really cannot see that it would be in any way advisable to change the law.

Mr. McGIBBON: I voice my personal opinion when I say that extreme penalties, especially prison sentences, should be our last resort. When you imprison people a stigma follows them to the grave; that stigma falls also upon the wife of a man as well as upon his children. To put a boy of fourteen or fifteen, or even sixteen or seventeen in a gaol for any offence without taking into consideration his education, his environment, his training or his parents is, I think, a very great mistake. We wish in this country to bring up respectable citizens, and I have always been opposed to gaol sentences except as extreme

penalties. The object of all punishment is reform, and especially is this true when you are dealing with children who have not had the advantage of proper home influence, training and environment and whose mistakes or crimes, if you will, are committed in ignorance. I am very much opposed to taking the authority away from the local body and placing it in the hands of the attorney general.

Section agreed to.

Sections 10 and 11 agreed to.

On section 12—Names not to be published or identity of child indicated.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does this include the publication of pictures? This has got to be a serious matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sure it does.

Mr. ADSHEAD: This section speaks of a delinquency committed by a child. Under section 2 "child" means any boy or girl under the age of sixteen years. Now in section 9 we are providing that any child over the age of fourteen may be proceeded against by indictment in the ordinary course. Surely that is not consistent; if he is under sixteen he is a child and should not be so dealt with.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Section 9 deals with cases in which the child may be proceeded against under the provisions of the criminal code, in the discretion of the judge.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Nevertheless he is still a child.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but in that case it is in the discretion of the judge.

Mr. JACOBS: Does not the hon. gentleman know that a child of fourteen can be hanged for murder?

Mr. ADSHEAD: You have defined "child" as a person under sixteen; surely you will not proceed against a child by indictment.

Mr. JACOBS: A child can commit an offence.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman has overlooked one fact. The criminal code provides that at the age of fourteen certain obligations rest upon every person, male or female, and section 9 of this act declares that the provisions of the criminal code may, if the judge so determines, become operative against that person if he or she is over fourteen. This act provides that up to the age of sixteen the child shall be regarded as a delinquent. There is no inconsistency; section 9 relates to the criminal code, which provides that every person, male or female, becomes responsible in the eyes of the law at the age of fourteen.

Section agreed to.

Sections 13 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

On section 16—Court may adjourn or postpone hearing.

Mr. JACOBS: Just as a matter of information I should like to ask the Minister of Justice why all these sections which are not changed are reenacted?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is a revision and consolidation of the act.

Section agreed to.

On section 17—Proceedings may be informal.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I may say that the convention made a recommendation which went much further than this; they recommended that we should provide that any warrant or process issued by the juvenile court should run through all parts of the Dominion. In the department we thought it better to retain the limitation contained in the criminal code and to require that a warrant be endorsed by a judge in the district in which the arrest is to be made. I think there can be no objection to this section in its present form.

Section agreed to.

On section 18—Seal not required.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The same rule applies under the criminal code.

Section agreed to.

Sections 19 and 20 agreed to.

On section 21—May be dealt with under provincial law.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is unchanged except for a merely formal amendment.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—Parent or guardian may be ordered to pay fine, damages or costs.

Mr. BENNETT: Under this provision it would be possible to impose a penalty upon

the parents of a child without their having an opportunity to be heard. I think this question should be carefully considered by the law officers of the crown.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I must confess that I was awaiting the reaction of the committee to this section. Personally I think it goes rather far, and if it were not for the fact that it was so strongly recommended by this convention I would hesitate to support it. I am quite willing to let this section stand.

Mr. BENNETT: The principle is all right.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but we are making the parents or guardians responsible and they may be compelled to pay.

Mr. BENNETT: Without having a chance to be heard.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think parliament usually goes quite so far, I am quite willing to let this section stand for further consideration, and we may be able to suggest changes which will make it less objectionable.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a provision in subsection 4 giving the parents a chance to be heard, but the relation between the two is not quite what it might be. If the minister would let it stand we would have an opportunity of looking it over and trying to make it satisfactory.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

GENEVA PROTOCOL

PROHIBITION OF POISONOUS GASES AND BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With the permission of the house I should like to table a copy of the protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare, signed at Geneva on June 17, 1925. I desire to move:

That 500 copies of the protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare, signed at Geneva on June 17, 1925, tabled this day, be printed forthwith; and that standing order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

It is the intention during the present session to ask the house to approve of this convention.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Bennett]

SOCKEYE SALMON FISHERIES TREATY

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to suggest to the Prime Minister that the papers and correspondence in connection with the sockeye salmon treaty be brought down before we discuss the treaty itself. There must be some correspondence and some instructions issued to our commissioners. I thought I had spoken about this matter previously but apparently I failed to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the correspondence has not already been brought down I will see that it is laid on the table as soon as possible.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, May 17, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Tenth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Parent.

Sixth report of the select standing committee on standing orders.—Mr. Morin (St. Hyacinthe).

PRIVATE BILLS

MARIAN ROSE HARRISON

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Anderson (High Park) moves, for Mr. Lawson, that Bill No. 255 an Act for the relief of Marian Rose Harrison be now read the third time.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, are you departing from our rule that the sponsor must be in his place?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member for High Park has been authorized to move the bill for the sponsor, but if exception is taken the bill cannot be proceeded with.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think we must hold to the rule except where the sponsor is absent through illness.

WILLIAM JOHN BRETT

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Heaps moves, seconded by Mr. Woodsworth, that Bill No. 257, an act for the relief of William John Brett be now read the first time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask that my name be withdrawn as seconder.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Heaps moves, seconded by Mr. Bird—

Mr. BIRD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to withdraw my name as seconder.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Heaps moves, seconded by Miss Macphail—

Miss MACPHAIL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to withdraw my name as seconder of this bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Heaps moves, seconded by Mr. Coote, that Bill No. 257, an act for the relief of William John Brett, be now read the first time. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to on division, and bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 256 for the relief of Dean William Moncrieff.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 261 for the relief of Mabel Graham.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 262 for the relief of Velma Stella Seadon.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 263, for the relief of Emma O'Grady.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 264, for the relief of Edna Marguerite Stroud Robinson.—Mr. Cahan.

Bill No. 266, for the relief of Joseph Richardson.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 269, for the relief of Angus John Archibald Blaine.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 270, for the relief of Thomas Horace Sillery.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 271, for the relief of George Melville Fulton.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 272, for the relief of Gladys Elizabeth Boyd.—Mr. Stinson.

Bill No. 274, for the relief of Annie Fraser Rice.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 275, for the relief of Clarence Spurgeon White.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 276, for the relief of Gertrude Georgeanna Anderson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 277, for the relief of Lloyd Edward Angel.—Mr. Ladner.

SOCKEYE SALMON FISHERIES TREATY

On the order, government notices of motions:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I rise, Mr. Speaker, not for the purpose of submitting the motion with reference to the sockeye salmon fisheries convention, of which notice appears on the order paper. Last night before adjournment my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) asked whether he might have the correspondence with reference to this convention. I may observe that the correspondence appears to be very largely of a confidential character, as is the case with respect to most correspondence pertaining to the negotiation of treaties; I see, however, no objection to placing the entire file at my hon. friend's disposal. If the leader of the opposition wishes to see it, I shall have pleasure in sending the file to his office, and he may look it over and place it at the disposal of hon. members on his side of the house.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the right hon. gentleman for his courtesy, but it was to permit some of our friends from British Columbia, who are greatly interested in the matter, to see the correspondence that I inquired. It was in their behalf rather than for myself that I asked the question in the first instance. If the Prime Minister would permit the correspondence to be inspected by our members from British Columbia, I think that would quite serve the purpose, provided he does not consider this in any sense a violation of any confidence that should be respected in the matter. Of course, I should not want to disregard any such confidence, but I should like my hon. friends to have an opportunity to see the correspondence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my hon. friend did not hear me add that he might place the correspondence at the disposal of his friends on the other side. It is confidential inasmuch as it is of an international character. We should like to proceed with the resolution on Monday and I hope my hon. friend will be ready to proceed then.

Mr. BENNETT: So far as I can see.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall I say "Stand"?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Motion stands.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SITTING ON VICTORIA DAY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Prime Minister propose to sit on May 24? Some of my friends have asked me to inquire.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The house has sat on May 24 in previous years and it is the intention to sit on that date this year.

BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS

CATTLE SLAUGHTERED IN FRASER VALLEY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. J. BARBER (Fraser Valley): I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) to the questions, passed on May 2 and 6, as orders for returns with respect to cattle slaughtered as reactors under the bovine tuberculosis test. I believe the information is all on the files in the department and I should be very glad if the minister would bring down the returns at an early date.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): I will look into the matter and see that the information is supplied as quickly as possible.

WESTERN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

READJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF THOSE DISMISSED AND REEMPLOYED

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General) moved the third reading of Bill No. 252, respecting certain employees of the postal or railway mail service of Canada.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The bill which is now before the house for its third reading is somewhat different in terms from the bill founded on the resolution which was first submitted for consideration by the Postmaster General. It offends a principle which we think should govern legislation of any character having to do with public servants who are reemployed in the service of the country after they have been dismissed from that service for good cause, or have left the service. This bill retroactively grants, in its terms, increases in pay to certain men on the basis of the employment which it is alleged they undertook when they reentered the service. I asked the Postmaster General to give the house some particulars with respect to the matter. It will be recalled that in 1919 this strike occurred. It will be further recalled that during the summer of 1919 the employees in question were dismissed from the service because they declined to avail themselves of the opportunites which were offered by the administration for reemployment. Having thus left the service by reason of failing to obey a lawful command of the state to go back to their work, they were dismissed by order in council. It was later thought that, having regard to all the circumstances, these men should be afforded an opportunity to be reemployed in the public service, and to that end the difficulty was waived with respect to their age and they were permitted to apply for reemployment through the Civil Service Commission; and having been reemployed they reentered the service as new employees. Their salary was fixed; the compensation they were to receive was a matter of contract between them and the state. That compensation was not as much as the compensation they enjoyed before they left the service and this measure seeks, whether successfully or not, to provide that these men shall now receive pay on another basis than that of the contract which they made with the state when they were reemployed. We cannot get away from that fact. The question is whether or not this house will give effect to that principle, and in order that it may realize just what is involved I am going to give some illustrations from the documents brought down by the Postmaster General in order to clear away any misunderstanding. For instance, a large number of these men did not go to work for five or six years after they had been dismissed; a large number did not seek reemployment, some until after six years, many until after five years, some after four and others after three years, while others did not reenter the service until nine years after they were dismissed from their positions.

Now I will give a few illustrations, without using the names. Here is a man who was first employed on March 16, 1908; at the time of the strike he had been eleven years in the postal service. He was not reemployed until November 2, 1925, six years after he had been dismissed. At the time of his reemployment the bonus had disappeared from the public service and he received an initial salary of $1,020. At the time of his dismissal he was in receipt of a salary of $1,419, but by meritorious service in May of this year he reached a salary of $1,440, or $21 more than the salary he was receiving when he was

dismissed from his employment. It is now suggested by the Postmaster General that this man who, when he was dismissed from the service, was employed as a letter carrier, and who was later employed as a mail porter, should receive compensation on the basis of the salary and bonus he was receiving when he was dismissed from the service. This is the fifth case on the list.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Surely my hon. friend misunderstands that table if it appears to indicate that payment is to be made for letter carrier service if the man is not employed as a letter carrier.

Mr. BENNETT: I am very grateful to the Prime Minister for making that observation, because it does remove at least one difficulty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That I think, is clear.

Mr. BENNETT: I am bound to say it is not alleged in that sense by those who are affected by this measure, and the reason I took this illustration was that the matter might be made perfectly clear before the bill is read the third time. Under the schedule provided by the Postmaster General it is stated that at the time this employee left the service through dismissal he was engaged as a letter carrier, and when he was later reemployed he went back as a mail porter. Now he is receiving $1,440, although at the time he left the service he was receiving $1,419, of which $480 was a bonus. When this man rejoined the service in 1925 he received a salary of $1,020, and the contention made outside of this house by those affected is that this employee is to receive his salary on the basis of the difference between what he was receiving at the time he was dismissed—

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Mr. BENNETT: I say that is the contention made outside this house by those affected; they contend that this man is to receive the difference between the amount he was receiving when he was dismissed and the amount he has received since going back to work.

Let me take another case which illustrates this wrong principle perhaps a little more clearly. This employee first joined the service in 1914; he had worked in the department five years when he was dismissed, and he did not go back to work until six years after the strike. When he was dismissed he was receiving, with bonus, a salary of $1,419, but on May 1 of this year his salary was $1,500. On both occasions he was employed as a letter carrier. Now, mark you, six years after he left the service he went back to work as a letter carrier, and when he was reemployed he received a salary of $1,200 although with the bonus, as I have said, he received $1,419 when he was dismissed. The contention is now made that he should receive additional compensation, although he was out of the service for six years before he went back to work as a letter carrier. The suggestion now is that he is to receive a salary not according to his employment but on the basis of what he would have received if he had not lost his job.

Mr. DUNNING: That is not in the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what they are contending it means, and the Postmaster General will say that that is their contention.

Mr. VENIOT: Who are contending that?

Mr. BENNETT: The letter carrier in this case.

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Mr. BENNETT: That man was a letter carrier when he was dismissed and he is a letter carrier now; his case is number six on the schedule. As I pointed out, six years after he was dismissed he went back to work under a new contract with the state, and the salary he received was $1,200 although when he left six years previously he had been receiving a salary of $1,419. Now, by meritorious service, his salary has increased to $1,500, and my submission is that no body of men in the world can determine how much of the recommendation for meritorious service was attributable to his antecedent knowledge of the business and how much to the improvement which he showed from the time he was reemployed up to May 1, 1929. Remember that this man is now receiving almost $100 more than he was getting when he left the service; he has been at work now only three years, after having been out of the service of the government for six years, and now the Dominion of Canada is proposing to give him additional money. I submit that that is wrong.

Now let us take another case in order that there may be no misapprehension. The next case is a little stronger still; it is the second last case on the first page of the list. This employee first entered the service in 1909, and therefore had ten years of service when he was dismissed; I find that he was not reemployed until March 22, 1928, nine years after his employment with the state was ser

ered. When he went back to work he was paid a salary of $1,020; when he left the employ of the state, according to the report furnished me, he received a salary of $1,300 and a bonus of $430, making a total of $1,730. On May 1, 1929, he was receiving only $1,140; he is now working as a postal helper, and when he left the service he was engaged as a primary sorter. He has been in the service now just over one year; he returned to work on March 22, 1928, and this is May 17, 1929. As I have said, he was reemployed at a salary of $1,020 and is now receiving $1,140, or $120 more than when he was reemployed some fifteen months ago. It is now asserted that he shall be paid on the basis of what he would have received as a postal helper had he continued his services without a break from the time he was first employed.

Let us go to the next case, the last one on the first sheet—I am not mentioning the names purposely. This man was reemployed in 1920, a year after the strike, at a salary and bonus amounting to $1,200. When he was dismissed from the service he was receiving $1,419. In both instances he had been working as a primary sorter. Look at what we are doing? That man made a definite contract with the state to work as a primary sorter a year after he was dismissed, the contract carrying a salary of $1,200 including bonus. When he left the year before he was receiving $1,419 and it is now contended that because he was employed as a primary sorter when he was dismissed and is employed as a primary sorter now that he shall be paid and compensated on the basis of $1,419 per year from the date of reemployment, although his contract calls for $1,200. In other words, the Dominion of Canada is to pay a man who makes a new contract, after he has struck in the public service and has been dismissed, $219 because he struck. That is the story.

Then we go to a case, which is found on the second page. This is a very striking case of a man who was employed in 1916, three years before the strike. He was dismissed after three years of service and did not go back to work until 1927, eight years after the strike. When he was reemployed he received $1,020; when he left the service he was receiving only $1,080 or $60 more than he received after being out of the service for eight years. He is now employed at a salary of $1,200 as a mail porter, and when he left the service he was employed as a letter carrier.

The next case is that of a man who was employed in 1918, about a year and a few months before he went on strike. He stayed out of the service four years, having come back on June 7, 1923. When he was reemployed he received $1,155 with bonus; when he was dismissed he was receiving $1,080. I want to show how this case works out. When he went back to work he received a larger sum of money than he was receiving when he left the service. He was receiving $1,620 on May 1st of this year, and in both instances he was employed as a subsorter.

Mr. VENIOT: What page is that?

Mr. BENNETT: The second page, the ninth from the top. The date of reemployment was June 7, 1923, four years after the strike. When reemployed he received $1,155 with the bonus; when he was dismissed his salary and bonus amounted to $1,080, and he is now receiving $1,620. He was employed as a subsorter at the time he left the service and was reemployed in that position. I put this to the house: How can you say that this man should have any adjustment of pay when he has been able so to conduct himself as to merit the appreciation of his employers to the extent of having his salary raised to $1,620?

Mr. VENIOT: He would not receive any readjustment.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the point I want to make. This man receives nothing, and the man who worked in the same job—the case I mentioned a few minutes ago—will receive $219.

Mr. VENIOT: This man was taken back after the strike as a subsorter, while the other case mentioned by the hon. leader of the opposition was that of a man who was taken back into a lower position but who did the work of a higher position; there is a difference between the two cases.

Mr. BENNETT: I am pointing out only what is shown on this sheet.

Mr. VENIOT: That is what it shows.

Mr. BENNETT: And these figures are given by the Postmaster General. I go to the next case, that of a man who was engaged as a subsorter and who was acting in the same capacity when he was dismissed. This man had been a little more than a year in the service and he went back to work in November, 1920, a year after the strike. At the time he was reemployed he received $1,260 with the bonus, but when he was dismissed he was receiving only $1,080. He is now receiving $1,800 and is still working as a subsorter.

Mr. VENIOT: He has reached the maximum of his class.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so, and he has done that through meritorious service. I put this to the house: Is it a sound principle to say that you are going to differentiate between the periods when meritorious service was rendered and go back to an antecedent period of time when a man received a certain amount of pay to determine what he is to receive in the light of what he should have received if he had not been so employed? That must be wrong, and the illustrations I have given prove it. That man would receive nothing under the readjustment; he would not even be considered according to the statement made by the Postmaster General.

The next case is that of a man first employed on March 18, 1912, seven years before the strike. He went back to work immediately after the strike, on November 10, 1919. He was reemployed at $1,202.50 including the bonus, but was receiving $1,206 when he was dismissed, and he is now receiving $1,740. When he was dismissed from the service he was employed as a subsorter and when he went back to work he was taken on as a mail transfer agent. In other words, he went back to work as a mail transfer agent at $4 per year less than he was receiving when he was dismissed. It is suggested that he is to be paid as a substorter from the time he started to work. I would like the right hon. the Prime Minister to make the matter clear, because the statement of the employees as to what they are to receive is entirely at variance with what has been stated in the house, and I am taking this opportunity to illustrate the inequalities in order that a concise statement may be made with respect to what is to be done. Only this morning I was asked about it, and certainly the construction placed upon this matter is entirely different from that which the right hon. the Prime Minister and the Postmaster General suggested is the correct construction of the document.

The third case, on the top of page 3, is a very striking one. This employee had only been at work for a little over two months, having started to work on May 7, 1919, and having struck in July, 1919. He was reemployed six years after, on April 28, 1925, at a salary of $1,020; when he was dismissed his salary was $1,080, because there had been readjustments of salary during that time. He is now receiving a salary of $1,200 per annum. At the time he struck the position was purely temporary because he had not been long enough employed to be on the permanent staff. The record shows that he went to work as a mail porter in 1925. What adjustment is possible in that case?

Let me pass to another case which illustrates the same principle. This employee went to work on the 2nd January, 1917, or a little more than two years before the strike. He went back to work on the first October, 1923, or about four years after the strike. When he went out on strike and was dismissed, his total salary and bonus amounted to $1,184.25. When he was reemployed his salary was $1,095 and it now amounts to $1,320. In both cases he was employed as a letter carrier. That is what this sheet shows. That is, he was employed as a letter carrier, as hon members will observe, four years after he was dismissed, and he is now receiving $1,320, on account of meritorious service based upon his ability as, I take it. At the time of his dismissal he was drawing $1,184.25, but when he went back to work he got only $1,095, and we are told there is to be a readjustment of that man's pay. This is plainly a case in which the Postmaster General says there is to be a readjustment. Can the country put itself behind such a principle? I leave it at that.

The next case is a very striking one, because this man was employed in June, 1914, five years before the strike, and he went back to work six years after the strike, namely, in 1925. The salary rate when he was reemployed was $1,020, there being no bonus. He has now risen to a salary of $1,500. At the time he left the service he was receiving $1,380. When he left the service he was enjoying the rank of a primary sorter; when he went back to work he got a position as a subsorter. In his case, according to the statements made in the house, there is to be a readjustment, I cannot tell on what basis.

I come now to the last case that I will mention, because it is not necessary to take up further time. On the 1st May, 1917, this employee entered the public service of Canada. Two years and a few months later he was dismissed. He stayed out of the public service for three years. When he was reemployed he received $1,095, including bonus. When he was dismissed he was receiving $1,184.25. He has now risen to a salary of $1,500 and in both cases before and after the strike he is classified as a letter carrier. Can you readjust his pay? If so, on what principle?

I will not take up further time in dealing with these cases. I took them just at random as I looked over the pages, some of them indicating men who went back to work shortly

after the strike, and some who did not go back to work for some years after the strike, one indeed, for as long as seven years afterwards. The contention is made that by reason of particular experience in certain work men were able to render greater service to the state than they otherwise would have been, in other words, they were found to be better employees of the Post Office Department than they otherwise would have been. I am going to read to the house a letter I received from one of the officials of the Amalgamated Civil Servants who was himself employed in the post office at Winnipeg and who gives this illustration to me for the purpose of showing that although a man might have been out of the service for a very considerable time, nevertheless his past experience was of importance. I use it to show just what the meaning of this proposal is. These are the exact words:

I joined the public service of Canada on the 4th of November, 1919.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What letter is this?

Mr. BENNETT: It is a letter written to me by one of the members of the Amalgamated Civil Service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend give his name?

Mr. BENNETT: It is hardly fair to give his name. He was writing to me, complaining about the position taken by me in this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is hardly fair to read the letter if the hon. member does not give the name.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not bound to disclose the name of the correspondent. I do not fancy he has any objection to my giving it, but I am not doing so at the moment. He goes on:

I had postal experience in England, terminating in 1911, when I came to Canada. As is usual with a young healthy immigrant, I turned my hand to anything, and worked at all sorts of civilian duties absolutely unconnected with post office work. I enlisted in 1914, stayed with it until 1919, so I had ample time in which to "forget".

The day after I entered the Winnipeg post office—

And hon. members will recollect that that was November 4, 1919.

—I took over walk 36, head office—as a letter carrier, and surprised my officer, Mr. R. F. Ross, by having my walk routed up without assistance for the second delivery. I did that route for two weeks without assistance, even on the Monday, when all walks are heavy.

As a reward, another man was taken off walk 33, head office, and I was given the walk for my own. From the date I took that walk, early in December 1919 until Christmas 1919 I trained three newcomers to the service, on walk 33 to see if they could do it, in order to give the supervisor the chance to use me as a "relief" man.

It was impossible to train a new man in so short a time, especially just before Christmas, so I retained the walk and now have a very good record as a carrier.

He is still a carrier.

I think my point is well taken and amply illustrated—that experience tells.

Let us see what we are doing. This young man receives his experience in England, not in Winnipeg. He did not strike sympathetically or otherwise. He joined the service of the state under a contract but because of his past experience that enabled him to do his work better than others, he was able to train others and his ambition being as it was, he found larger scope and wider opportunities because he desired to make progress. He now says that he has made that progress. The experience which he had in England was of assistance to him as a letter carrier. Had he struck, had he been reemployed, he would now come back and get some pay from the country because it was said that he had experience in Canada before he struck. But being a man whose experience was derived in another country and who is not making it the basis of a claim for more pay, we are now told that he has no part or parcel in this transaction. He does not claim it, I may say. He is supporting the claim of these men.

Mr. VENIOT: He supports their contention?

Mr. BENNETT: He is supporting his fellow workers; he is their representative and the minister evidently has the letter in front of him also, so there is no question he knows to whom I refer. Having regard to the fact that men antecedently to employment may have been employed in a particular walk of life which enables them to do better the work in which they are engaged, and having regard to the fact that their employer must every year make recommendations as to their meritorious service, which recommendations, as I have pointed out, have resulted in many of these men receiving higher pay now than they had when they left the service, and in some cases receiving their maximum, is it not an unsound principle to say that because of the circumstances under which they left the service, you are to go back to their antecedent employment in order to determine the compensation they will receive.

If that principle can be applied as this gentleman thinks it can—and he is speaking for the Amalgamated Civil Servants of the country—as the Postmaster General and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) say the bill means, and as the Prime Minister says it does not, we can only look at the terms of the bill itself and ask ourselves what it does mean. What does the bill say? It says that these employees who subsequently were reemployed and are now in the said postal or railway mail service shall be paid for services actually performed as from the date of their reemployment at the rates of remuneration paid to other employees for similar services. That is a letter carrier is to be paid a letter carrier's pay.

Mr. VENIOT: If he performs the work.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, that is what I am saying. A letter carrier is to be paid a letter carrier's pay. That is what he was before, and you cannot segregate the work that he did from the time of his reemployment against the experience that he has had in all these years and say that when he is promoted and receives additional pay it is referable only to the time of reemployment. It is referable to the whole experience he has had in life. It is so with everyone of us. I may have had experience in one particular line of work, and then have gone out of it, and come back to it. It is likely that the work will come back to me a little more readily because of my previous experience, and I am pushed up a little more quickly and reach the maximum of my class a little more rapidly than the other man. But we are now to say, that notwithstanding it was the experience that some one had somewhere else that enabled him to rise to the position he has reached without any assistance, he is not to share in any division of this money, although he has done this work, joining as a novice. Although he has had experience, he joins as a new employee, and he has now risen to the position where he is ranked as one of the very best of the employees, and yet he does not have anything to do with respect to this $100,000 that is to be distributed. That is the sum which the Postmaster General says is to be distributed, and on the letters that are now before us as to the position of these gentlemen, I am satisfied that with the bill construed as it would be construed by a court, it would be very difficult to see how any employee would get anything. I am only pointing out to the house what the men think they are getting and what the bill itself says, and I leave it at that.

I cannot for my part bring myself to believe that it is a sound principle in a country like this to declare that because men received certain compensation before they sympathetically struck and left their employment, thereby tying up the public service, when they were reemployed and made a new contract with the state, and were reemployed because the state realized that the conditions were such that if possible they should use these men's services—I cannot believe that it is a sound principle not to punish them for striking. The only punishment according to this list that may be said to have been given to many of these men—the loss of seniority, whatever that may mean, they say is lost, because you cannot change the clock, time does not stand still. All that they have lost if this bill becomes operative is their seniority. The effect of it will be that some of them—not all, but some of them—are already saying that they have vindicated their position and that the postmaster at Winnipeg is to go. That is the next thing. They say: We have got the government to do this and now we are going to drive the postmaster out; we have got it started now. Thereby they are saying to the world that in the great struggle for the supremacy of law and order in this country against the forces of revolution and rebellion, this parliament is going to put the imprimatur of its approval upon the latter and not upon the former. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) who is behind this move may think that it will bring great kudos to him from organized labour, but if my memory serves me well, in the long run it is the great labour forces in this country who are best served by the maintenance of law and order, and they look in the end to fair and even justice for the preservation of their rights, justice and fair play and fair treatment under every consideration. I am not unmindful of the effort that has been made in some quarters to induce me, for instance, to realize that those who supported this bill will be approved and those who did not will not be. I will not give my assistance to the forces of anarchy and the forces that brought disruption to the postal service of Canada, and I tell that to the Minister of Labour of this country. I tell him that he is doing no service to his own organizations when he does this, for the Postmaster General is but the medium through which the Minister of Labour expresses his opinion with respect to these matters.

I had hoped, very greatly hoped, that the retroactive features of this measure would be discarded, that we would not endeavour to adjust these matters as we are doing, but

apparently the government thinks otherwise. The government thinks that it is going to bring some measure of peace and harmony out of discord and trouble by saying: We now recognize the principle that those who without notice left the service of the state, depriving the public of their opportunity for getting their mail, who disrupted a great public service, and who did that under circumstances to which we shall not now refer, should be rewarded and compensated for what they then did. If that be so, a precedent has been established which will have a far-reaching effect, and when you cloak it behind the hollow pretence of saying that men are going to be compensated for the work they do, that is cant and hypocrisy so far as the public is concerned, because every man who is employed to do a job and is seeking with ambition to advance his future and make a better place for himself in the world does not watch the clock and see how little he can do, but does the best that is in him by reason of the experience that he has had. Just as this man coming to this country in 1911 and working at various times after the war finally went into the postal service in 1919 and was able in the light of his past knowledge to rise more rapidly and be of greater use to the public service and get in the end a higher classification and more pay than the man who joined the service as a novice, so these men in the light of the knowledge which they had knew when they reentered the service what they were doing; they made their contract with the state, and the state now says that it was not a contract such as they should have made, and the state is now going to make a new contract for them. I can only say that that principle I oppose. This bill is undoubtedly a modification of the first proposals. What it means I think it is difficult to say. It is not clearly stated. It is to be left to certain gentlemen to work out in the future, but when it is said that it involves $100,000, it can only do that if the principles which the Postmaster General and the Minister of Labour have from time to time told these men would be applied, are applied.

Mr. VENIOT: I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. I never told these men anything of the kind.

Mr. BENNETT: Then he told the house.

Mr. VENIOT: I never told the house either.

Mr. BENNETT: Did not the minister say the amount was $100,000?

Mr. VENIOT: Yes.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BENNETT: Well, then, what are you talking about?

Mr. VENIOT: My hon. friend said that I told these men certain principles would be applied. I never told these men of any principle that would be applied except that a workman was worthy of his hire, and I laid that principle down in this house every time I spoke.

Mr. BENNETT: The day before yesterday, according to Hansard, the minister said that the amount involved would be $100,000, and not $125,000. It is the old story, the hon. gentleman never will make a frank statement with respect to anything if he can avoid it. He told this house last year the amount was $125,000, and it was in the supplementary estimates. It is not there this year. He now tells this house that it is $100,000. He told the house that the other day when he was passing his resolution and his bill. What does he mean by saying now that he did not say any such thing?

Mr. VENIOT: I never said that I did not say that. I said that I did not state to the men that the principle the hon. gentleman is now laying down is the principle I was to follow, but that the principle was that every man was worthy of his hire.

Mr. BENNETT: How can you know that you are paying every man the worth of his hire unless you supervise every contract in this country? Is the Minister of Labour going to revise the contracts of the men who went to Hudson bay and worked ten hours a day although the fair wage scale saye eight hours? Is he going to revise the contracts of the men who went to Hudson bay and worked fourteen hours a day when the fair wage scale says eight hours? Is the Minister of Labour going to say that for every hour over eight hours that they worked they shall be paid overtime? Is he going to revise these contracts or not? These were contracts that the state made with the workmen. Is the bargain that a man makes a contract or not? Is it some other bargain? Is some other consideration going to prevail? Is somebody else going to make the contract? The Minister of Finance is paid $10,000 a year. It is a little inadequate. Are you going to enter into a new contract with him and make it retroactive; is that what is to be done? What about the deputy ministers whose salaries are to be increased; are you going to make the increase retroactive? They have been doing the same work all these years that they are doing now. Are you going to do it with every branch of the public service? Shall the Dominion of Canada make new contracts and say "The labourer is worthy of

his hire"? Is that the sort of talk that you get as the answer to the question whether or not we shall make a new contract. And who is going to determine it? The men themselves? When men without duress, without fraud, without undue influence enter into a contract with an employer, that contract binds; it binds in every other walk of life; but it remains for this government to say that that contract thus made is not a contract that governs between the employer and the employee because some six, some seven, some eight years ago, the employee had experience in the particular job in which he now finds himself. That is the retroactive principle this house is asked to endorse. It is against that retroactive principle that I place myself, it is against the recognition of the right of this government to make such a contract. A contract between the state and the individual is as solemn as a contract between two individuals. And the men who will suffer most are the men who might find themselves opposed to the power of the state—as they well might be at some future time—when the state might claim the right to break its contract with impunity. It is easy for the state to break a contract in order to reduce wages as it is to break a contract to increase them. If a contract is broken and you reduce the pay you have changed an important condition, just as you do when you break a contract to increase the pay. The two cases are similar. There will come to this house year after year numberless cases in which it will be said, "Having interfered with the postal workers' contract you must make a new contract for us." And some day we may say, "We will make a new contract and reduce the compensation." This is what will be said about the sanctity of a contract. Then we shall hear the hollow cry of "The labourer is worthy of his hire." Those who make their contract, as I say, without undue influence, without fraud, men over twenty-one years of age, ought to appreciate the bargain they make. Having made it, but for promises by the Minister of Labour they would have observed their contract and lived up to it gladly and willingly.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot bring myself to support the third reading of a measure conceived as it is upon a principle which, if adopted, destroys the sanctity of contracts, is injurious to the state, places a premium upon those who endeavour at moments of crisis to dislocate the public service, and, if carried to its logical end, destroys the very state itself.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the opposition is, I think, quite right in endeavouring to see that before this bill passes its third reading there should be left no possibility of misunderstanding as to what it means not only to hon. members in this house, but to those who may feel themselves entitled to some consideration under its provisions. With respect to his desire to have the meaning of the bill made perfectly clear, I have no exception to take. I would take very strong exception, however, to my hon. friend seeking to misrepresent in any way either the motive or the purpose of the Postmaster General or the Minister of Labour in so far as their association with the measure is concerned.

I will give to the house what the government understands to be the full force, meaning and effect of this bill, and if in any particular I am expressing a view which is other than that entertained by the Postmaster General or by the Minister of Labour, each of whom is in his seat at the moment, I hope he will correct me at once, because so far as the government is concerned there is no doubt in our minds as to what this measure contemplates, and there is one opinion only entertained by the cabinet with respect to its intention.

In a word, the bill means exactly what it says. I will read the section, omitting the few words that refer to certain orders in council. It is that:

> the former employees of the postal or railway mail service of Canada who were removed from such service—

Then I skip a few words.

> —and who were subsequently reemployed and are now in the said postal or railway mail service, shall be paid for services actually performed as from the date of their reemployment at the rates of remuneration paid to other employees for similar services.

That language is, I think, as plain as the English language can be. I do not believe it is possible to express in words a meaning more clearly than that expressed in this clause which in fact is the whole bill. It says that the employees are to be paid for services actually performed. My hon. friend has taken a table of statistics which has been supplied by the Postmaster General, and has placed his own interpretation upon their meaning. My hon. friend must have meant what he said as to the statistics leading to certain deductions which in fact he drew, but I am bound to say that so far as I can see no deductions of any kind whatever appear on the statement which is before my hon. friend

What is recorded throughout is a mere statement of fact. There are no deductions or conditions set forth. I may be allowed to read the headings of the various matters referred to in the table:

Name of employee; year of birth; date of first employment; date of reemployment; salary rate when reemployed; salary bonus and total; salary rate when dismissed; salary bonus and total; salary May 1929; occupation at time of strike; occupation when reemployed.

These are the headings that appear on the table, and beneath them are given the facts or statistics that appropriately relate to the several headings. There are no deductions. My hon. friend has drawn his own inferences, and I confess that its seems to me he must have had in mind as he was doing so the resolution as it originally appeared on the order paper and his own interpretation thereof.

Mr. BENNETT: May I ask my right hon. friend a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: He will observe on page one there are six within the first ten that were L.C.—letter carriers—when the strike came on and who were reemployed as letter carriers. The salary they received was not as great when they went back to work as that which they had received before they were dismissed. What is to be done under this bill with respect to those cases?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will answer my hon. friend in a statement which will be applicable to all cases. Perhaps I may simplfy the matter by saying that insofar as this bill is concerned no account need be taken of the salary a man was receiving when he went out, no account need be taken of the date of his reemployment, no account need be taken of anything other than the actual work at which he has been engaged since his reemployment.

Mr. BENNETT: I am very greatly obliged to the right hon. gentleman. That clarifies it very much.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the whole position. Now, may I go a step further? With respect to the salary that he receives when he is reemployed, as hon. gentlemen know, the Civil Service Commission attaches a certain rate of remuneration to each of certain classes of employment. That rate of remuneration is known and it is supposed to apply to all who are employed in a particular class. Had there been no strike, all who were engaged in performing a particular class of duties would have been receiving an amount of remuneration equivalent to that assignable to that particular class. There are some men who came back into the postal service at Winnipeg under the terms of the order in council which permitted them to reenter. They were put into certain classes of work, but were put into these classes not at the rate of remuneration which these classes properly command but at a rate which was lower than that for which the service at which they were engaged should have been remunerated. This bill provides that where such was the case men shall be paid for the work they actually performed at the rates of pay attaching to the work of the class on which they were engaged. If, for example, a man was a letter carrier and was doing letter carrier's work, but was paid as a postal helper at a much lower rate, he would be entitled to the difference between the postal helper's rate and the letter carrier's rate for the time during which he had been doing letter carrier's work; nothing more. The same with respect to all other classes of employees. Now I ask hon. gentlemen: Is not that obviously the fair thing to do?

There is no necessity of confusing the present measure with any question that relates itself back to the reemployment of these men. If there was an error in their reemployment it is an error for which the present administration at all events is not responsible. We are not trying to saddle responsibility upon anyone with respect to the reemployment of these men. We say that the principle involved in their reemployment, whether right or wrong, was settled by the government in office in 1920. We are not even taking exception to the manner in which they settled the matter. But the fact is that they settled it without reference to any act or authority; they settled it in total disregard of the Civil Service Act. Hon. gentlemen have been saying a good deal about the attention that should be paid to the Civil Service Act. Well, the act was there, and if they had followed its provisions we should not now be discussing this matter. But they ignored the act altogether. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) thought they had proceeded under authority of the War Measures Act, but I find on going into the matter that they ignored that act also. In other words, they followed no act; they proceeded without authority, and arbitrarily under order in council, to reemploy the men.

Mr. BENNETT: I was careful to say that I did not know.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; my hon. friend did say that he did not know. But I wish to make it clear that, having looked into

the matter, I find the facts as I state them. Be that as it may, however, we are all prepared, I hope, to concede that at that particular time many things may have occurred which we trust will never occur again. But what we do say is that the question of reemployment. the right or the wrong of it, was settled at that time; and that, therefore, is not the principle which is to be settled at this moment.

Let us come now to what this particular measure seeks to do. It seeks to proceed in accordance with another principle, namely, that the state in hiring labour should pay for services rendered in certain positions the rates of wages which those positions command, either in accordance with the current rate or in keeping with what may be fixed by the Civil Service Commission or by some other recognized authority. In all government employment there is a certain basis on which labour is paid, having regard to the amount and the quality of the work performed. In this particular matter there is no dispute regarding what certain classes of work of a particular quality command. It is known that a postal helper receives so much a day; that a sorter receives so much a day; that a letter carrier receives so much a day. And so on. Records are kept of the work of employees from day to day, and it is known whether men have worked as letter carriers or sorters or helpers. It is possible therefore to ascertain exactly the difference between what any man was paid and what he should have received had he not been penalized in the matter of his wages.

This bill seeks to remove, as respects actual service performed, a sense of injustice not only in the minds of the men immediately affected but in the minds of labour generally; because as the matter now stands the government of the country is in the position of seeking to depress standard rates of wages, and hon. gentlemen know that if labour is concerned about one thing above another it is the maintenance of certain standards in the matter of hours, wages and conditions of employment. We say there is no dispute as to the standard which should prevail with respect to wages, hours and conditions of employment in this particular post office at Winnipeg, and we believe that the state, as a model employer, should see to it that the men who have been reemployed and have done certain work should be given the full payment due them for the services they have performed. I trust that this explanation is clear. I do not think it leaves doubt in the mind of anyone, and I think this house would do itself a fuller measure of justice if it unanimously accepted the principle of the payment of wages for actual work performed to those who have been so engaged especially where the men who have been reemployed have been reemployed by the state itself.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the Prime Minister permit a question? In the light of the explanation he has just made, why has not the government for the last seven years paid employees wages for services rendered—a principle very clearly explained by the right hon. gentleman?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope the government has done so. There may be some laws—the Civil Service Act for example—which operate in the matter. That act gives to the Civil Service Commission the power of fixing certain rates and the government complies with that particular law. Each case must be met on its own merits. So far as I am concerned I stand strongly for the principle that employees, whether engaged by the government or by private industry, shall be paid for services actually rendered.

Mr. STEVENS: The Prime Minister does not catch my question. I have not time to read the list, but I venture to say that a substantial percentage of the men have been reemployed during that period—I am not referring now to the period which the Prime Minister rather condemned, namely, under the previous government, but in the last seven years. This practice which the Prime Minister has just strongly condemned has been observed all along. Why has not the government taken steps until this late date to invoke the principle which he has advocated to-day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe the leader of the opposition said a moment ago that an effort was made last year and the year before, but apparently the excitement which the introduction of the measure provoked prevented our getting as far along with it as we have succeeded in doing this year with the present bill. The reason these men have been paid a lower rate for so many years is that the order in council which permitted their reemployment necessitated their reentering the service at a low rate. Had they been placed at and continued in the employment which commanded that low rate no exception could be taken at all to what was done. But what happened was this: The men who were qualified to act as sorters and letter carriers were obliged, under the order in council of reemployment, to enter as postal helpers and to receive the pay of postal helpers, although they were not given postal helpers' work to do. Many of them were put

into the class of sorters or letter carriers or other of the higher classes and were paid lower rates of wages than sorters, letter carriers and the other classes command. That is where undoubtedly the mistake has occurred, with consequent confusion. If these men had entered the class of employment at which by the order in council they were supposed to start—postal helpers—and had worked up step by step, always receiving the full payment for the class of work on which they were employed, then certainly there could be nothing due them to-day. But where a man entered at a postal helper's rate of pay and worked as a sorter or as a letter carrier, we say that an injustice was done—an injustice which this bill seeks to remove.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder whether I am trespassing too much on the right hon. gentleman's patience in asking a single question. On the list supplied by the Postmaster General there are the names of thirty-seven men who are alleged to have been employed as letter carriers at the time of the strike and who were reemployed as such. I thought the right hon. gentleman said that what they were receiving at the time of the strike, before they were reemployed, was not to enter into the matter. What I was anxious to know, was—because it will clarify the whole situation—whether or not there would be any change with respect to those employees who went back to the same work in which they were engaged at the time of the strike.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certain men were letter carriers when they went on strike and when they came back they were put into the class of letter carriers. When they were put back into that class they were not paid letter carriers' wages; had they been paid those wages nothing would be due them to-day. This bill provides that when men were put back as letter carriers, although they were engaged as postal helpers, and were given the wages of postal helpers notwithstanding that they did the work of letter carriers, they should receive the difference between what they actually earned as letter carriers and what they were actually paid as postal helpers.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would like to ask the Prime Minister one or two questions. Where men are employed in the civil service who for some considerable time have done the work of a certain position without receiving the salary attached to that position, and when they do obtain such position will the government adopt it as their policy that these men shall be paid for the services previously rendered? For example, in our penitentiaries a man is appointed as guard; for some considerable time, perhaps for a year, he fills a higher position before he is actually promoted to it. Will the government pay for such services as a matter of policy?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think every case should be examined and considered on its own merits. Perhaps that will answer my hon. friend's first question.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Then my second question is this: These men who are to receive higher salaries for a year or two back will pay a certain amount into the superanuation fund, so they will obtain a higher rate of superannuation. Is that the case?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should think the superannuation would relate to the class of work they have been doing and the payment received for that work. The Postmaster General tells me that superannuation was not affected by the strike.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I do not think the answer given by the Prime Minister is satisfactory; it does not really answer the question. I have come here repeatedly on behalf of men who went back to work during the war and who were getting a certain amount of pension, but these men have been consistently refused consideration for their services. They have been ignored, although they did not go on strike; they gave good, faithful service, but their applications have been refused by the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I can only say that any case of apparent injustice should be considered on its merits.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed on division.

EXCISE ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) (for Mr. Robb) moved the third reading of Bill No. 279, to amend the Excise Act.

Mr. STEVENS: I rise to a point of order, and I do so because I wish to raise the point in connection with another practice which has arisen. Can this third reading be moved in the absence of the Minister of Finance?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was simply trying to save time.

Mr. STEVENS: May I ask under what rule any member of the house is denied the privilege of proposing a private bill for another member?

Mr. SPEAKER: A private bill is in a different position; there is a difference between a government order and a private bill.

Mr. STEVENS: I know there is a difference, but I would like to have the clerk furnish us with the rule. I will not delay the house to press the point at the moment, but I would like that rule cited.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not like my hon. friend to think me guilty of a discourtesy. As hon. members know, we are desirous of making progress in these matters.

Mr. STEVENS: I am entirely in accord with this practice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Minister of Finance is in his office; I have asked him to come to the house.

Mr. STEVENS: Go ahead; I entirely disagree with the other practice, that is all.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister), for Mr. Robb, moved the third reading of Bill No. 212, to amend the Customs Tariff.

Mr. L. S. R. MORIN (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville): I desire to move in amendment to the motion for third reading:

That Bill No. 212, an act to amend the Customs Tariff, be not read a third time but be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to amend item 460 F by adding thereto after the words "trough belt conveyors" the words "of a class or kind not made in Canada."

My reason for proposing this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is that the belt manufacturers of Canada will be placed in a very difficult position if some action of this kind is not taken. In their competition with British and United States manufacturers they are handicapped by the fact that while their raw material is imported free they must pay on it higher transportation charges than they pay on the finished product, because the raw material is more bulky.

Mr. BENNETT: The raw material carries a lower freight rate.

Mr. MORIN (St. Hyacinthe): But since it is more bulky the transportation charges are higher. Moreover, the manufacturers are handicapped by the action of this house in imposing a duty of fifty cents per ton on all their coal and a duty of 27½ per cent on their machinery when it is of a kind made in Canada, or 10 per cent when it is of a kind not made in Canada. Under these circumstances the Canadian manufacturer is not in a position to meet the competition of the British manufacturer who is not affected by these duties, and as a matter of fact the Canadian industry is hardly able to meet the competition of the American industry even under a duty of 12½ per cent.

Let us suppose the American and the Canadian manufacturers were placed on the same footing; we could reasonably assume that they would divide the Canadian trade, and therefore 50 per cent of our consumption of this article would be furnished by American manufacturers to the detriment of Canadian labour. It seems to me that these are conditions which should not be approved by this house and which should not be the policy of the government; at a time when the balance of trade is so much in favour of the United States I think we should not continue to increase our purchases in that country and decrease the production in Canada, particularly when it is very clear that the Canadian consumer will not derive any benefit.

I think if we add to item 460 F a provision that the reduction in duty will apply only to trough belt conveyors not made in Canada the requirements of our industry will be satisfied and it will be for the general advantage of our country.

Mr. BENNETT: Might I ask whether the general effect would be an increase or a decrease in revenue?

Mr. MORIN (St. Hyacinthe): It all depends on whether these articles are presently imported from the United States. If they are not imported now there is no revenue; if they are imported of course it will increase the revenue.

Mr. T. E. KAISER (Ontario): I am very much surprised that any member of this house should once more seek to introduce into the tariff of Canada the most dangerous phrase ever invented. The clause says that articles shall come into Canada free which are "of a class and kind not manufactured in Canada." I have been endeavouring to ascertain from the Department of Finance who it was that invented this clause; I have been trying to ascertain when it was first introduced into a budget. It is an amazing thing to find this clause no less than nine times in the present budget. I object to the clause because it is a dangerous one. The province of Ontario has recently passed a bill permitting municipalities in that province—

Mr. MORRISSEY: What about the other provinces in Canada?

Mr. KAISER: The province of Ontario does not pass laws for any other province. This bill will permit municipalities to issue debentures to defray the cost of laying out sections of their cities or towns for industrial purposes. The city of Oshawa, where I come from, is a highly industralized community and we are asking authority to lay out a portion of the city for industrial purposes. What form of industry can we induce to come to the province of Ontario? Naturally we look into our imports to see just what articles are consumed in Canada, but when we look at the budget we find that articles which are not made in Canada are permitted to come in free. What encouragement is that for the industrial development of our province? The clause appears nine times in the present budget and I look upon it as a blight. I cannot imagine anything more injurious to the future of Canada than the continual injection of that clause into the industrial budgets of Canada, a clause which says that anything which is not made in Canada shall be allowed to come in free. The people of Canada want to manufacture as much as possible in Canada and not have it continually said that when an article is not made here it may come in free.

We are endeavouring to manufacture every part of the automobile in Canada, and we are asking firms to invest money in building factories in order that certain parts may be manufactured here. Then this clause without modification is injected which says that those articles which are not made in Canada shall be permitted to come in free. How can we ever build the entire article in Canada when this clause is continually being thrust into the budgets?

I would like to find out who invented this clause and when it was first used in the budgets of Canada—I hope the time will come when in its unqualified form it will be eliminated from the budget altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member (Mr. Morin, St. Hyacinthe) in moving the amendment is out of order. Beauchesne, paragraph 553, states:

> When it appeared from the debate that an amendment proposed to a resolution reported from the committee of ways and means would increase the charge, the Speaker ruled the amendment out of order.

And 551 is as follows:

> It is a fundamental principle that no resolution or amendment to increase a charge upon the people can be moved with the Speaker in the chair; it must be initiated in committee by a minister acting on behalf of the crown.

[Mr. Kaiser.]

The hon. gentleman has stated that the effect of his amendment might increase the rates, and under those conditions I am obliged to rule his amendment out of order.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I fail to see how the moving of this amendment is out of order. I think a statement should be made by someone in authority, and I would be quite satisfied to take the opinion of the Minister of Finance. I am frankly in accord with the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Morin), and if I might be permitted to proceed I could state very shortly my reason for taking that position. I think we should have something which is authoritative.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the best authority is the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. MORIN (St. Hyacinthe): I do not believe that my amendment would increase taxation because it would leave the articles mentioned in this section under the tariff which is actually in force. We are dealing with a bill which will reduce taxation but the bill is not law as yet, and the purpose of my amendment is only to maintain the actual legislation or the actual duty which is at present imposed on this class of goods; therefore, it does not increase the taxation.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, I abide by your ruling. If the argument of the hon. member is correct that it does not increase taxation, then there is no necessity for his amendment.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

WAR REPARATIONS

AUTHORITY TO PLACE $2,500,000 TO CREDIT OF CUSTODIAN FOR PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

The house resumed from February 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Rinfret that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

> That the Minister of Finance be authorized to place to the credit of the custodian, out of the reparation money paid into the treasury for losses sustained during the late war, a sum not exceeding $2,500,000 and that provision be made as to the method and scale of payments.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the minister in charge of this bill has suggested a certain amendment which he would like me to move to the resolution. The government is inclined to believe that there is a misunderstanding on the part of some who have opposed the resolution in its present form. The resolution contains the words "not exceeding" and these words seem to have suggested to

the minds of some hon. members that if the resolution were adopted in its present form it would not be possible at a later stage, if it were thought advisable so to do, for the government to consider any payments beyond that amount. That was not the intention of the resolution as it was drafted. I have spoken to the clerk, who advises me that the words "not exceeding" are not essential and that the substitution of the word "of" having regard to the provisions of the bill would be perfectly proper. If the house would give its consent to that substitution, I would move in amendment to the resolution:

That in the third line of the resolution the words "not exceeding" be struck out and the word "of" be substituted therefor:

The resolution would then read:

That the Minister of Finance be authorized to place to the credit of the custodian, out of the reparation money paid into the treasury for losses sustained during the late war, a sum of $2,500,000 and that provision be made as to the method and scale of payments.

If the resolution passes in that form, the minister will be in a position, when we are discussing the resolution in committee and, later on, the bill, to indicate to the house the view of the government with respect to making certain immediate payments. The question whether further payments should be made will necessarily depend in no little measure on the discussion that may take place when the resolution is in committee or when the bill is before the house, but the minister himself has been precluded from indicating to the house up to the present time the particulars of the bill, because, having spoken once on the resolution, he is prevented from speaking again, and the debate seemed to turn on the question of the words "not exceeding", as though in some particular the government had intended finally to restrict all payments to that amount.

Mr. SPEAKER: This amendment cannot be put at the present moment, but it can be made when the resolution gets into committee Standing order 50 reads:

A motion to refer a bill, resolution or any question to the committees of the whole, or any standing or special committee shall preclude all amendment of the main question.

In a few moments when the resolution is in committee, the amendment may be moved.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Before the resolution goes into committee, I should like, in order to enable the minister to deal with it properly in committee, to ask why we have been so long in using money that came to the treasury of Canada to pay the claims of people justly entitled to payment. The word "reparations" means just what it says, and the reparation that is sought is to have the money that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) has been keeping in the treasury of this country for the purpose of swelling his surpluses, used for the object for which it was paid. Germany paid the money to make reparation for injuries done to the civil population. The money which has thus far been received amounts to $21,000,000 and it has gone into the consolidated revenue fund of Canada. There is therefore ample money to pay all the claims that have been made, assuming that they are just and proper. Without any consideration other than an order in council, the government appointed successive commissioners to deal with this matter, and they have determined that certain of the civil population making claims, are entitled to receive the money. The commissioner, namely, Commissioner Friel, has provided that 5 per cent should be paid upon that money from a given date with respect to most of the claims. The date that he has fixed for the interest to run from is the date of the conclusion made as to the treaty of Versailles. That is with respect to personal losses only: property and other losses stand in a different category.

There are some people who are actually suffering because they have not received this money. They have lost everything, and I have never yet been able to understand why the government holds that money in the treasury to swell, as I say, the surpluses of the country, using it for public purposes instead of paying it to the people for whom it was intended. It is idle to say that there is no trust. I know there was not a trust in the ordinary sense of the term, but the government received this money to be distributed among the people who were entitled to it. When the minister amends his resolution, I hope he will not only provide for the claims that will exhaust the $2,500,000 but deal with people who have claims of any kind. Last year it was suggested that some claims would have to be referred to the courts. That may be so, but in the meantime that has not been done, and if they have just claims, all of us who have business experience know that it is desirable that such claims should be paid promptly. Some of these people are poor. I recall receiving a letter from a poor woman who said that she had been solicited by many people to put her claim into their hands and who asked me if I could do anything in the matter. I said that I would refer to it in the house. It is only a small claim of about $900, but it means a great deal to her. I suggest that we

should utilize the money for the purpose of paying all the smaller claims in full; that if there be business claims about which there is no criticism, they should be paid, and that if there be doubt as to the soundness of the conclusions arrived at by the commissioner, such claims should be dealt with by the proper authority, for instance a judge of the exchequer court, so that there may be no delay in the matter. I hope the minister, when the resolution gets into committee, will amend it so as to deal with all the cases to which I have referred.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) a little while ago asked for a ruling about the moving of private or public bills. If he will refer to May, thirteenth edition, at pages 255 and 226 he will find the following:

A member of the government may act in behalf of a colleague in all cases including the proposal of new clauses on the report stage of a bill; but, with this exception, or in the case of an unopposed return, or of a motion for leave of absence, no motion can be moved save by the member in whose name the notice stands.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee on the resolution, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg to move:

That the resolution be amended by striking out in the third line the words "not exceeding" and substituting the word "of" therefor.

Mr. RINFRET: I dealt with this matter at some length last year when it was discussed on a motion for supply and an amendment thereto moved by an hon. member on the other side, and I do not intend to cover the whole field again, unless in reply to questions that may be put to me by hon. gentlemen. But for the proper understanding of the present resolution, some essentials should be brought out again and coordinated. I believe they all centre on two different points: first, the character of the reparation money paid to Canada by Germany through Great Britain, and, second, the nature of the claims put before, and the awards recommended by the commissioners; that is to say: money and claims. What is this money that we have now in the consolidated fund, and that may be used for this purpose, and what is the nature of the claims and the awards made by the commissioners? The claims we are dealing with originated under certain articles of the treaty of Versailles which have been read a number of times in the house but from which I should like to read again at least essential extracts. Article 231 says:

The allied and associated governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the allied and associated governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies.

Article 232 is in these terms:

The allied and associated governments recognize that the resources of Germany are not adequate, after taking into account permanent diminutions of such resources which will result from other provisions of the present treaty, to make complete reparation for all such loss and damage.

The allied and associated governments, however, require, and Germany undertakes, that she will make compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the allied and assoicated powers and to their property during the period of the belligerency of each as an allied or associated power against Germany by such aggression by land, by sea and from the air, and in general all damage as defined in Annex 1 hereto.

Then annex 1 sets out some ten categories as applicable to article 232.

Now what is the meaning of these two articles? In the first place article 231 clearly establishes that the responsibility for all damages and losses caused to every allied nation is acknowledged by Germany, not only the damage done to the civilian population, but the whole damage of the war generally. That is the meaning of article 231.

But in article 232 it is admitted by the allies that Germany cannot compensate the allies for the whole losses of the war, but Germany accepts the responsibility of compensating for the losses caused to the civilian population, as a basis for general compensation.

That is the meaning of these two essential articles of the treaty of Versailles, and that is the interpretation that was placed upon them by the British government itself when this matter was discussed in the British parliament. That is very important.

I wish first to dispel the impression that has gone abroad, an impression, in fact, that was evident in the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition a moment ago, that this reparation money is intended purely and solely to meet the losses of the civilian population. It is not so, and we do not admit that. The treaty says very clearly that Germany admits responsibility for all the losses of the war, but that inasmuch as Germany cannot meet all these losses, Germany on the one part and the allies on the other part accept as a basis of settlement the civilian losses. That is the interpretation that is to be placed upon the treaty of Versailles, as I tried to explain last year when we discussed this question in the house.

But this interpretation, even if it were disputed, is not so material after all, because that basis set out in the treaty has been abandoned in further conferences between the allies and Germany and has been replaced by another basis altogether. It was represented that if civilian losses alone were taken into consideration some countries would receive a much larger amount than others which had suffered from another class of losses which were much greater than their proportion of civilian losses. And therefore it was agreed that instead of taking these articles as a practical basis for settlement a fixed amount would be adopted for Germany to pay to the allies, and that fixed amount was to be distributed. The allies reached an agreement upon one point. The reparation payment it was agreed should be distributed to them, not on the basis of the civilian losses, but on the following fixed basis:

	Per cent
British Empire	22
France	52
Italy	10
Japan	·75
Belgium	8
Portugal	·75

As regards the balance it was agreed that: 6·5 per cent shall be reserved for Greece, Roumania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene state, and for the other powers entitled to reparation which are not signatories to this agreement.

Canada by agreement with the representatives of the British Empire was to receive a proportion of the 22 per cent allotted to the British Empire on the following basis, along with the other dominions:

	Per cent
Great Britain	86·85
Minor colonies	·80
Canada	4·35
Australia	4·35
New Zealand	1·75
South Africa	·60
Newfoundland	·10
India	1·20

This is clearly acknowledged in the first place by Commissioner Friel himself, who says at page 16 of his report, paragraph 4:

> The first intention had been apparently to assist in arriving at Canada's share of the British claim to be presented to Germany under the treaty of Versailles. The claims were never used for this purpose because the amount to be paid by Germany to Great Britain in which Canada would share was fixed otherwise.

That is the very same interpretation that was given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, speaking in the British House of Commons on May 4, 1920. I desire to read what he says because it bears on the whole question and it gives at least a very authoritative explanation of the whole matter, as my hon. friends will see. It will be found at page 1874 of the English Parliamentary Debates of May 4, 1920:

> His Majesty's government are engaged in preparing, for submission to the reparation commission, schedules of claims which they are entitled to put forward against the German government under the various categories specified in annex 1 to the reparation chapter of the treaty of peace. The reparation commission will in due course decide whether and to what extent the claims submitted are admissible. They are required to notify to the German government, on or before 1st May, 1921, the amount of damage for which Germany is liable, and to draw up a schedule of payments prescribing the time and manner for securing and discharging the entire obligation within thirty years.
>
> The British government may not, therefore, know for some time the amount at which their claim in respect of damage done to individuals is admitted. In any case payment may be expected to be spread over a considerable period.
>
> His Majesty's government have given careful consideration to the position of individuals in respect of whose losses reparation will be claimed by His Majesty's government. It must be understood that the claims to be made are claims by the British government in respect of a wrong done to the state, and not claims by individuals in respect of private wrongs, and that the government do not act as the agents of any individual to put forward his personal claim. Any payments that may be received from Germany are therefore the property of the nation, and no individual will have any claim in law for any sum which the British government may receive from Germany in respect of reparation.
>
> But His Majesty's government recognize that in particular cases, while there can be no legal claim a private individual may have a strong moral claim for compensation for sufferings and damage for which it will be the desire of parliament to make provision. They propose, therefore, to set aside a sum of £5,000,000 out of the first receipts on account of reparation which are allocated to the exchequer of the United Kingdom, as distinct from the British empire. . . . to be used as a fund out of which payments can be made to individuals as an act of grace on the part of His Majesty's government.

I think this document, Mr. Speaker, is very clear.

Mr. ERNST: If the minister will permit a question, is the course of action which has been followed by the government of this country subsequent to 1920 consistent, in his opinion, with adherence to the principles enunciated by Sir Austen Chamberlain?

Mr. RINFRET: I shall come to that. I was trying in the first place to explain the character of the payments made to Canada through Great Britain. Then I will come to the nature of the Canadian claims and the way in which they have been received and treated in this country. I am glad to see from

the question of my hon. friend that he agrees with Mr. Austen Chamberlain that the money —and he puts it very clearly—is intended to compensate the wrong done to the state, not to pay individual claims; that there is no legal claim, but there is a moral claim that might be recognized. The British government did acknowledge and recognize that moral claim, and set aside a certain amount—not to compensate the whole of the claims that had been made, but to pay them to a certain extent and on a certain scale. My hon. friend shakes his head. In the papers before me is very clearly indicated the way in which the British government has met those claims.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister permit me? Did not this parliament three years ago formally and finally recognize the principle of compensating private parties? Why go into an academic argument as to whether it is an act of grace? We have admitted all that.

Mr. RINFRET: I am delighted to hear it. We can start from that point and very likely reach the decision that we are all anxious to reach.

Mr. STEVENS: Let us pay the claims. That is all we are after.

Mr. RINFRET: Let it be understood then that we are not disputing any further that this money is the property of the state, that we acknowledge only a moral claim on the part of the claimants. And perhaps we can go further and regard the action of the British parliament as an example of what should be done in Canada.

Mr. ERNST: Oh no.

Mr. RINFRET: I am now coming to the story of what happened in Canada, and I hope I may be as convincing as I have been regarding the character of the money. Let us see what was done in 1918. On November 15 of that year the Borden government passed an order in council appointing the Under-secretary of State, Mr. Thomas Mulvey, as an officer to take such steps as might be necessary to make a list of the Canadian claims and submit them in proper order. Advertisements were circulated inviting claimants to send in their claims and setting forth the machinery for dealing with the matter.

I may point out that when the advertisement was circulated the Canadian government of that day made it very clear that although these claims would be received, at the same time the government would not guarantee that they would ever be paid. I admit that at the time it was intended to submit the claims, not to a commissioner in Canada, but to a mixed commission that would sit in London and pass on them. It had also been contemplated at the time that payments might be made direct by Germany to Canada to meet those claims. But as I established a moment ago, that basis was abandoned, and instead a commissioner was appointed to act in Canada, his instructions being to hear the claims, and to recommend awards.

Now, it is true there has been considerable delay in this matter, and I agree with my hon. friend that we should do everything possible to avoid any further delay.

Mr. ERNST: Tell us what you are going to do, then.

Mr. RINFRET: But at the same time an unkind fate has caused delay, irrespective of either party which may have been in power. The former government in 1921 appointed Sir John Douglas Hazen as commissioner. Later he was called to the bench and therefore could not act. In 1923 the Liberal government appointed the Hon. William Pugsley as commissioner, but unfortunately after hearing a few cases he died. In 1925 Commissioner Friel was appointed, and he heard the claims, numbering in all 1,613. Last year he made his final report, but by the time it had been printed the session was pretty well advanced.

Mr. ERNST: It was printed in December, 1927, according to the report.

Mr. RINFRET: The typewritten report was sent to the printing office, but the printing was a rather complicated affair by reason of the number of figures to be dealt with. It took considerable time for the commissioner to go through the proofs, and it was some weeks later before the printed report was actually in the hands of the government. But, I may set my hon. friend's mind at ease if I tell him that I admit there has been undue delay in this matter.

Mr. ERNST: Hear, hear.

Mr. RINFRET: I hope we shall agree that the delay was due to various causes that it would only prolong the discussion to explain.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to know whether it is a fact that the report of Commissioner Friel was in the hands of the press for months before it came into the hands of members of parliament?

Mr. RINFRET: So far as I know, I must deny that. I have no such information.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister get the information for the house? I am informed that the report was in the hands of the press for months before it became available in parliament.

Mr. RINFRET: I can tell my hon. friend that neither the minister nor his department gave the report to the press as he indicates. But perhaps my hon. friend will admit that this is only a detail, and as we are all very anxious to avoid delay, it might be desirable that I be allowed to complete my explanation before we come to such episodes.

Mr. ERNST: Tell us what you are going to do.

Mr. RINFRET: During the course of the session of 1925 Commissioner Friel had hardly begun his work, but it is true that the then Secretary of State, the Hon. Mr. Copp, brought down a resolution asking the house to authorize the Secretary of State to receive the report and to pay the claims that might be recommended. Every time we discuss this matter it is pointed out very strongly by hon. members opposite that the introduction of this resolution was a clear indication of the policy of the government. But my hon. friends are less anxious to remind the house of the very clear indication of their own policy at the time. The resolution to which I have referred was so strongly opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite that it was withdrawn by the government.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, but the minister surely is not going to precipitate a discussion on that point, because if he wants to do so it will not look so well when we get through with it as it does from the presentation he is now making. There were very good reasons for opposing that resolution. This has been threshed out over and over again. All we are urging the government to do now is to get on with this resolution and let the country pay those poor people who are entitled to be paid for the losses they sustained. Why raise up old issues? If the minister discusses them we will have to discuss them and so unnecessarily delay this business.

Mr. RINFRET: My hon. friend does not get my point, for the very good reason that he did not allow me to make it. I only wanted to point out that the conditions at the time did not permit—

Mr. SHORT: You have rehashed that sort of thing time and time again, year after year. Why don't you tell us when you are going to pay these claims? That is what we are interested in.

Mr. RINFRET: I am quite willing to stop my explanation right here and appeal to the leader of the opposition. If he is willing that this resolution should pass and will allow me to introduce my bill, I shall be quite willing to conclude my speech at once.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. minister has referred to me. If he will be good enough to indicate what payments he proposes to make, and what claims will be dealt with, I think it would expedite the passage of the resolution.

Mr. RINFRET: When the Hon. Mr. Copp introduced his resolution in 1925 he made it quite clear that he was introducing that resolution in order to meet the moral claims of certain of the claimants. He did not at that time lay down a policy on any legal ground. Our hon. friends on the other side and in the far corner pointed out in the first place that the nation should be recognized and, in the second place, which was very proper I think, that inasmuch as there was no report before the house it was scarcely opportune to consider such a resolution at that time. Consequently the resolution was withdrawn.

Last year, on May 19, my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Ernst), on a motion for the house to go into supply, introduced an amendment recommending payment of the claims in full or in part, and I then undertook to explain that as we had not had an opportunity to study the report fully we were not in a position to recommend payment of the claims in full. I indicated on that occasion, however, the intention of the government in the following observations with which I concluded my speech:

> Therefore, as I have said, it is our intention during the recess, when the labours of the session are over, to give that report, the judgments and the evidence the fullest care and study in order to be in a position at the beginning of next session to introduce legislation. I cannot now forsee exactly what the legislation will be, but I can say that in principle it will be shaped by and based upon the policy adopted in the British parliament by the British government. It will not admit any legal rights, but the government is willing to meet some of these claims on compassionate grounds and as an act of grace. And I hope that this policy will commend itself to the good sense of the parliament of Canada and of the country.

Voting on the amendment, the house endorsed that statement by rather a large majority. Now coming to the bill proposed to be introduced, I may say that in the first place the explanation would have been available a long time ago had opportunity been

given me to make it. The bill proposes to meet precisely the position which the government took at the time the amendment was moved on May 19, 1928. What it is intended to do by the bill is to recommend immediate payment of all small claims and payment on account in respect to the larger ones.

Mr. BENNETT: What is meant by small claims?

Mr. RINFRET: I will indicate that. The bill provides in the first place that the report of the commissioner shall be deposited with the Secretary of State, and the Minister of Finance shall then place to the credit of the custodians the sum of $2,500,000. It sets out in clause 5 the method of payment. It is proposed to meet in full all claims up to $15,000; in excess of $15,000 and up to $25,000, payment of 25 per cent; in excess of $25,000, payment of 10 per cent; in no case shall the total amount exceed $25,000. Under the scale adopted in the proposed bill the outlay required will be as follows:

Assessments to $15,000..	1,294	$1,761,018 00	In full	$1,761,018 00
Excess of $15,000 to $25,000..	10	191,541 35	25 p.c.	160,274 34
Excess of $25,000..	17	2,294,309 40	10 p.c.	410,092 92
	1,321	$4,246,868 75	.....	$2,331,385 26

In other words, the number of awards recommended by the commissioner is 1,321. If this bill is adopted it means that 1,294 of these claims will be met in full; 10 other claims will receive $15,000 plus 25 per cent; and 17 claims will receive these allotments plus 10 per cent. But in no case will the sum paid be greater than $25,000.

As pointed out by the Prime Minister a moment ago, this is not intended to be a final settlement or in any way to preclude or prejudice further discussion of this question; it is intended merely to avoid any further delays in meeting the claims of the 1,294 claimants where the amount does not exceed $15,000. It is only in respect to the 27 claims exceeding $15,000 that we are not in a position immediately to recommend to the house payment either in full or in any higher proportion than proposed. This is a matter in which at the present time as in the past both parties are interested; moreover, it is non-political. It should be approached in that spirit and I do invite the fullest discussion of the question from all parts of the house. I know that some hon. gentlemen are anxious to have us meet all claims in a larger proportion; but I know also that other hon. members will probably take the opposite view, the view taken in 1925, that the money belongs primarily to the nation. The losses of the nation have been very heavy, running into a billion dollars, and possibly it will be thought that $2,500,000 is a sufficiently large sum to spend at the present time. We must not forget that other settlements have been made along the same lines. Such have been made in the British parliament—war claims of this very nature. The Home bank claims here have also been settled in this manner and it is therefore not altogether extraordinary to make a proposal of this kind.

I wish to stress this point—because I am anxious that there shall be not the slightest misgiving in the minds of my hon. friends—that the government invites the fullest discussion of the matter; it is desirous to know the sentiment of the house. In 1925 the house was absolutely opposed to any form of payment, but last year by a somewhat large majority it rather indicated that, in its opinion, a partial payment would meet the case. If the representatives of the people, having met their constituents, indicate in the discussion the feeling that this payment is not sufficient, we are willing and prepared to meet the demand of the people and of parliament. And perhaps I might indicate, in case my hon. friends think this would mean a delay of another year, that we have ascertained the possibility, after we have laid down the principle contained in this bill, of having an amount in the supplementary estimates to increase the payments if it appears from the discussion that such is the desire of the house.

Before I sit down I wish to make another point. We have not made allowance for interest. The reason is obvious. I do not think we can consider interest unless we meet all claims in full. It would not be proper to pay certain claims with interest and make only partial payments in the case of other claims where interest is not possible. Therefore I do submit that the government is not inspired in this matter by any desire other than to meet the wishes of the nation as expressed here by the representatives of the Canadian people.

Mr. DUFF: I am sure we listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Secretary of State. I am not particularly interested in the legal argument. I do not particularly care whether these claims are technically legal or whether some typist omitted to cross a "t" or dot an "i" in typing the treaty of Versailles; this matter is far above any technicality of that kind. I do not pretend to know any law; I am sometimes referred to as a sea lawyer, but when I hear some of our lawyer friends discussing different matters I think perhaps the laymen can come to equally good if not better decisions by simply using their common sense.

For a few moments I would like to deal with some of the arguments advanced by the minister, who claims that there is no legal obligation on the government to pay this money. If that is true I wonder why certain sections are included in different orders in council which were passed not only by this government but by the previous government, giving certain instructions to three successive commissioners. The order in council of October 31, 1921, stated that the commissioner was to take such steps as were necessary to obtain a complete list of claimants and persons residing or carrying on business in Canada who suffered damage due to the destruction of life and property through the illegal warfare carried on by the enemy.

Then it goes on:

The minister further submits—

That means the government of the day.

—that, under article 231, part VIII (reparation) of the treaty of Peace with Germany, the allied and associated powers affirmed and Germany accepted the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing the loss and damage to which the allied and associated governments and their nationals had been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies.

It seems to me that this includes not only the loss caused by naval and military operations during the war but also the losses suffered by our nationals, or in other words the individual citizens of Canada. After Sir Douglas Hazen resigned the same instructions were issued to Hon. William Pugsley, and if we look at article 232 of the treaty of Versailles we find the following:

The allied and associated governments, however, require, and Germany undertakes, that she will make compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the allied and associated powers and to their property during the period of the belligerency of each as an allied or associated power against Germany by such aggression by land, by sea and from the air, and in general all damage as defined in annex 1 hereto.

Section 9 states:

Damage in respect of all property wherever situated belonging to any of the allied or associated states or their nationals, with the exception of naval and military works or materials, which has been carried off, seized, injured or destroyed by the acts of Germany or her allies on land, on sea or from the air, or damage directly in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war.

My hon. friend tried to argue that legally all this or any other government could pay out of the moneys received from Germany was the cost of the actual operation of the war. Let me tell my hon. friend that even if he is technically correct the people who suffered the damages set forth in Mr. Freil's report have to help pay the cost of the war as well as those who did not suffer any special damage, and I believe that the cases of the 1,600 claimants should be considered and their damages paid.

My hon. friend told us what Great Britain did, but we have a neighbour closer than Great Britain; I refer to the United States. Their claims totalled $191,000,000. If, as the minister says, he cannot legally take the full amount necessary to pay these claims out of the payments made by Germany, which to date have totalled $21,000,000 and which will amount to $360,000,000 in the next fifty years, I would suggest that he follow the lead of the United States and pay this money from another fund. In the United States they took 30 per cent of the German property held by the custodian, amounting to $45,000,000, in order to settle these claims. I understand that we have some $13,000,000 or more obtained from the same source, which has been kept in a special fund, and if we cannot pay all these claims with the reparations money surely we can use the money in that special fund.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): Did they pay interest also?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, from March 10, 1925. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, putting aside the legal question, that, as the minister said a few moments ago, there is a moral question involved. These people have suffered damages; in my own county I know there are hundreds of people who suffered greatly through the loss of their ships, in the case of ship owners, the loss of wages in the case of seamen and the loss of their catch in the case of fishermen. Some of these men have never recovered from their losses, because they have been waiting all this time for this government to reimburse them, which should have been done from the reparation money.

I say that in fairness to these claimants they should get not only the amounts set opposite their names but also the interest as set forth in Mr. Freil's report. Certainly this government had confidence in Mr. Freil when they told him to investigate this matter; they practically said, "We will accept the report you make." In his report Mr. Freil declared in no uncertain terms that after going over these claims it was his opinion that they come under section 232 of the Versailles treaty and under part 8 of annex II to part 2.

In view of the fact that the government appointed these commissioners, that a large amount of money was expended in order to investigate these claims, that the claimants themselves have spent small and large sums of money in order to file their claims that hope has been held out to them during the past ten years that they will get their money, it seems to me that this government, this country and this House of Commons should have no hesitation in passing a unanimous vote that the claims be paid in full. Not only should the $2,500,000 be paid but the government should bring down a supplementary estimate to provide for sufficient money to pay the claims in full with interest.

To show that I am not as selfish as people sometimes think I am, I want to say that the $15,000 proposition made by the minister covers every claim I have. I think my hon. friend will agree with me when I say that possibly all the claims in the county of Lunenburg, which has the most claimants, will come within this $15,000 proposition.

An hon. MEMBER: There will be no interest, though.

Mr. DUFF: I know that. The reason the majority of our claims will be paid is because most of our vessels are owned by shareholders. We differ from the people who own vessels in other parts of the country. When a man owns one, two or up to ten or twelve shares in a vessel, it does not amount to $15,000, but there are other cases of ship owners where there is only one share. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley) may own a whole ship, and is it fair that I and the sixty-three other shareholders should get the full amount of our claims while my hon. friend gets only $15,000 and 10 per cent besides? Take case No. 51, in the county of Cumberland. This covers the loss of the schooners L. C. Power and Lillian H., and the total claim amounts to $78,640. These ships were owned by G. M. Cochrane and if they had been divided into sixty-four shares the total of the $78,640 would be paid. But because this man owns the ship outright he will only receive a portion of his claim. I submit that that is not fair or right. The same principle applies to claims of $200,000 or $300,000, or upwards.

The total of all the claims amounts to only about $4,000,000, and the interest is only $2,000,000. It is not our fault that the interest has mounted up, because we should have had the money many years ago. The government has had this money for years, so they really would not be out the interest. As my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said, the government has had $21,000,000 for two or three years from the reparation receipts, and $13,000,000, representing enemy property funds, since 1918, so if the government should meet these demands it would not cost the country one cent. The government has to provide only $2,000,000 in round figures in the estimates to pay all the claims in full.

The government does not want the people to come knocking at its doors day after day. There is only one way to settle the thing, and that is to settle it right and the government or parliament will not be settling this question right if they only pay the $2,500,000 as proposed. The way to settle it is to pay all the claims, because if the money is not paid in full with interest, day after day and year after year not only will the government be bothered, but every member of this parliament will be receiving letters and be tormented until the government finally decides to pay the claims in full.

I think the government should appreciate the fact that although I was strongly in favour of the payment of these claims last year, I showed my allegiance to my party by voting against the want of confidence amendment moved by one of the hon. members on the other side. I do not want to be placed in that position this year. Whether these claims are called legal claims, equitable claims or moral claims, the only way to settle them is by payment in full with interest so that the people will receive the money to which they are entitled.

Mr. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse everything which has been said by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff), even though his enthusiasm for these payments in full is somewhat belated.

An hon. MEMBER: The lion and the lamb.

Mr. ERNST: Who is the lion? I said the hon. member's enthusiasm is apparently belated. I do not intend to attempt to answer argument by argument, but the hon. min-

ister referred to the treaty and the most conclusive answer to every argument he has adduced is the action of this government and its immediate predecessors in office. The example of Great Britain has been brought forth as an argument, but in the face of that example Mr. Pugsley was appointed in 1923 as a commissioner to determine the amount of the claims due to civilians owing to enemy actions during the war. When you invite claimants to come before a tribunal and do not tell them that any payment which they may get as a result of the award of that tribunal will be a matter of charitable donation or an act of grace, you encourage them to expect that the claims will be paid in full according to the award. That is the only conclusion to which you can come in view of the action taken in 1923. In addition to that, a resolution was introduced in 1925 by the then government which sought to provide for payment in full.

An hon. MEMBER: And with interest.

Mr. ERNST: And with interest, yes. In the face of these facts how can the minister ask the house to believe that he seriously thinks we ought to follow the example of Great Britain, when he knows perfectly well that his own government departed from that example? He knows perfectly well that we have between $13,000,000 and $14,000,000 which we have received from Germany as reparations under section 232 of the treaty. He knows the United States have interpreted a similar section in the treaty of peace which they signed as meaning that civilians are entitled to participate in the money received under that section.

I realize that the amount of $15,000 will cover most of the industrial claims in Lunenburg county, but it will not cover them with interest. I accept the proposition of the minister that we cannot reasonably expect interest to be paid upon the small claims until the large claims are paid in full, but I submit that having the money and having intimated to the various claimants that payment would be made when the money was available, there is no moral justification today for refusing to pay the claims in full. They should be paid in full and with interest as the commissioner awarded or recommended —interest on personal losses other than property losses from the date of the signing of peace, which was January 10, 1920, and interest on property losses from the date of the loss. The government has had the use of this money during a period of years, but the people who lost their property through the illegal warfare have been put to great hardship in many cases, and in other cases they have had to borrow money and pay interest. They have lost the use of their capital during that period; that capital was worth something to them, and that something is interest. They should get back their capital and the interest as well. I know of dozens of cases of fishermen around my own part of the county whose capital was lost. I know of some instances where they have had to borrow, and when they borrowed they have had to pay interest. The government has the money and it should pay in full with the interest. This interest means the addition of approximately 50 per cent to each award.

Some reference has been made by the minister to the fact that this proposal in its present form is introduced only to test the feeling of the house. I understood him to say that some revision might be made through the medium of the supplementary estimates, but I think I know the feelings of this part of the house. If it had not been for a motion from this side of the house we would not have received the report last year. The minister refused to table it until my leader said that we would not go on with supply until we got it, and then the report was forthcoming. This resolution was called during the early part of the session but for some reason, which the minister alone knows, it has been allowed to stand over a period of months and as it is now late in the session he can offer that as an excuse for not presenting any amended measure if the house voices its disapproval of the proposal as it now stands.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is politics.

Mr. RINFRET: We will have to ask the member for Vancouver to come back and address to my hon. friends the remarks he addressed to me.

Mr. ERNST: I am about to conclude with this remark that the minister knows perfectly well that the sentiment on this side of the house is in favour of payment and payment in full, with interest.

Mr. RINFRET: I will just read to the hon. member his own amendment of last year:

Mr. W. G. Ernst (Queens-Lunenburg): I move in amendment seconded by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark):

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

"This house regrets the refusal of the government to introduce legislation at the present session of parliament providing for the payment

in full or in part of the various sums fixed by James Friel, Esquire, K.C., a commissioner appointed under the Inquiries Act, as losses sustained by the civilian population of Canada during the Great war."

"In full or in part."

Mr. ERNST: That was the amendment, it is true, but would the minister say from that that this side of the house did not pledge itself to payment in full? It did pledge itself to payment in full, but to test what the feeling of the house would be on the amendment, the alternatives were necessary. But this side of the house believes in payment in full and with interest, and forced the government to its present position, if you will. The minister must know what the feeling on his side of the house is, and there is no reason why these claims cannot be paid in full and at once, with interest.

Mr. JACOBS: I am glad to see my hon. friends on the opposite side of the house have changed their views with respect to the payment of these reparation claims. In 1925, had it not been for the obstruction of the opposition, this money would have been paid to every one of the claimants.

Mr. BENNETT: That is nonsense.

Mr. JACOBS: I would like to support my statement from Hansard.

Mr. BENNETT: I have the Hansard under my hand.

Mr. JACOBS: I should like to read to the leader of the opposition the views of the then leader of the opposition, a man who, I think, at that time had the confidence of the gentlemen who sat behind him to the same degree that the present leader of the opposition has. Might I refer to the remarks of Mr. Meighen as reported in the Commons debates, under date of June 19, 1925, at page 4517:

Right Hon. Arthur Meighen (Leader of the Opposition): This is undoubtedly a measure of some consequence, the full purport of which should be made very clear before the resolution is adopted. The opening sentence is rather threatening, that it is expedient to bring in a measure "to make provision for the payment of claims". And paragraph (3) provides for payment. Does the minister propose that on the report of the late Hon. William Pugsley he is to be permitted to distribute assets amounting to millions of dollars in cash among those whom Mr. Pugsley thought the money ought to go to?

Then I would cite Mr. Meighen a little further. If this is nonsense, I am in pretty good company.

[Mr. Rinfret.]

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that the observations of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen were nonsense; I said that the observations of the hon. gentleman who is speaking were nonsense.

Mr. JACOBS: But I said that this would have passed and become law four years ago if the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen and the hon. gentlemen who sat behind him had not opposed it.

Mr. BENNETT: Who had the majority in the house at that time?

Mr. JACOBS: The government had the majority, but the opposition was such on the other side that the government thought it well to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. SPENCE: Do they withdraw things now that they can put through?

Mr. JACOBS: Sometimes they do.

Mr. SPENCE: Not very often.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If you want to put it through, why not do it now? You have the majority now.

Mr. JACOBS: If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I will quote some of the remarks on his own side of the house, and perhaps I will find some of his remarks too. I will continue with what Mr. Meighen said—the "nonsense"—as follows:

Mr. Meighen: If the motion is adopted it will be in the face of my protest. This is merely requesting the government for authority to pay out millions of money as a first charge on reparations, on the mere say-so of him who, unfortunately, now has passed away, but who was for many years a close associate of the government themselves. It is a measure of far-reaching consequence, and that it should be brought in at this stage of the session and sought to be precipitated through along with many others seems to me a disgrace to this house. I for one lodge my protest, and lodge it now. Under what rule of equity, or reason, or fidelity to the public interest—

Here is some nonsense.

Mr. BENNETT: Not a bit of it.

Mr. JACOBS:

—are millions of money to be paid out merely on the dictum of a commissioner? Possibly he had some practical duty to perform in investigating certain facts and saving the time of a duly constituted court; but here was a commissioner acting under the authority of, subject to the will of, dismissible on the whim of, the government in office,—and we are asked to act now on the assumption that he was a final judge in appeal as between the treasury of this country and certain claimants to vast sums of money. Is it right? I know of no other country that has done any such thing. I do not know what the nature of these claims is. I do not doubt some

of them are good. I am not going to speak arbitrarily on the priority right of these claimants. It may be they have it; I doubt it. I want to say now, I doubt very much if special claims for damages due to the war are in priority to the state itself,—the damage of the state.

Further nonsense from the then leader of the opposition.

Reparations are not paid in respect of the special damage of the individuals of a country; they are paid in respect of the damage of the nation itself. Now this government asks us to take the dictum of the late Hon. William Pugsley, grant the priority of claims that he has allowed, pay the money out—money paid to Canada as reparations of the war—to these claimants, and lose the whole of it so far as the general taxpayer is concerned. These vast sums are all to be paid to individuals. And more—because no doubt these seven or eight millions are just a beginning—we are called upon to decide to-day what course we are going to take as to the whole career of this thing. As for me, I am firmly against it from the beginning. I will protest against its passing, this session in partcular.

Does the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) not think he spoke a little too soon?

Mr. BENNETT: Not at all, as I shall presently show.

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps that is the reason my hon. friend is now leader of the opposition and Mr. Meighen is no longer in the house. Maybe it was some of that nonsense which caused Mr. Meighen to seek private life. In any event, what I want to say is that if there had not been such opposition, such obstruction, shall I say, from hon. gentlemen on the other side, this money might have been paid. Mr. Meighen was not the only one. Perhaps I can cite the names of some hon. gentlemen who are still well known on the other side of the house and who, happily, are still with us: the hon. member who now represents Fort William (Mr. Manion); my smiling friend the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart), and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) who uttered some rather pungent criticisms. Then I find that an hon. gentleman asked whether, in view of the opposition to the resolution coming from the other side, the Secretary of State would not be well advised to withdraw it. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." The Secretary of State withdrew the resolution and now, four years afterwards, when it is reintroduced by the Secretary of State, we find that the strongest protagonists of the measure are these very hon. gentlemen who opposed the resolution four years ago. They cannot get away with anything of that kind. They cannot go to the country and say: The government did not wish to do anything at all in the matter of paying these reparation claims, but were forced to do so. My object in rising is to show that the view of the Conservative party in 1925 was in strong opposition to the resolution. Mr. Meighen says that legally and morally the claimants are not entitled to one penny of the money. I am glad the present leader of the opposition says that this is nonsense.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not say so.

Mr. JACOBS: We believed his remarks were nonsense four years ago and we believe to-day that we were right at that time.

I am opposed to the resolution before the house because I do not think that it goes far enough. I am in favour of seeing payments of all the claims made in full, as was suggested four years ago, and if the Secretary of State would take my suggestion he would withdraw his resolution and bring in something that would give satisfaction I think to the entire house, satisfaction to us in 1925 and in 1929, and satisfaction to the Conservative party in 1929.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman from Cartier rose in his place and made an observation the effect of which was that but for the opposition of 1925, the reparations claims would have been paid. I said that that was nonsense, and I repeat it. He then, realizing that he had made a statement which was entirely without foundation, states that what was said by hon. gentlemen in the house at that time was declared by me to be nonsense. Does he think that that improves his position? Does he think that a misstatement such as that from a member of the legal profession as to what was said by a member of this house improves his position?

Mr. JACOBS: In what respect did I make a misstatement?

Mr. BENNETT: When he said that I declared that the observations made by the then leader of the opposition were nonsense. He knows that I said no such thing.

Mr. JACOBS: No, excuse me, I did not say that. What I said—

Mr. BENNETT: He said "more nonsense."

Mr. JACOBS: There was obstruction by men in his party in 1925, and he said that was nonsense. Then I quoted what the nonsense was.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is beginning to get a sense

of responsibility. I am glad to see that he is not endeavouring to laugh himself out of the false position in which he placed himself. You cannot fool with the truth and get away with it as a joke.

Mr. JACOBS: In what respect was I fooling with the truth?

Mr. BENNETT: I repeat that he said several times in his speech when he read from what Mr. Meighen said at that time that that was more nonsense according to the leader of the opposition, and I say that I said no such thing, and he knows it.

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend then agree with Mr. Meighen? Answer that.

Mr. BENNETT: I certainly shall, but once more my hon. friend is evading again; it is the old story.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Answer the question.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman from Melfort is doing the same thing. The question before this house is a simple one. The hon. member for Cartier got up and said that I said that the speech made by the leader of the opposition was nonsense, and I say that is untrue, and he knows it was untrue. How will that go? Does the hon. member for Melfort understand that?

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): As the hon. gentleman has brought my name into it, I would ask him to answer the question he promised to answer.

Mr. BENNETT: I will in my own time, in the right way, on the right occasion.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Then leave the hon. member for Melfort alone when he is leaving you alone.

Mr. BENNETT: You asked me to answer a question, and I say I will answer it when I get ready. I am dealing at the moment with the hon. member for Cartier, who has endeavoured in this house to place a statement on Hansard that was incorrect and false, and he must have known that it was.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 154, for the relief of Agnes Victoria Leader.—Mr. Edwards (Waterloo South).

[Mr. Bennett.]

Bill No. 178, for the relief of Adèle Cawthra Rogers.—Mr. Matthews.

Bill No. 179, for the relief of Madelaine Virginia Lumsden.—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 180, for the relief of Edgar Charles Buchanan.—Mr. Stewart (Leeds).

Bill No. 186, for the relief of Isabel Honor Gilderoy.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 194, for the relief of Harvey Baden Powell Haney.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 198, for the relief of John Campbell.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 208, for the relief of Marjory Lavinia Bradford.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 209, for the relief of Patrizio Nardini.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Motions for third readings agreed to on division.

JOSEPH NICHOLL

Mr. W. F. GARLAND (Carleton) moved the third reading of Bill No. 202, for the relief of Joseph Nicholl.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the house to the fact that we have about ninety-five divorce bills on the order paper in a single day, and the majority of these, if not all of them, are uncontested. We are dealing simply with ex parte evidence. The house the other day referred one of these bills to its own private bill committee for the first time in many years. The case was investigated and evidence taken, with the result that the bill was withdrawn. So I would just point out to the house what might happen if we investigated all these bills thoroughly—perhaps not one-quarter of them would be allowed to pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed on division.

MARION ISABEL KEMP

The house in committee on Bill No. 153, for the relief of Marion Isabel Kemp—Mr. Arthurs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand there are two children. Has any provision been made for them?

Mr. ARTHURS: Any such provision is entirely in the hands of the courts of the various provinces. No provision can be made by this parliament. There are three bills stand-

ing in my name for consideration in committee. I have read most carefully the evidence in each case, and I am quite satisfied that the committee will be justified in passing these bills.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Was there any representation that the children should be cared for before this divorce was granted?

Mr. ARTHURS: Representations of that kind, Mr. Chairman, would be no use to the committee on divorce.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the matter come up in the courts of Ontario? It is important to know that the children will not be thrown on the street without provision. The committee should have required the petitioner to give evidence on that point.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

ELIZABETH CRAWFORD COPPING

The house in committee on Bill No. 157, for the relief of Elizabeth Crawford Copping —Mr. Arthurs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. ARTHURS: No.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

ARTHUR ALDERTON

The house in committee on Bill No. 158, for the relief of Arthur Alderton—Mr. Arthurs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What about the children?

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

CONSTANCE MARY KEARNS

The house in committee on Bill No. 103, for the relief of Constance Mary Kearns—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): No children.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

EDNA LOUISE BROWN

The house in committee on Bill No. 110, for the relief of Edna Louise Brown—Mr. Anderson (High Park)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): There is one child in the custody of the petitioner, the mother, and the husband is living in a state of adultery. I suggest that the child is much better off with the mother than it would be with the father, living as he is.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

WALLACE EVERED GILLESPIE

The house in committee on Bill No. 117, for the relief of Wallace Evered Gillespie—Mr. Anderson (High Park)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No children?

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

MAUD PARKER

The house in committee on Bill No. 182, for the relief of Maud Parker—Mr. Spence (for Mr. Church)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. SPENCE: Yes, one born in 1917, but the husband has deserted this woman and she has been living with her mother.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

ELEANOR VAIR

The house in committee on Bill No. 183, for the relief of Eleanor Vair—Mr. Spence (for Mr. Church)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that in this case we are departing from the rule which requires the sponsor of a private bill to be in the house.

Mr. SPENCE: I called on the hon. member for Toronto Northwest (Mr. Church) on Sunday and I have had a letter from him. He is absolutely unable to be out of doors, to say nothing of coming here, and he probably will not be here this session.

Mr. MARCIL: I merely wanted to have it understood that this was the reason for allowing the bill to go through in the absence of the sponsor, on account of illness.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Everyone in the committee knew that.

Mr. MARCIL: But it is just as well to have it in Hansard so that there may be no misunderstanding. I have no personal interest in the matter but I wish to safeguard what I conceive to be public morality and to give expression to the sentiments of the people whom I represent.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

CATHERINE GORING

The house in committee on Bill No. 192, for the relief of Catherine Goring—Mr. Spence (for Mr. Church)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. SPENCE: One child seven years old.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: With whom?

Mr. SPENCE: Living with the mother, who has been deserted.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

BESSIE RUTH GLASS

The house in committee on Bill No. 119, for the relief of Bessie Ruth Glass—Mr. Jacobs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. JACOBS: I am not in a position to say; I am not responsible.

[Mr. Spence.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think the least we can expect is some information regarding the facts of the case, and until the sponsor is prepared to ascertain the important information as to whether or not there are children we ought to ask that the bill stand.

Mr. JACOBS: What difference would it make to my hon. friend whether there were children or not? That matter does not come before us.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It makes considerable difference.

Mr. JACOBS: That is a matter for the provincial courts.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is quite within the competence of this parliament to refuse the divorce on this ground, among others, namely that there is no assurance that the children will be provided for. I think the Minister of Justice will support me in that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I agree with that.

Mr JACOBS: Parliament, of course, could do anything; it could abolish my hon. friend.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have a right to ask whether there are any children in this case and whether they are provided for. If the sponsor of the bill is not in a position to answer that question I shall have to ask to have the bill stand.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): The hon. member has a perfect right to ask that question. He has asked it in respect to several bills and has received a reply in most cases. But I would ask him, now that he has got the information, what he proposes to do.

Mr. MARCIL: Call public attention to the matter.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): We know that we have not the power here to deal with that aspect of the matter. We might refuse the divorce asked for, but we have not been doing so. How much further ahead are we? I appeal to the good common sense of the house. We know perfectly well that we are now simply taking up the time of the house. I was one of those who for some time during this session protested against the refusal to provide a divorce court for Ontario; I strongly advocated the bill in that respect. I thought it was our duty to bring the matter to the attention of the house and of the country. That has now been done, and for the life of me I cannot see what we are gaining in taking up the time of the house. I am not suggesting for a moment

that an hon. member has not the right to ask any questions with reference to any of these bills, but after we have obtained the information asked for I do not think it is serving any purpose to delay matters.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): No; I do not waste much of the time of the house and I will say what I have to say. No one will stop me. I want to appeal to the good common sense of every hon. member to take a reasonable and sane view of the whole situation, and unless there is some specific reason why a particular bill should not go through I think we should expedite matters as far as possible.

Mr. MARCIL: In answer to my hon. friend, I would point out that the people who are asking for these divorces are residents of Ontario and Quebec where the law of the indissolubility of marriage prevails. These people, therefore, are asking to be exempted from that law; they are asking in each case for a law unto themselves. When therefore they ask that favour of parliament, parliament has a perfect right to deal with the matter as it sees fit, as was done in the Bourdon case which was referred back to the committee on the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). After the evidence had been heard the bill was withdrawn because the parties knew the house would not grant it. Are we going to deal honestly and conscientiously with these bills, some three hundred, as we do with all other measures that come before parliament, or are we going to constitute ourselves merely a rubber stamp, shouting "carried", without giving them any consideration? Are we going to break up family ties and throw the children on the streets, leaving them for the Canadian people to support? I should not care to face an audience in any place where the marriage tie is still held in high veneration and confess that I had taken that stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, there is something important involved here, and if some of us make ourselves unpopular I suppose that is the penalty we will have to pay for insisting on reform. The other day we came to a sort of understanding that far from in any way blocking these bills we would simply ask that when they were considered in committee—during that one stage—we would make an inquiry concerning the children, or if any bill came up of which we had special information we would ask for a simple outline of the case. Surely that is reducing our inquiry to the lowest possible minimum. We have let all these third readings go by when we could have checked them; we have let the first readings go by and we have let the second readings go and now we are letting these pass committee after simply asking one question which I at least think is very important.

There are hon. gentlemen in this house who blame a few of us for this condition of affairs. I am not going to refer again to the divorce court question except to say that if anyone is to blame for this situation it is these members who voted against the establishment of such a court. Further than that, there are members of this house who leave early Friday afternoon and do not return until late Monday night or Tuesday; they come chiefly from points near Ottawa, and for their own convenience they travel home every week end, leaving some of us who are far from our homes to struggle along as best we may, week after week, month after month, without a chance to see our homes at all. Then, because these men are not here to sponsor their bills we are told that we are responsible for keeping the order paper cluttered with these bills. They are responsible and they must bear their responsibility.

As the hon. member for Bonaventure has said, owing to an appeal which was made to me personally I asked the house to refer one particular bill back to the committee. The house responded splendidly to that request; I do not think any hon. member could have conscientiously refused to do so. A number of sessions of the private bills committee were devoted to an investigation of that case and serious allegations were made, so serious that some gentlemen concerned did not want to appear before that committee. In any case the result, as we all know, was that the committee did not refuse to report the bill for the simple reason that it was withdrawn. I would suggest that the newspapers which undertook to comment on the bill and which said there was no likelihood of its being turned down were absolutely misrepresenting the case, because a number of hon. members were well understood to be in favour of that bill not being reported again to this house. In addition to that, when it was suggested that a doubtful operation had been performed there were members of this house who told me such a thing was impossible, that no reputable surgeon would do it and that no hospital would permit that sort of thing, yet the evidence disclosed that a reputable doctor in this city did perform

such an operation in the civic hospital here in Ottawa. This information has not been brought out here before. I have no desire to name the doctor, although his name was given in evidence before the committee, but I do say this is a most serious state of affairs. If out of 300 of these bills one is referred to a committee and that one is turned down by the committee, I say it is a serious question as to whether we should not consider more of these bills in our private bills committee. Now I come to the point raised by the hon. member for Saskatoon.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): On a point of order, I would like to say that the bill was not turned down by the committee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I did not say it was turned down; I said it was withdrawn.

An hon. MEMBER: You said both.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I want to make it clear.

Mr. McGIBBON: It was withdrawn because it was thought parliament would prorogue before the bill could be put through.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I intended to say that the bill was withdrawn. Further I am very much concerned, as I know many social workers and citizens generally are concerned, with the fate of the children in these cases. We have been told by the Minister of Justice that this is a provincial matter; I presume he is right, and for the time being we accept that decision. However, that does not absolve us from some responsibility in granting divorces where children are concerned. If I were a member of the senate committee I would make it a condition precedent to the granting of divorce that the children should be provided for; I think that would be a reasonable thing. Until the senate adopts that procedure, and they can do so any time, I think that without referring these bills back to the committee I am quite within my rights to call the attention of the house to the fact that there are children involved and that some provision should be made for them. I suggest that I can take that action, for my own reasons, without being charged with obstructing.

Mr. NEILL: Does my hon. friend consider that the children will be any better off if these divorces are not granted?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, but for my own information and the information of others I want to know if any children are involved and whether or not provision has been made for them.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. JACOBS: May I tell my hon. friend that the responsibility of the parents towards the children exists just the same as if there were no divorce. They have a legal responsibility, and these children have a right to apply both to the father and to the mother for maintenance, notwithstanding any divorce which may have been granted. Under the law in Quebec the father has the custody of the children unless, for some sufficient reason in the opinion of the court, the custody is given the mother. However, the responsibility exists just the same, so really all these harangues do not amount to anything.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: They may not amount to anything in the opinion of my hon. friend, but I still insist that we have the right to know something about these cases. This house has deliberately adopted this procedure of dealing with divorce cases, and under this procedure I am quite within my rights in asking for some information with regard to these bills. The information I want is as to whether there are any children and whether or not any provision has been made for their future maintenance. I should like the sponsor of this bill to answer those questions.

Mr. JACOBS: Nothing appears in the record with regard to whether or not these people have children; otherwise I should be glad to give my hon. friend the information.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then, for us to know the real situation is a decided gain, because it shows that this question is not considered by the senate committee.

Mr. MARCIL: As I said before, we do not have divorce in either Quebec or Ontario but we have processes which are very similar, and I question very much whether any court would grant a separation without inquiring as to whether or not there were children.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

EDITH MARIE MCFARLANE

The house in committee on Bill No. 125, for the relief of Edith Marie McFarlane—Mr. Jacobs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. JACOBS: Apparently the senate committee did not think it of sufficient importance to ask that question; I do not see anything in the record regarding the children.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

CLEONIKI PALEOLOGOU DRAKOULAS

The house in committee on Bill No. 128, for the relief of Cleoniki Paleologou Drakoulas—Mr. Jacobs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. JACOBS: These people being Greeks, they were careful enough to state that there was one child.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has any provision been made for it?

Mr. JACOBS: There is the usual legal provision.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

NANETTE COFFEY

The house in committe on Bill No. 140, for the relief of Nanette Coffey—Mr. Jacobs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. JACOBS: I am glad to be able to give the hon. member the much desired information. The petition contains the following:

That after the said marriage your petitioner lived and cohabited with Joseph John Coffey, at the city of Toronto, and there is now living issue of the said marriage, one child, viz.:—Edwin Carl, born the twenty-second day of December, 1924.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: With whom is that child living now?

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps I could find out after the bill has passed and if so, I will pass the information on to my hon. friend.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am quite serious in this: In whose care is the child at the present time?

Mr. JACOBS: There does not appear to be anything in the record to show that.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

STEPHEN DYMON

The house in committee on Bill No. 142, for the relief of Stephen Dymon—Mr. Jacobs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Mariage dissolved.

Mr. JACOBS: For the information of my hon. friend I would say that the petition discloses that there are now living issue of the said marriage, three children.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

ELIAS ABRAHAM

The house in committee on Bill No. 159, for the relief of Elias Abraham, otherwise known as Elie Abraham Allen—Mr. Jacobs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would like a brief explanation of this case, as there seems to be something peculiar about it; why the alias?

Mr. JACOBS: I might state that the parties do not belong to my persuasion. They are Syrians.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

HELEN JANE SIM PITTENDREICH

The house in committee on Bill No. 185, for the relief of Helen Jane Sim Pittendreich—Mr. Spence—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCE: There is one child in this case, who was born in Scotland. By an order made by Magistrate Patterson, this man was ordered to pay six dollars per week, but the lady apparently would rather do without the man than get the six dollars.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

MOLLY VAUGHAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 189, for the relief of Molly Vaughan—Mr. Ryckman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children in this case?

Mr. RYCKMAN: None reported.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

LILLIAN AUGUSTA DUNN

The house in committee on bill No. 190, for the relief of Lillian Augusta Dunn—Mr. Tummon—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. TUMMON: There is one child in the custody of the mother, who is the petitioner. The same is true in connection with Bill 206—one child who is in the custody of the petitioner.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

MYRTLE MARY JANE MCLEAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 191, for the relief of Myrtle Mary Jane McLean—Mr. Ryckman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children in this case?

Mr. RYCKMAN: There is one child, a child of the adulterous father who left his wife, who, according to the principle of public morality announced in the house to-night by the hon. member for Bonaventure, should not have a divorce. There is a child by the father who offended against his wife.

Mr. MARCIL: I am surprised at the hon. gentleman making that statement. I am not defending the guilty party in this case. I am merely asking the house to deal with the matter seriously and not be a rubber stamp, approving, without any investigation, what has been done in the other house. I am prepared to defend my attitude in that regard.

[Mr. Spence.]

Mr. RYCKMAN: The hon. member for Bonaventure would not grant a divorce in this case. He said—and I took down his words—that these people were a law unto themselves and came to parliament seeking divorce. Who is a law unto himself? The offending husband who would not be granted relief by anyone, and my hon. friend from Bonaventure would not dare rise in his seat and say he would grant the wife relief. If a divorce should be granted in any case, it should be granted in this. Will the hon. member say on the floor of the house whether he would grant her a divorce?

Mr. MARCIL: The man has not been heard. These are all ex parte cases. We know what happened in the case that was referred to our own committee where the bill was withdrawn.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

MARY ADDIE LINTON

The house in committee on Bill No. 181, for the relief of Mary Addie Linton—Mr. Lennox—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. LENNOX: There are two children, aged fourteen and eleven respectively. They are living with the mother who is a housekeeper but who owns the property which was deeded to her by the husband when the application was made for divorce.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—REPORTED

Bill No. 141, for the relief of James Graham McCreadie.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 177, for the relief of Claude Frederick Burgin.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 184, for the relief of Edna Maud James.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 187, for the relief of Alfred Roy Edwards.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 206, for the relief of Walter Henry Lyne Dixson.—Mr. Tummon.

Bill No. 207, for the relief of Ida Rosenberg.—Mr. Spence.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 188, for the relief of Marie Rose Beffre Baer.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 214, for the relief of Eva Alexandra Grayson Smith.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 215, for the relief of Ernest Gillespie Simpson.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 217, for the relief of Gertrude Helena Martin.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 218, for the relief of Laura Warren. —Mr. Speakman.

Bill No. 219, for the relief of Ethel Elizabeth Kelley.—Mr. Edwards (Waterloo South).

Bill No. 220, for the relief of Andrew Ralph Wilson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 221, for the relief of Marion Jane Stewart.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 222, for the relief of Mildred Muriel Lange.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 223, for the relief of Linda Lydia Snowdon Pascoe.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 228, for the relief of William Treslove.—Mr. Thorson.

Bill No. 229, for the relief of Annie Letticia Smith.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 231, for the relief of Jennie White. —Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 233, for the relief of Gladys Evelyn Lawrence.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 234, for the relief of Daniel Ray Bouvier.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 237, for the relief of George Nelson Brown.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 239, for the relief of James Duncan Gerard.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 241, for the relief of Violet Haney. —Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 242, for the relief of James Thompson Clark.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 245, for the relief of Alexander James Purse.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 246, for the relief of Wilfred Keith Black.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 247, for the relief of Henry Feldman.—Mr. Jacobs.

Motions for second readings agreed to on division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for private bills being exhausted—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on. Put them all through.

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be unanimous consent.

Mr. MARCIL: I object, Mr. Speaker.

WAR REPARATIONS

AUTHORITY TO PLACE $2,500,000 TO CREDIT OF CUSTODIAN FOR PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

The house resumed consideration in committee of the following proposed resolution—Mr. Rinfret—Mr. Johnston in the chair:

That the Minister of Finance be authorized to place to the credit of the Custodian, out of the reparation money paid into the treasury for losses sustained during the late war, a sum not exceeding $2,500,000 and that provision be made as to the method and scale of payments.

Mr. BENNETT: When the house rose at six o'clock I had been endeavouring to point out the very improper attitude taken by the hon. member for Cartier with respect to certain observations that were made by myself. I have taken the trouble to ask Hansard for the record of his remarks, and I find he said that:

> In 1925 had it not been for the obstruction of the opposition this money would have been paid to every one of the claimants.
>
> Mr. Bennett: That is nonsense.

He proceeded to point out that the then leader of the opposition had taken a very pronounced stand against that resolution, and in the course of his observations he added:

> Then I would cite Mr. Meighen a little further. If this is nonsense, I am in pretty good company.

At once I pointed out that I had not in any sense indicated that the observations of the then leader of the opposition were nonsense. Again the hon. member for Cartier said the same thing later in his speech. I repeat what I said before recess, that such statements are not to the credit of this house or of my hon. and learned friend from Cartier who made them. For when he endeavoured to indicate that the leader of the opposition of to-day had said that the observations of the leader of the opposition in 1925 were nonsense, he made a statement wholly without foundation, and he knew it to be without foundation, a statement for which there was no warrant on the record as he himself read it. I repudiate such a statement as that, and I say further it is not creditable to a member of the legal profession or to a member of this house to continue to make a statement of that kind in the light of the record then before him.

Mr. JACOBS: Would the hon. gentleman pardon a question?

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly.

Mr. JACOBS: What remarks of mine did he consider were nonsense? Perhaps I am entitled to know that.

Mr. BENNETT: Why, certainly. I have already said so and I repeat it. The hon. gentleman said that in 1925 had it not been for the obstruction of the opposition this money would have been paid to every one of the claimants.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. BENNETT: I say it is nonsense.

Mr. JACOBS: I cite the remarks of Mr. Meighen and his party on that occasion. If what I say now is nonsense, what Mr. Meighen and his party said then is nonsense.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure the gentlemen who applauded that are not paying a tribute to their own intelligence. If "a fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind," it is because they find themselves so often in the same box.

The right hon. gentleman, the then leader of the opposition, opposed a somewhat similar resolution to the one now before us, and he told the government his reasons why. In the first place, the resolution was introduced on the 19th day of June, and the house rose on the 27th. It was introduced, as Sir Henry Drayton pointed out, in the dying days of the session. Further, it was not a resolution to pay claims that had been ascertained. A part only of the claims had been settled by the commission; the balance were to be settled. The position was taken that until the claims had been determined by some authority, Mr. Meighen thought that a single authority without reference to parliament was not ample enough. When the hon. gentleman speaks of obstruction, I would point out to him that the whole debate, participated in by Liberals, Conservatives and Progressives, took only eight pages in Hansard. He ventures to call that obstruction. The Hon. Mr. Copp, then Secretary of State, withdrew his motion, giving as his reasons that he had not expected that it would be so treated. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) also participated in the debate and gave two reasons why he was opposed to the resolution, which were in part the reasons of the then leader of the opposition. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre, who has spoken to-day, pointed out that these claims had not been determined and that it was proposed to give to the government, without reference to parliament, the power to settle claims when the commissioner had not yet completed his work.

The whole purpose of our effort last session was to endeavour to secure the report of the commissioner in order that we might see in black and white what the decisions were so that this parliament might know whether or not those decisions were based upon appreciation of the evidence, and that the government might for itself determine, as was then said, whether or not it would pay the claims or wait until they had referred some of them to a judge. What action the government will now take I cannot say, but the smaller claims under $15,000, I take it, have been reviewed by the administration in terms of their promise of last year, and the administration is satisfied that the claims of $15,000 reported upon by the commissioners should be paid in full.

My friend, the member for Melfort, asked me to answer the question he put to me, whether I was now desirous to adopt the language of the then right hon. leader of the opposition. I say, without adopting his language, which is his own always, as my language is my own, that I approve entirely of what he said—

Mr. JACOBS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: —that no parliament should be called upon to approve of the payment of claims about which it does not know. If the hon. gentleman will look at the resolution, which is found on pages 4517 of Hansard for 1925, he will find that the house was asked to approve of the report of the commissioner as far as it went. Then:

(2) That from time to time, as sums are received on account of reparation under the agreement of London—

—and so on, they shall be placed to certain credits.

until such time as the aggregate of such payments is equal to the total amount of the claims for reparation as determined by the report of the said commissioner and approved by the governor in council;

(3) That the Secretary of State shall, on receipt of such payments, from time to time distribute the same to persons found entitled to claims for reparation in the commissioner's report, by way of pro rata dividend;

(4) That the Secretary of State shall annually lay before parliament, within fifteen days after the meeting thereof, a report of the receipts and expenditures under the proposed legislation.

The obvious principle being that this was to be a matter extending over many years, because they were to lay before parliament fifteen days after it met a report of the moneys received and the moneys paid. What we pointed out last year was that the money had been received in sufficient amounts to enable the payments to be made in full of the claims that had been approved. That is what we endeavoured to point out. When the hon. member from Antigonish-Guysborough—who described himself this afternoon as a "sea lawyer" but whom we always affectionately term as "the Admiral"—referred

to these claims as he did, and said that out of loyalty to the administration he voted with them last year, although he felt they should pay the claims, he but presented the argument which we now make to this government, that having the money in hand which was paid by Germany for the purpose of reparations for the wrongs and injuries suffered by the civil population in the terms that were read this afternoon by the Secretary of State, then indeed we should proceed to discharge them. In other words, the money is there, the claims are now proven, judgment has been given by the commissioner, and on that judgment we should proceed to pay in full.

Let us proceed a step further. There was another reason. A very few claims had been considered by the late Mr. Pugsley. Some of the larger ones and the great multitude of the small claims which Mr. Commissioner Friel dealt with, had not, may I remind the hon. member for Cartier, even been considered by the commissioner. These claims that were referred to this afternoon, the claims that the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough mentioned, the claims in which we are all interested, are the claims of the small persons who have suffered by reason of not having received this money. I do say to the Minister of Finance, now that he has had the use of this money for all these years and has received $21,000,000 that enabled him to pay off obligations due by the Dominion, carrying interest at the rate of five per cent, he should with the remaining money and the accumulated benefits that have come to this treasury by the use of it all these years pay these claimants in full with interest at five per cent per annum in the terms of the judgment of Mr. Commissioner Friel. Why should this country retain the money which belongs to these people and not pay interest on it? Would a private individual do so? It is true there was no legal trust set up, but the very word "reparations" and the language that my hon. friend the Secretary of State this afternoon referred to, namely the injuries and the wrongs done to the civil population, indicate that this money—as indeed it was—was paid by Germany for one purpose, to discharge at least in part the damages that were done to the civil population by reason of the war. There seems to be no doubt about it on the part of all the members of this house. The hon. member for Cartier said three years ago the government recognized that principle; the opposition of that day said, you have not ample evidence before you to warrant you taking this step; the hon. member for Vancouver Centre pointed out very distinctly aand clearly that fact; Sir Henry Drayton in his observations pointed out that it was late in the session and it should not be done. The right hon. leader of the opposition pointed out further that the money belonged to the state and they could do with it as they pleased. I say I am not discussing the legal rights; I never have. I have conceded always, so far as the state is concerned, that the obligation of parliament is not an obligation that can be measured in terms of exact contract. But the money was reparations money to repair the wrongs done to a civil population—not injuries suffered in the field, not defeats suffered on sea or land, but injuries done to the civil population through the war. The men who lost their fishing smacks, the men who lost their nets, the men who lost their boats, the women whose husbands were lost at sea—all these are losses of the civil population for which Germany, being responsible for the war, has paid a sum of money into the treasury of this country. These are losses which the civil population suffered and for which Germany, having been responsible for the war, has paid money into the treasury, and I think it ill becomes any Minister of Finance, whether it be the present incumbent of the office or some other, to state to this house that he will depart from the principle under which such moneys are paid. That principle is that such moneys shall be available to rectify the wrongs and injuries done the civil population of the country in consequence of the war. My hon. friend from Cartier and the Secretary of State take this attitude: they say that what this house thinks this house will do. That is a very fair attitude to take because, as has been pointed out, the wrongs were suffered not by one class of people alone; they were not suffered only by members who supported the administration, although one member is concerned in the net result. But not one member of parliament or two, not Liberals or Conservatives, are to be considered as such in dealing with the matter. That is not the point. Those who suffered these wrongs were citizens of Canada, and Germany has paid a sum of money to repair those wrongs, that sum of money being known as reparations.

Now since we are all agreed in that respect —members on the right as well as those on the left—then let us see to it that we express unanimously the desire that the Secretary of State should amend this legislation. He cannot do it in this resolution inasmuch as he must introduce a new resolution if he intends to increase the amount and secure the approval

of His Excellency the Governor General. But if he cannot meet the situation without the introduction of a new resolution he can, as has been indicated, place in the supplementary estimates, if the Minister of Finance will enable him to do so, a sum sufficient to pay these claims; and that amount should represent the sum total of all the claims which the Minister of Justice and the law officers of the crown believe are proper claims, fully established upon testimony taken by the commissioner and upon which he has reported. Last year it was thought desirable perhaps that a judge should review the findings. Now, I take it, the administration has reviewed the findings as it thought best and concluded, for reasons that must be ample to it, whether or not these claims should be paid; and I assume that although there may be some doubt as to the soundness of the judgment in some cases, or as to whether the evidence has sufficiently made good particular claims, with respect to most of the claims there can be no question that they should be paid and paid in full. The fact that a man's claim is large does not differentiate it in principle from a small claim. If it be a great corporation that has lost money, it is as much the money of the shareholders as is the money claimed by the man who lost a suit of clothes and his trunk in the Lusitania, for which a sum as small as £100 has been awarded. These, however, are mere details; the principle is that the money, having been paid by Germany to repair the wrongs suffered by the civil population, and that money being now available in the treasury of the country, should be paid for the purpose for which it was intended and was received. This was clearly recognised by the former government as well as by the present administration, and for that reason I submit we should all unite and urge upon the Secretary of State that the claims be paid in full. It is not sufficient at this late date to say that mere expressions of acquiescence in the will of parliament should govern the matter. I urge that it is no satisfactory disposition of the question to pay the claims without interest. I wish to impress that upon the minister.

I would point out to the Minister of Justice that the very bill we have been considering in the last few days, the bill arising out of the Winnipeg strike, is one which has appeared and reappeared on the order paper, in the estimates and elsewhere—and why? Because those interested were encouraged that if they pressed long enough they would get something. Similarly, in the matter of these reparations, unless we satisfactorily dispose of it there is going to be, as the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough has observed, a persistent effort on the part of constituents to press their claims. Those who support the present administration will bring pressure to bear, and that pressure will become stronger and stronger, the necessity becoming probably greater as it did in 1926, and consequently promises will be more apt to be made than would be the case if the matter were finally settled in a satisfactory manner. When the pressure becomes too great you will once more have recourse to parliament. Let us be done with it; let us treat the matter on a broad, generous scale, as it was intended that we should. Here is the money, here are the claims; let us pay those claims and pay them in full. Let us say to those who have been out of their money all these years that we will compensate them with the money, the use of which we have had; because once we recognize these claims we must, it seems to me, also recognize the fact that, having had the use of money belonging to these claimants we should pay for it, the money being a commodity which we have kept from them.

What did the Minister of Finance do with respect to those who had automobiles in storage? What about the budget of Sir Henry Drayton which affected adversely the interests of men who had automobiles in stock? That was under the government of Mr. Meighen, when Sir Henry Drayton was Minister of Finance. He passed a measure which adversely affected a certain number of automobile dealers and it was thought that compensation would not be paid. Yet on one occasion an amount was included in the estimates to cover the matter. But in this case we have money provided by a third party and passing through this conduit pipe of parliament—money made available for Smith, Jones and other beneficiaries entitled to it, and which has earned interest in the banks and elsewhere. We have used that money and I submit that without question it should be used now to liquidate with interest these claims as found by the tribunal created by the government. I say that these claims should be paid with interest from the date fixed by the commissioner who investigated them.

Mr. ILSLEY: As one of the Liberal members from the province of Nova Scotia I wish to place myself on record in this matter. I am in accord, I may say at the outset, with the conclusions to which the leader of the opposition has come. I believe that the claims of civilian claimants which have been established before the various commissioners should be paid in full, and paid this session, and should all be paid and with interest.

But, Mr. Chairman, I must dissent from some of the observations which the leader of the opposition has made especially in reference to the argument put forward this afternoon by the hon. member for Cartier. I have before me the debate of June 19, 1925, in which Mr. Meighen, then leader of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre and some others participated; and when the leader of the opposition would have the committee believe that Mr. Meighen's only objection was that the matter had not come before parliament, or that some of the claims had not been adjudicated upon, I submit that he is leaving a wrong impression on the house. I wish to read a few sentences from the speech of Mr. Meighen in 1925. It is to be found at page 4519 of Hansard of that date, at the bottom of the first column:

> I want to say now, I doubt very much if special claims for damages due to the war are in priority to the state itself—the damage of the state. Reparations are not paid in respect of the special damage of the individuals of a country; they are paid in respect of the damage of the nation itself. Now this government asks us to take the dictum of the late Hon. William Pugsley, grant the priority of claims that he has allowed, pay the money out—money paid to Canada as reparations of the war—to these claimants, and lose the whole of it so far as the general taxpayer is concerned.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That was read this afternoon; we can all hear.

Mr. ILSLEY: That was the principle laid down then.

Mr. RYCKMAN: It has been read once

Mr. ILSLEY: I am going to read it again, even if it has been read once, and I am going to make two or three observations with reference to it. The principle underlying Mr. Meighen's objection in 1925 was that if these claims were paid in full the money would be lost so far as the general taxpayer was concerned. He goes on to say:

> These vast sums are all to be paid to individuals. And more—because no doubt these seven or eight millions are just a beginning—we are called upon to decide to-day what course we are going to take as to the whole career of this thing. As for me, I am firmly against it from the beginning. I will protest against its passing, this session in particular.

I am free to say that the reasons given in some of the other speeches, particularly those delivered by Sir Henry Drayton and by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre are not these reasons, but the then leader of the Conservative party placed on record his objection to the step which we are now being asked by the opposition to take, and the objection was that if these claims were paid in full the money would be taken out of the pockets of the general taxpayers. I hope I have made that clear. The hon. member for Cartier points out that only a few moments ago the present leader of the opposition said that while the language used by Mr. Meighen at that time was a little different, his sentiments were the same and he concurred in Mr. Meighen's conclusions.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that.

Mr. ILSLEY: Would the leader of the opposition repeat what he did say?

Mr. BENNETT: Hansard will show it in the morning.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, I am glad Hansard will show what the leader of the opposition said.

Mr. ERNST: And Hansard will also show what the hon. member for Hants-Kings has not said on any previous occasion.

Mr. ILSLEY: I have not previously spoken on the question; there was no reason for my doing so. However, I am glad the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg brought up that point. This afternoon the Secretary of State approached this matter in a very conciliatory way; he invited the fullest discussion from all parties in the house and he intimated the willingness of the government to place in the supplementary estimates an amount to meet these claims in full if the general opinion of the house was in favour of such procedure. If I had been a member of the opposition, after listening to that statement I would not have indulged in a very extreme, violent and partisan speech such as we heard from the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg, this afternoon and which I was very much surprised to hear. The hon. member said that his party or he himself, as I gathered, had forced the government to adopt this position. I want to say that not in 1925, not last year and not up to the present time have we known the attitude of the opposition in regard to this matter.

An hon. MEMBER: What about last year?

Mr. ILSLEY: I will deal with last year.

An hon. MEMBER: Read all the speeches.

Mr. ILSLEY: I have read the speeches during the dinner recess, and I was surprised at their contents. In the first place, what was the resolution moved by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg?

An hon. MEMBER: Read them all.

Mr. ILSLEY: Will my hon. friends please keep quiet for a moment? I would like to read the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg last year, and I ask hon. members to remember the attitude taken by the hon. member and by the leader of the opposition to-night, which is that the opposition have been in favour of payment in full of these claims, and still take that position. Here is the amendment:

> That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:
> "This house regrets the refusal of the government to introduce legislation at the present session of parliament providing for the payment in full or in part of the various sums fixed by James Friel, Esquire, K.C., a commissioner apointed under the Inquiries Act, as losses sustained by the civilian population of Canada during the great war."

There is nothing in that resolution about paying all the claims in full. It says in full or in part.

Mr. ERNST: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. ILSLEY: Just wait till I finish. I have been invited to read the speeches which were delivered last year, and I wish to say that the only request made then was that the government pay the smaller claims. In the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, I find the following:

> It may be that in some of the large claims—I understand there are one or two of over a million dollars—time should be taken to scrutinize them carefully. If there are such cases, by all means scrutinize them with the greatest of care. . .

What for, if they are to be paid in full?

> ...no one objects to that; but we do object to the holding up of claims by individuals who are suffering privation while the government coolly takes time to look into these other matters.

In other words, "Pay the small claims but not necessarily the large ones." That was the entire request last year, to pay the small claims. At page 3205 of Hansard for last year we have the leader of the opposition saying:

> Mr. Rinfret: Does my hon. friend take the stand that the report should be considered as final?
> Mr. Bennett: The report is final so far as this commissioner is concerned; he is through. But whether or not it should be final so far as the government is concerned depends, it seems to me, upon the amount involved.

In other words, at that time the opposition were not prepared to accept the findings of the commissioner as final; that is, they were not prepared to pay the claims in full as determined by the commissioner. Later on in the same speech, at page 3206, I find the following:

> But the point is that the smaller claims should be disposed of. Whatever the government might consider just in the way of a partial payment on account of the larger claims, I submit that the smaller claims should be dealt with at once; because after all, when men lose their all, by act of war, and they know that a fund has been provided by the enemy to pay that liability, it only makes for dissatisfaction when that money is withheld from year to year.

So it was with great satisfaction that I heard the unequivocal declaration of the leader of the opposition to-night, a declaration which has not been made before on behalf of the opposition, aithough my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg purported to speak for them this afternoon. I was glad to hear the leader of the opposition say he was in favour of paying all these claims in full, with interest, at once.

What he says as to there being no real distinction between the large claims and the small claims is perfectly correct. The hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough pointed out this afternoon that the smaller vessels are owned in shares, and that each of the shareholders who suffered a loss was entitled to file and did file an individual claim, whereas certain larger ships were owned by incorporated companies and the claim of the company is dealt with as a whole. So if the large claims are not paid in full the shareholders of the large companies will be prejudiced or discriminated against. In the part of Nova Scotia from which I come I know there is a fairly large number of shareholders in these larger companies; many of them are not in affluent circumstances, and they would feel that they were very greatly and very unjustly discriminated against if the government paid their claims to the extent of only 10 per cent while at the same time they paid an individual claim to the extent of 100 per cent.

If, as I believe is the case, the members on both sides of the house are now in accord as to the procedure which should be followed in adjusting this matter, I feel that the resolution should be altered in order to provide for the payment of about $4,000,000 in addition to the $2,500,000 mentioned in the resolution in order to satisfy the claims in full with interest.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the minister in connection with a point in this discussion which was under consideration during the debate of February 26. Article 232 of the Versailles treaty reads, in part, as follows:

> The allied and associated governments, however, require, and Germany undertakes, that

she will make compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the allied and associated powers and to their property during the period of the belligerency of each as an allied or associated power against Germany by such aggression by land, by sea and from the air, and in general damage as defined in annex 1 hereto.

Section 9 of annex 1 reads as follows:

(9) Damage in respect of all property wherever situated belonging to any of the allied or associated states or their nationals, with the exception of naval and military works or materials, which has been carried off, seized, injured or destroyed by the acts of Germany or her allies on land, on sea or from the air, or damage directly in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war.

I read these two paragraphs to point out to the minister that by a treaty to which Canada's name is appended an obligation is placed upon this country with respect to the moneys which we received from Germany, and I submit that there is created not only a moral obligation on the part of Canada in relation to her nationals but also a legal obligation, because the very wording of the treaty makes the contributions of Germany payable to the nationals of this country.

I rise to make this point and to ask the minister a question upon it. If there is in any sense a legal claim on the part of a claimant, or if there are principles of law involved on the part of any claimant, and the commissioner, either through lack of judgment or lack of knowledge of the law, or for any other reason, has failed to give justice to the claimant, I consider that the claimant should have the right of appeal to a court which could properly determine the question, just as the right of appeal prevails with respect to the administration of justice in all our courts. My question is this: As the minister has had time to consider the matter following the previous discussion, is it his intention to provide for a right of appeal with respect to the claims which have been turned down, where good cause for appeal can be shown?

Mr. RINFRET: In reply to the hon. member I will say that this question is very much along the same lines as the question of interest, which was mentioned this afternoon. It was decided that this matter would not be settled finally until it was decided whether we would pay the awards in full, but we have given consideration to the matter. There are instances where Commissioner Pugsley had practically rendered his judgment but the cases have been revised by Commissioner Friel. There are other cases, either dismissed or an award granted, which might possibly be reviewed with advantage by a judge. I am not willing to admit the legal right which my hon. friend stresses; in fact I was stopped this afternoon from making my point by the response of the other side of the house that the moral right was admitted. Even on moral grounds I think we should act with as much equity as possible, and although the bill does not contain any clause with reference to appeals, I am quite willing to discuss that feature when the bill is in committee and possibly make a proposal which will cover the matter.

I invited a very full discussion of this matter and I do not want to stifle it, but the house as a whole seems to be in favour of this resolution inasmuch as it is not considered as being final. I would submit that we might possibly report the resolution and allow the bill to be introduced and the matter could be discussed on the second reading. If it is proposed by the government that additions be made, either in committee or later on by way of supplementary estimates, I would be in a position to make a declaration.

Mr. SPENCE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister has said that this matter should be allowed to proceed until it reaches the second reading of the bill, but we would like to know what he is going to do. As far as I am concerned, I am not very well satisfied. He has not as yet promised to pay the interest, and I think an honourable government should carry out its agreement after a commissioner has heard the cases of the claimants and awarded certain sums of money to individuals who have suffered both on the water and on the land. I have received many pathetic letters from different parts of Canada which give the views of many people as to the conduct of this government. It is too bad that so much time of the house is taken up by hon. members on the government benches continually rehashing the days which have passed. The whole business world has been reformed since the war; the man who did not change his methods has no business to-day, and I hope the government will forget the past and let us legislate for the future. The guilty party is on that side, as a rule. I am satisfied that the right thinking people of Canada are behind this proposition and will heartily support the payment of the awards with interest. This party has never prevented the government from carrying out any honourable act and we advocate strongly that these payments be made. I have in mind a particular case I might mention, that of a gentleman who lives up in the north end of my old riding. He went overseas and was taken prisoner. His case was tried and he was awarded $4,000, but since that time he has

struck nothing but hard luck. Had that man received the $4,000 when it was awarded to him it would have put him in business and would have been worth far more to him than it will be to-day, because his health is breaking down.

Even though the bill is passed this session we do not we do not know when the claims will be paid. It may not be for ten years, and by that time many of the claimants will have died. When the bill comes down to the house it should be understood just when the claims will be paid.

Another case I might mention is that of a man who has borrowed $966 from the Reverend J. D. Gibson. He has had a wonderful record; a son who enlisted at fourteen years of age—of course he told them he was nineteen—went to the war, and came back blinded.

Here is another case of a man in Winnipeg. He went down with the Lusitania. He was an electrical engineer but has never been able to do any work since his return, as his health is gone. He was awarded $8,850, and if that had been paid to him at the time he could have gone into business and would have been able to do something for himself. He is getting old and feeble and in a few years he will be gone and no one will be getting anything in relation to that claim. I believe in doing something now. Give the people flowers when they are alive—not thorns, as this government is trying to do all the time.

The next case is that of a lady with three daughters living at 16 Inglewood drive. They were on the Lusitania, and she has been awarded $5,680. This is what she says:

> If these claims, which have been passed by the government's own commission, are to be denied it is surely the cruelest piece of deception which a government could conceive—

I think the same, because I believe the government, after they have received this money from Germany, are in honour bound to pay it out. There is no reason why they should put it into some other melting pot or spend it in some other way. This lady says also:

> —besides being a waste of public funds which the government now seems to be so desirous of conserving.

This is a lady in distress. I have another case of a person who is getting on in years. An award of $1,000 was made, but nothing has been paid.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. SPENCE: It will be carried when I say so. I just want to point out that these are sad cases. These people should have had the money long ago when it would have done them more good without interest than it would now with interest. I think the government are really waiting until half of these people die. Here is another case, affecting people who used to live in Toronto but who now live in Vancouver. It is a case of great hardship where a lady is suffering. She is awarded only $1,400. I am not asking that the big claims be paid in full, but I contend that claims up to $15,000 should be paid in full with interest. The government are in honour bound to do this and I hope at the next sitting they will change their minds in regard to the payment of interest on these small claims and will bring in a bill to cover the situation.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am interested in this question from the point of interest of quite a number of my constituents, both private parties and corporations. I listened this afternoon with scant patience and a good deal of indignation to the pussyfooting speech of the hon. the Secretary of State. This matter has been before the government for ten years. Ten years ago the then Secretary of State introduced a resolution into this house providing for payment on reparations account.

Mr. RINFRET: It was only three years ago, not ten years ago. I do not want to be alluding to that all the time, but I may say that it was a resolution that was put forward tentatively by the government and withdrawn.

Mr. CANTLEY: It was introduced in June, 1919, ten years ago, lacking one month, by the then Secretary of State.

Mr. RINFRET: June, 1925.

Mr. CANTLEY: No, it was in June, 1919. Is that not ten years ago lacking one month? What therefore is my hon. friend talking about?

Mr. RINFRET: If my hon. friend will allow me—

Mr. CANTLEY: I allowed my hon. friend this afternoon to talk a great deal of what I considered nonsense. His predecessor in June, 1919, introduced a resolution and I will read its terms.

Mr. RINFRET: It was in 1925.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister's predecessor.

Mr. RINFRET: We are not talking about the same thing.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am not referring to the minister; I am talking about certain actions

of his predecessor. The resolution was to provide that reparation payments should be turned over to the Secretary of State by the Minister of Finance and—

—that the Secretary of State should, on receipt of such payments, from time to time disburse the same to persons found entitled to claims for reparation in the commissioner's report, by way of pro rata dividend.

That was withdrawn.

Mr. RINFRET: I regret to rise again just to put the thing straight. That was moved by the Hon. Mr. Copp in 1925.

Mr. RYCKMAN: It was moved in 1919 almost before the hon. member was born or got any knowledge.

Mr. RINFRET: There was a resolution moved by the Hon. Mr. Copp in 1925.

Mr. RYCKMAN: That is another one. Get back to the facts. This was moved in 1919.

Mr. RINFRET: My hon. friend is rehashing the past. I was trying to deal with the present.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister is only making matters worse. Apparently there were two occasions on which the government came to a decision that the money ought to be paid. The minister wasted a great deal of time this afternoon on the same subject. The money is not yet paid over and nobody on this side of the chamber knows whether the government are going to pay in full now or not. Germany admitted that they were not able to pay all the losses occasioned by the war, but they said they would pay the losses occasioned to the civilian populations of the countries involved, and they have already contributed a very large amount for that purpose. This government has received over $21,500,000 which they hold plus a good deal of accumulated interest as from the date of the first payment, but nothing has been paid out yet. Hundreds of people in Nova Scotia and elsewhere in Canada have suffered and suffered severely for a long time. Some of the original sufferers are dead; many of them are in want. But the government insists, I think wrongfully, on withholding from those people money which should be paid to them on account of those losses. Germany paid that money on one account and one only; the government took that money from Germany, and if they do not pay it over to the people who sustained the losses, either they are guilty of taking money from Germany on false pretences or they are defrauding parties in this country who are entitled to those amounts—one or the other. I have scant respect for the idea that this money belongs to the state, come from what source it may. If the government cannot deal justly with money that comes into their hands for a specific purpose, then woe betide the country.

As regards the question of interest, the government have held this money for years. They have either spent the interest or saved it; it is immaterial which. The people to whom the awards were made by the government's own commissioners after evidence taken and inquiries made, are entitled to the payment not only of the amount awarded by the commissioners appointed by the government, but to the interest. As to that there is no possible doubt. I am at a loss to understand why this or any other government should insist on keeping in the treasury money which does not belong to them, and which they received for a specific purpose and which is due people who are and have been in needy circumstances for many years.

I apprehend that probably the present intention of the minister although it has not yet been disclosed, is to now vote a portion of the amount. Certainly that was his intention when he brought down the resolution in the first place. I anticipate now, from the hedging which has been exhibited in the house this afternoon, that he intends later to bring down a bill providing for the payment of the balance. I suggest to him that it would be better for him, better for his government and better for the well-being and honour of the Dominion of Canada that he should pay the full amount this year rather than next year immediately prior to a coming election. If he will take my advice in that matter, he will act accordingly. I only regret that I am not able to put this matter as effectively as I should like to. My leader has however, ably done so, and I again appeal to the government and to the minister to deal with this matter as they would deal with it if it were a matter in their own private business. We are sometimes told that members of the House of Commons coming here are sometimes not actuated by the best of motives. I repudiate that idea, which however the action of the government as outlined by the minister this afternoon goes far to give colour to. If the minister persists in the attitude which he has so far adopted a good many people in this country will have occasion to blaspheme.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would ask the hon. Secretary of State to take into consideration the real mind of this parliament, and I suggest that because he has shown himself dis-

posed not to put a limit upon the amount but rather to offer opportunity to increase it. I am familiar myself with many cases of hardship, and I think that nothing else will do but paying the full amount of these claims according to the judgments that have been given. The people of Canada will not be satisfied with less. You cannot pay just a certain percentage, 20 per cent or 50 per cent; you cannot single out some and deny others; you cannot make a choice between those who can afford to do without the awards and those who cannot. In a matter of this kind the full amount of the claim has to be reckoned. As the hon. gentleman who preceded me said, in 1919 the attitude then taken was to recognize these claims and to pay them. The Secretary of State says that it is an ex gratia payment. So it is in law. None of these private individuals would have a lawsuit against Germany; that is well understood, but that money has been paid in respect of a specific application, and I say it would be fraud on the part of this country if these claims were not recognized.

An automobile accident takes place. The father is in the car with his child. Both are injured. The father is awarded so much for himself and so much for his child. The child cannot take the money but his claim is paid; it is an ex gratia payment if you like, but who would say that the father could appropriate that money to himself? He is not allowed to touch a cent of it. So I say when this money has been given to Canada for a specific purpose, why should the Dominion of Canada say how that money should be spent? Why apply it to the consolidated revenue fund? Why should the government say: We are going to make a payment for which we should be complimented, if we recompense in part those who have suffered? Let me tell the Secretary of State that the people of Canada will never be satisfied unless the specific money has the specific application which it was intended to have, and I am satisfied that the people of this country will say that those who have suffered damages should be recompensed according to the judgments handed down.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): I am interested in the resolution which is before the committee because there are a few reparation claims in the province of Prince Edward Island now waiting to be adjusted. I think the viewpoint that has been expressed from the different parts of the house should convince the hon. Secretary of State that something further should be done before the matter is finally disposed of. I am sure that we are pleased at the attitude taken by the Secretary of State to-day, because I think we can read between the lines and see that he is ready to amend this legislation to meet as far as possible the views of the different sections of the house. I believe that in doing so he is acting wisely. I feel sure that unless this matter is dealt with in a way that will appeal to the claimants and also be approved by the people of the country generally, it will not be settled satisfactorily.

The bill provides for the settlement of some fourteen hundred claims. There are only a few others, no doubt large ones, but I think possibly the government would be well advised to endeavour to take care of them also.

My main object in rising at this stage is to advocate the payment of interest in connection with these claims. There are different reasons, and I think good reasons, that can be advanced in favour of that course. One is that the government has had this money for some time, and as has already been stated, the money has been earning interest for the government, so the government would not be much out of pocket if they paid the interest on these claims. Another reason, and I think it is perhaps a stronger one, is this: We are now acknowledging these claims. If we acknowledge these claims I contend that we are admitting the principle that that money has been held by the government in trust for the different claimants, and if the money has been so held by the government, it is in duty bound to pay interest on the claims.

The question next arises as to the date from which interest should begin. That is a very material matter to the claimants, because if you will read over the different claims you will find that a great many different dates have been stated. I have in mind two claims one of which I am interested in. Both these parties lost properties on the same date in 1918. The claims were adjusted by the same man, but he recommended that interest be paid in the one case from 1918, and in the other only from 1923. That is a matter that will have to be looked into very carefully before the money is paid over. I observe that the United States has admitted the payment of interest on all claims from the one date, from September 16, 1928. I do not know whether the claimants in Canada would be satisfied with a settlement of that kind—I do not think they would; but I think possibly the government could arrive at a decision to pay interest on all the claims from a certain date. That is a position which the government could very well take, and it is one to which not much objection could be

taken. We should approach this matter not in any spirit of party recrimination or fault-finding. The minister has shown his willingness to meet the views of the house, and I think we can trust him to do so. I am highly pleased with the attitude he has taken to-night. I feel that nothing that the government has done this session will be received in the country with more enthusiasm and more appreciation than its settlement of these claims. We have settled other claims in this parliament. We settled the claim of the automobile dealers who were asking for a refund some years ago; the Home bank depositors had their claims dealt with, and only to-day we passed a bill providing compensation for the postal workers in western Canada. I think therefore that the house would be well advised to go as far as we possibly can in adjusting these claims and making a clean job of the matter. Let us provide the money and the interest, and let the interest be fixed to run from a certain date, and then I think that the people will thank the government and the members who advocated this measure.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): I did not intend to take any part in this discussion, but sitting here and listening to the debate I have been deeply impressed with the injustice of the attitude which the government takes towards these claimants, these unfortunate people who are suffering because of the non-payment of debts that are due them fairly and honestly, and which the government holds the money to settle. I look upon it as nothing more nor less than misappropriation of funds. The payments were put off for a commission to examine the claims. The commission reported long ago, and yet we are told "Oh, well, these claims are not going to be paid; we want the use of this money a little longer." This is in line with the record of this government in connection with the Duncan report and with the fisheries commission. They appoint these commissions and then they take no action on their reports. I say to the government to-night that if the Duncan commission report is not fully implemented, and if the other commissions' reports are not dealt with, there will be another maritime rights agitation. and the government will be compelled by public opinion to take action, as they were compelled when they appointed the Duncan commission. I warn the government that will be the procedure in the maritime provinces, and if we cannot get what we are entitled to by a fair and moderate appeal, we will force the government to give us our just rights.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Rinfret thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 285 to provide for the payment of claims for compensation for loss sustained by the civil population of Canada during the late war.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Care of patients and medical examination of pensioners, $2,600,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Vote 232, page 63 of the estimates.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct my remarks to the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. King) with regard to this vote. The minister, of course, is perfectly well aware that the Department of Health was created in 1919 for several specific purposes, the more important of which have not been carried out by the department. The main activities of the department since that date have been generally in connection with various kinds of work which were formerly done by other departments. Those works were of importance in themselves, but they were very efficiently administered by other departments before the health department was brought into existence at all. In themselves they did not constitute a real cause for the organization of a department of health, and as a matter of fact they were not considered a reason for the creation of that department, but were simply thrown in, I might say, as ballast.

The conditions existing after the war had something to do with the creation of a health department. The control of venereal disease, the coordination of health activities of the provinces into a unit, and the establishment of a bureau of scientific research with regard to health, were the real basic reasons for the creation of a health department. Since that time it has not in any way attempted to implement the basic purposes for which it was created in 1919. So far as the control of venereal disease is concerned the department apparently thought they had done their duty when they relegated the matter to the provincial departments of health and gave them $100,000 a year to be distributed pro rata to population. Not even on the question of immigration, where large numbers of people were coming into this country, did the depart-

ment attempt to control this disease or to find out those suffering from it, although the department must have known quite well that in the free clinics of our various hospitals 60 per cent of those asking for free treatment for the disease were members of our foreign population. Scarcely anything was done to keep out that class of people; the only class they attempted to exclude were those suffering from syphilis.

In so far as coordination of the various health activities of the provinces is concerned, nothing was done but to appoint a Dominion council of health. That council was constituted of men eminent in the medical profession and in other walks of life, representing the departments of health in the various provinces and certain departments of the government as well as outside societies. I think the council was constituted of about fifteen members, but they were practically crippled in their efforts to do anything in relation to public health. They were earnest and desirous of doing something for the public health of Canada, but they were not given any facilities or any means by which they could carry any project to a successful conclusion. Consequently they confined their efforts to giving advice.

So far as the real basic reason for establishing the health department is concerned, that is, the bringing about of a bureau of scientific research, not even has it been spoken of so far as I know by any official of the department or by any member of the government. Since the day of the organization of the department nothing has been done in any way to establish a bureau of scientific research. I know the government has a laboratory of hygiene upon which a few thousands each year have been spent, but that has nothing whatever to do with scientific research. I do not wish to minimize the benefit of even the laboratory of hygiene, I think it has done fairly good work in looking after the purity of food, standardizing drugs, and also in analyzing patent and proprietary medicine. It has done some work of that kind; but with regard to the establishment of scientific research nothing has been done at all. I do not need to tell the minister, because he knows it himself, that the establishment of a real research institute properly equipped and manned would be one of the best agencies for the promotion of good health in Canada that could be had. He knows that it would be a centre around which the activities of the various provinces would revolve, and it would create in Ottawa a health department which would be an asset to the country instead of a liability. It would be a sort of clearing house for health information and would help to coordinate the activities of the various health departments in the provinces which are now doing good work. I am of the opinion that the establishment of a scientific research bureau is the one thing needed to coordinate the efforts of the various health departments of the nation into a unit which would perform a splendid service in the Dominion. There are many and substantial reasons why the government should take this matter into serious consideration at the earliest opportunity in the future and establish a bureau of scientific research.

The greatest asset of a country is its people, and the greatest asset of a people is good health. There is no doubt on that score. Good health gives a vigorous body, a sound mind and great mental activity, with initiative, resourcefulness and ability and courage to carry projects into effect. These attributes of body and mind are influenced by many factors, some of them natural and others under our control. Professor Fisher of Yale, making a demand for a scientific health institute in the United States, made the statement that the future belongs to the nation that has the greatest inventive genius. I think that is correct, but I would go further and say that, other things being equal, the future belongs to the nation that keeps the health of its people up to the highest standard. Mr. Hoover, making a speech in the city of New York only a short time ago, said that we were entering a period of increased competition from the reconstructed nations of Europe. That is quite correct; everyone will agree with it; and I might go further and say that increased population and the increased propagation of scientific knowledge and methods will increase competition still further, so that only those nations that are alive to the necessity of a vigorous citizenship will be able to take leadership or maintain it. Canada should have little difficulty in doing this because nature has endowed us with two of the main contributing factors. Nature has given us a splendid climate in a north temperate zone, a climate which is conducive to strong, vigorous and mentally active people. We have the nucleus of that people now, and Professor McLennan of Toronto university, when he appeared before the special committee on industrial research, made this statement with regard to our people:

> Canadians have an intellect, a freshness of mind, a virility, a broad outlook and a resourcefulness not excelled in any country in the world.

I think most hon. members in this house will agree with that statement. Again, we have a country teeming with natural resources of such a wide variety that we have the raw material for almost every kind of industry; and having the people there is no reason in the world why we should not forge ahead with great strides towards leadership amongst the nations. But, Mr. Chairman, great natural resources are of little use if the people have not the intelligence and energy enough to make use of them. Large areas of agricultural land are useful and valuable just in proportion to the quality and the extent of cultivation. Great mineral resources are valueless if they are left buried in the ground. It needs a healthy, energetic people to turn these resources into wealth. I say, therefore, that we in Canada are neglecting the greatest asset this country has. Are we going to continue in our present haphazard methods with regard to these conditions that exist to-day? We should give direction from the city of Ottawa to the health activities of the whole Dominion. The one thing needed to weld these various activities into an efficient whole that would give proper service is a bureau of scientific research in health, a bureau which would bring the brightest scientific minds in the medical profession into this city, giving them the facilities which would enable them to undertake research in the cure and prevention of disease. I do not think anyone in this chamber could estimate the value to the Dominion of Canada of a cure and preventive for the flu, or influenza, or even a common cold. It would be impossible to estimate the benefits that would accrue to mankind; you could not compute it in dollars and cents. It is beyond human computation. Yet that is something that will be found in the future, and it should be our duty at least to make an attempt in this Dominion to solve that problem. It is estimated that the deaths from flu in 1918 were many times greater than the number of deaths caused by the Great war. Senator Copeland, at one time Minister of Health in New York, said that the deaths caused by influenza in 1918 exceeded the deaths caused by all the wars of history. I should not care to go to that extent, but I am satisfied that the number was very large indeed. Professor Fisher of Yale university made an estimate of the economic loss to the United States in a single year from loss in wages due to preventable illness and premature deaths, and he placed that loss at fifteen billions of dollars. If that estimate is right as regards the United States, then the loss in Canada annually from the same cause amounts to between a billion and a billion and a half. Surely it is worth while on behalf of the people of this country for us to take such steps as we may to prevent such losses year by year.

The Great war stimulated medical and scientific research. It has been well said that necessity is the mother of invention, and the unusual difficulties with which the medical forces of the world armies were faced during the war stimulated them to find remedies to meet the various cases with which they had to deal. In all the previous wars of history disease carried off many times more soldiers than were killed by the enemy, but the Great war was a signal vindication of medical science. The war could not have been carried on but for the advances which have been made in medical and sanitary science during the last twenty-five years. Disease and pestilence would have decimated the armies if they had not been able to avail themselves of these discoveries.

Typhoid fever always has been the great scourge of war. During the South African war, in which only 200,000 men were engaged; 80 men died from typhoid to every 20 men who died from their wounds. There were over 60,000 cases of typhoid fever, with 8,227 deaths. During the Great war ten times that number of men were engaged in the British army; they were engaged in the field for four and a half years, yet during that time there were only 4,571 cases of typhoid fever with a mortality of 1.3 per cent. Through the advance of medical science the ratio of deaths from disease and deaths due to enemy bullets was reversed; 20 men died from disease to 80 men who died from wounds, and one writer has gone so far as to say that 95 per cent of the deaths in the Great war resulted from wounds and only 5 per cent from disease. The victory over typhoid fever was the greatest success of the war, and it was brought about by the use of a preventive serum and by sanitation, as far as that could be carried out.

Another great success of the war was the victory over tetanus. The medical corps of the different armies were very much exercised over the dangers which might exist in the highly cultivated soil of Flanders and France, which contained a large amount of fertilizer; it was realized that the soil would be teeming with the bacillus of tetanus. A serum had been developed previous to the war but had not been thoroughly tested; it was brought into use, and the results were wonderful. Tetanus was practically eliminated as a cause of death during the Great war.

Malaria has been stated by one writer to have been the cause of the fall of Rome and

the decadence of Greece. Malaria took a hand in the Great war; on the Macedonian and Mesopotamian fronts malaria was a more formidable enemy than the Bulgarian or Turkish troops. The mortality from that cause was very high; many men were invalided home and it cost the British government millions of pounds in after years to bring these men back to any degree of health, and many of them are still suffering from a recurrence of the disease. The campaign on the Gallipoli front was a failure because of malaria and dysentery among the troops. dysentery both of the amoebic and bacillary varieties. There was no real remedy at that time for these two diseases, which were mainly caused by the large number of flies in that hot climate, but before the campaign ended the medical service perfected two remedies which were very effective indeed, and from that time on the deaths were very few in comparison to what they had been previously.

A federal health institute of research has been provided for in the act which was passed in 1919, and all that is required is an amount of money placed in the estimates sufficient to care for the organization of that department. Subsection (a) of section 4 of chapter 24 provides for cooperation with the various health departments of the provinces, while subsection (b) provides for the establishment of a bureau of scientific research. In moving the second reading of the bill Mr. Rowell is reported at page 1171 of Hansard for 1919 as follows:

> —I should think that one of the natural and inevitable developments of a federfal department of health would be a bureau of scientific research in connection with it.

The power is there and, as I have said, the only thing lacking is an amount in the estimates sufficient to provide for the organization of this department. Professor Fisher of Yale, in advocating a health institute in the United States, said:

> The heads of all the leading research bodies and medical organizations testify that the proposed national institute of health will not duplicate their work, but will rather help to focus it better.

I am of opinion that a scientific institute here in Ottawa would focus the health activities of the Dominion and make them very much more effective. Such an institution would be a clearing house for the provinces, particularly with relation to epidemic diseases. At present there is no method by which the various activities of the provinces can be brought together and the information developed in one province communicated to the others. A scientfic research bureau here would accomplish that purpose.

In 1917, when the Military Service Act was enforced, a little over 50 per cent of the men examined were rejected because of disease; of 361,655 men examined 181,225 were rejected. Of those rejected almost 60 per cent were found physically unfit because of preventable diseases. Surely it is a severe indictment of the public health activities of the Dominion of Canada when so many men were found physically unfit because of diseases they should not have had.

A great deal of research work has been done, much of it by private individuals and by our universities in a rather desultory way; many men work by themselves, yet even so a great many discoveries of immense benefit to the world have been made. What is the value of those great discoveries of the past to the people of the world? Jenner discovered a vaccine for smallpox. Can anyone estimate the value of that one discovery? It goes on in increasing volume as the years go by and it will continue throughout the centuries. When a remedy is discovered for a disease the value continues for ever. Pasteur discovered a remedy for hydrophobia. Lister discovered antiseptics which revolutionzed surgery and made it possible to perform surgical operations which otherwise would have proved fatal. Cavities of the body may be invaded and diseased tissue removed with impunity because of that discovery. What is the value to be put upon the discoveries of Simpson and Morton in the matter of anaesthetics? Surgery was revolutionized when the groaning and struggling patient was made to lie quiet while the operation was performed without pain. Banting through his discovery of insulin has done a great deal for people suffering from diabetes. He has lengthened their lives and made them happier. Reed and Carroll discovered the cause of yellow fever and made it possible to complete the Panama canal. Klebs and Loeffler discovered the bacillus of diphtheria and made the first step in the direction of producing a serum which has practically eliminated that loathsome disease which is very fatal to children. Are these discoveries worth anything to the world? No one can estimate their value, and if anyone doubts their value he has only to get one of the diseases and he will realize what it means to him.

There are still many worlds to conquer in the realm of medicine and we should do our share in that regard, and at the same time consolidate our position with regard to the discoveries which have been made in the

past. At times such discoveries are not used because of the indifference of public health authorities and the ignorance of the people. I was interested in reading the other day an article by Doctor Rajchman, director of health organizations of the League of Nations, in which he drew attention to the fact that smallpox had not yet been eliminated from the world although we had a very effective remedy in the vaccine discovered by Jenner. Many people have a feeling that the vaccine caused other diseases. He gave a list of the epidemics which have occurred in the last few years, as follows:

Minneapolis	1925
Detroit	1924
Los Angeles	1927
Algeria	1927
Rio de Janiero	1926

He reported that in 1927 there were 280,000 certified cases of smallpox reported in the world, and during that same year 50,000 deaths occurred in India from the same disease. He also reported that the death rates in these epidemics ranged from 10 to 30 per cent. In 1927 there was an epidemic of smallpox in Indiana, which has no compulsory vaccination law. In 1885 there was an epidemic of smallpox in Montreal and Quebec, and 7,000 deaths. In 1884, the previous year, the Ontario Medical Health Act was passed. As soon as the outbreak occurred in Quebec the Ontario health authorities organized 563 local boards of health and appointed 283 medical officers and 160 sanitary inspectors. They enforced compulsory vaccination and the result was that the epidemic was stopped in that province with a loss of only 18 lives. That illustrates what can be done when science is fully organized.

In 1928 the city of Olean, New York, had an epidemic of typhoid fever caused by infected water. Actions were brought against the health department and judgments were granted to the amount of $350,000. Application was made to the state legislature for an enabling act to allow them to issue bonds to pay these damages, and they will be paying for the neglect of their health department for the next twenty years. The city of Albany, New York, has also had judgments rendered against it for the same cause, and I should think the city of Ottawa would take warning. No city I have ever visited had so vile a water supply as this city.

What is being done outside of looking after the human element in the Dominion of Canada? When I consider the estimates for other departments I find that more is being done for them than is being done for the public health of the country. In 1916 the national research council was set up to promote the utilization of our natural resources and to find means of using the waste products from the same, as well as to carry on other duties. This council is composed of some of the most prominent scientists of Canada. The council has given 344 scholarships to 199 persons who have shown special adaptability for scientific research. Young men are being turned out in our universities trained in medical and other sciences, but year after year they go to the United States and the universities of that country are filled with Canadians who have been trained here. They have been forced to take that step because we do not employ them.

We spend millions on agriculture and we have brought it to a very high state of efficiency. The 1930 estimates for this department amount to $8,483,000. Of that amount $2,450,000 is being asked for the health of animals branch, and $1,530,000 for the improvement of live stock. That amount spent upon the public health of Canada would be very acceptable, and would make a very splendid contribution to scientific research.

The estimates of this year include an item of $730,540 for the mines and geological survey. Of that amount $257,000 is for the investigation of mineral resources and deposits, and $363,000 for the geological survey.

We are spending $2,403,000 in an endeavour to make the fishing industry of this country profitable. Of that amount $442,000 is for the culture of fish, $301,000 for scientific and practical work, making a total of $743,000 spent in scientific work for the benefit of the fisheries of this country.

Mr. BENNETT: With very little advantage.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): With very little advantage. As regards immigration we have this year a grant of $1,300,000 for immigration societies, women's hostels, and contingencies and a grant of $1,000,000 for the empire settlement scheme, making a total of $2,300,000 to bring people into this country, and yet we neglect the people we have at home. We do not look after their health and we are losing many of them prematurely because of inactivity in our public health departments. For the health of the people of Canada how much do we spend? This year for the laboratory of hygiene we have an estimate of $150,000; for the control of venereal disease, $100,000, for quarantine, $240,000. Quarantine properly belongs to the Department of Immigration. The appropriation is largely spent in connection with that, although

some of it, I am sure, is spent in connection with quarantine stations for other purposes. That makes a total of $490,000 for the health of human beings in Canada. It is surely a reflection on the intelligence of the Dominion parliament that such a situation exists to-day Millions for the health of animals, millions for bringing immigrants into Canada, and millions for mining and fishing, but a paltry five hundred thousand dollars to improve the condition of health of the people.

I do not intend to labour this question much further, but I should like to read what President Hoover has to say with regard to the situation in the United States and his desire for further organization of the health department. In his speech made on March 1 of this year Mr. Hoover says this:

> Public health service should be as fully organized and as universally incorporated into our governmental system as our public education system to-day. The returns are a thousandfold in economic benefits and infinitely more in reduction of suffering and promotion of human happiness.

I direct the attention of the Minister of National Health to these statements and I would say that if next year he will decide to insert in the estimates an amount that will provide a building, equip and man it for the purpose of scientific research in health, the money will be returned to him, not a thousandfold, but many thousandfold, and if in future years they are able to find a remedy and preventive for the flu, the amount spent will return to him so many times over that he will be surprised. I therefore ask the minister to take this matter into his serious consideration and turn the present Health department of the Dominion of Canada, which is now doing some work but which is inefficient and not carrying out the provisions of the Health Act as it was intended by the government and parliament which passed it in 1919, into a real asset to the country so that it will be worthy of his tenure of office.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I supplement what the last speaker has said in his very excellent address by a few statements which I should like to place on the record as appearing in a pamphlet issued by the Canadian Social Hygiene Council, as follows:

> Figures would appear to prove that from 45 to 60 per cent of all disabling illness is of external origin and, therefore, within the possibility of prevention.
>
> Various authentic estimates would show that 2 to 3 per cent of the total population is continuously ill.
>
> Of the population of Canada, 30 per cent are adult males; 30 per cent are adult females.
>
> It is thus estimated that 54,000 adult males are continuously ill. This amount of illness would suggest that in the adult male population alone there are lost each year 16,200,000 working days.
>
> Calculations show that, for every 20 males gainfully employed, there are aproximately 6 females similarly employed. This would suggest that, in addition, the female population loses 4,800,000 working days per year.
>
> Total loss per year—21,000,000 working days; at least 50 per cent preventable.
>
> Superfluous loss per year 10,500,000 working days.
>
> It is important to bear in mind that the resultant cost must be reckoned not only in terms of loss of pay to employees, but also in terms of diminished output, disorganization of industry and other economic results.
>
> It is estimated that the total cost of illness to the Dominion of Canada per year is $270,000,000, which equals 75 per cent of the total expenditure of the Dominion Government for 1924.

This pamphlet is several years old. There has been little opportunity for discussing this matter and now I do not want to say very much with regard to it. It is most unfortunate that there is no provision in this house for the careful study of an important ques- of this kind. I would venture to suggest that we could not do better than set up a committee on public health that would definitely devote itself to a study of the whole field of public health. Here we come to a Friday evening at nearly 11 o'clock, and this is about the only opportunity we have in the course of the whole session for a discussion of a question of this kind.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): We shall have more.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I hope we shall, and I think the doctors might well take the lead in this matter. I know the public would respond if they would take the lead in a progressive policy of this kind. While the discussion was going on, I glanced around the chamber and I found there were only thirty members present.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Six on the government side at one time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I noticed nine on the government side when I made my observation, but in any case there were only thirty people in the house for a discussion of an important question of this kind. I can only hope that the medical men in the house will give us a lead, and I am quite sure the public outside will support any reasonable expenditure in connection with public health.

Mr. McGIBBON: I know the minister does not expect to get much through to-night, but I think it is his duty to give the committee a resumé of the doings in his department. I

have been in the house for a good many years. I was one who helped to bring the Health Act into existence. With one exception I have never known anything to happen but what has happened to-night; at eleven o'clock on Friday night the estimates of this department have always been brought in. I think this is a reflection upon the intelligence of the house, upon the people of Canada and upon the minister and the government who have for ten years sat in office and have had at their disposal a department which should be a most useful one in this or any other government. I say without contradiction that it has failed in every particular for which it was brought into existence. The minister smiles. On Monday probably I will give him some facts that may change that smile. I remember quite well, when this act was brought down in the old museum, the late Mr. Carvell coming to me afterwards and saying: "McGibbon, you are only making positions for a lot more employees; you are only going to add to the country's expense; you will accomplish nothing." I was shocked that a minister of the crown should make such a statement upon such a subject. I have said before that I was speaking as a prophet, and to-night the voice of history records the accuracy of my prophecy as to the accomplishments of this department, which have been nothing up to the present time. It has been nothing but a bill of expense to the country, and it has failed in every particular to do what it was intended it should do. I intend to have something more to say on this subject on Monday. As it is now five minutes to eleven, I do not suppose the minister expects to get any estimates through to-night, and I think he should come to this house on Monday or whenever the estimates come up again prepared to give parliament and the country some account of his stewardship during the last five or six years. The report which has been handed out by the department is nothing but a catalogue.

Mr. BENNETT: And no bargains in it.

Mr. McGIBBON: No, not for the country. It is simply a rehash of the doings of the mounted police, a reprinting of some reports from the Ontario Department of Health, and other departments of the government; but as to the essential purposes for which the department was created, to look after and improve the health of the people of this country, you can read the report from cover to cover and you will find it is absolutely devoid of imagination or any new suggestions. It is simply a reprint by the department of what has been done in other departments of the government. It makes a show of having a department here that they call a Department of Health, but which has no more to do with health than with mines.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As it is near eleven o-clock I shall not attempt to reply to-night to my hon. friends who have just spoken. I am sure we all enjoyed the excellent review of medicine and medical history given by my hon. friend from Halton. It was especially interesting to those of us who are of the medical profession. This, of course, would not be the time to discuss the matters brought forward by my hon. friend. The vote under consideration is one dealing with the care of patients and the examination of pensioners. Later on we shall come to the estimates to maintain what is known as the Health section.

In regard to this department my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. McGibbon) indicated that as a member of the house at the time he had a great deal to do with the enactment that brought into being the Health department. I shall take occasion to deal with that subject when the estimates of the Health section are under consideration. It is all right for us to say that there is a great field in health measures. That is recognized the world over, but under the practice that has existed in Canada up to the present and as is provided for in the bill, these matters come under the provinces and under the municipalities.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the minister cite the clause in the British North America Act which states that public health is a provincial matter?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not need to do that. I can cite the section from the Department of Health Act itself.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The minister said under our constitution.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I said that it had been the practice.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Under the constitution.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not under the constitution; I said in the bill, but it is under the constitution also, and if my hon. friend will take the pains to consult the Justice department he will be so advised. My hon. friends who are complaining in regard to the activities of this department should read the legislation which they say had a great deal to do in improving, bringing into being the Health department. Section 7 of the Department of Health Act says:

Nothing in this act or in any regulations made hereunder shall authorize the minister or any officer of the department to exercise any jurisdiction or control over any provincial or municipal board of health or other health authority operating under the laws of any province.

Mr. ANDERSON: The minister surely does not mean that that applies to a national bureau of research.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is quite different; I was not speaking of that, I shall deal with that later, because we have progressed in the matter of a bureau of research and moneys are being voted this year for the establishment in the city of Ottawa of research laboratories, laboratories which I believe the Health department will be able to utilize for the advantage of the people of Canada.

Mr. McGIBBON: Are these laboratories for fundamental or applied science?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): An arrangement will be made whereby the Department of Health will have the opportunity to carry on scientific investigations in these laboratories.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister said they were in existence.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If my hon. friend will permit me, I shall speak of that matter later. As I said when I rose, I do not propose to-night to make any extended explanation of these matters, because this is not the time or place. The vote called is the one dealing with the care and treatment of patients, and that means the care and treatment in the departmental hospitals of our men who served overseas.

Mr. BENNETT: Put on the record the story of the various units in which they are lodged and cared for.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Under this vote we provide for the care and maintenance in outside institutions and in mental institutions of the men who served overseas and who suffered disabilities; also for drugs, medical and surgical supplies, and dental treatment and supplies, medical examination and observation of pensioners, manufacture and purchase of orthopedic, ophthalmic and surgical appliances, supplies and repairs, and for the transportation of patients and pensioners.

Under the heading of departmental institutions the expenditure was $797,004.38; in outside hospitals and for doctors, $1,252,661.93; indirect charges, transportation of patients, escorts $50,085.61; funeral expenses $25,673.24; expenses of travelling medical boards $5,062.27; transportation of pensioners $47,576.24, or a total of $128,397.96. The expenditure for limb factory operations was $263,204.22. Altogether the total expenditure was $2,441,268.49.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): As the item is worded it consists of two parts, pensions and health. We are now dealing with the first part, pensions, and in order to save time I would ask the minister to come prepared on Monday or when next his estimates are up to give an account of what has been done by way of reorganization in that department; second, the amount apportioned under this heading to each province. It would save time if the minister would also give the same information with regard to pensions. Third, as to sheltered employment, and fourth, as to the officers who have been retired within the last two years and those who have been added to the staff by provinces, together with the allowances to those who retired.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be glad to gather that information for my hon. friend.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Monday, May 20, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

MONTREAL RAILWAY TERMINALS

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I was asked a day or two ago to make such provision as would enable members of the house generally to acquire information respecting the proposals contained in the Montreal terminals bill which has been referred to the railway committee. I wish to announce that models and maps are now in the railway committee room and will be there until Thursday, when the railway committee will meet to consider the matter. It will be appreciated if members generally will avail themselves of the opportunity to secure information regarding the Montreal terminals scheme. Officials will be present to explain any feature to any member desirous of securing that information.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 259, for the relief of Grace Viola Byers.—Mr. Hay.

Bill No. 260, for the relief of Mildred Soden.—Mr. Hay.

Bill No. 265, for the relief of Gordon Hanna.—Mr. Rowe.

Bill No. 282, respecting The New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Bourgeois.

Bill No. 284, respecting a certain patent of Cobb Connector Company.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 288, for the relief of George Stanley Warner.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 289, for the relief of Vincenzina Gramigna.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 292, for the relief of Kenneth Evan Thompson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 293, for the relief of Thomas Matthews Moland.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 294, for the relief of Andrew Townsley Hirch.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Motions for first readings agreed to on division.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

PASSENGER STEAMERS IN NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. MACDOUGALL:

1. What are the names of the boats which carried passengers and plied between Nova Scotia ports, one or more of which are in Cape Breton island, in 1926, 1927, and 1928?
2. Did the Department of Marine investigate each of such boats in each year to see if it complied with the law?
3. If so, what are the detailed requirements of each of such boats which it investigated, regarding certificated officers, and life equipment, and to what extent did it not comply?
4. If not, what are the names of the boats the department did not investigate in each year?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. According to the records of the marine branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries the following boats were engaged in the carriage of passengers between or to and from ports in Cape Breton in 1926, 1927, and 1928:—

Arichat, 1926, 1927; Aspy, 1926, 1927, 1928; Blue Hill, 1926, 1927, 1928; Boularderie, 1926, 1928; Bras D'Or, 1926, 1927, 1928; Breton, 1928; Electronic, 1926, 1927, 1928; Grandona, 1928; Harry Mathers, 1926 (as SS. Richmond, 1927, 1928); Kinburn, 1926, 1927, 1928; Lakeview, 1926, 1927, 1928; Magdalen, 1927, 1928; Mary, 1926, 1927, 1928; Pearl Can, 1926, 1927, 1928; Peerless, 1926, 1927, 1928; Pont de Canseau, 1926, 1928; Prince Albert, 1927, 1928; Richmond (See SS. Harry Mathers above); Robert G. Cann, 1926, 1927, 1928; Scotia No. I, 1927, 1928; Scotia No. II, 1926, 1927, 1928; Sir Charles Tupper, 1928.

2. The boats were inspected by federal government steamship inspectors in the years set opposite their names in the answer to No. 1 above.

3. Certified officers—(a) Master—certificate as master of a passenger boat is required; (b) Mate—in the case of a steamboat over 400 tons registered tonnage or carrying over 40 passengers, a properly certificated mate is also required; (c) Engineers—the chief and other engineers must each hold a proper engineer's certificate or permit according to the nominal horse-power of the engine.

Life-saving equipment—(a) Life-boat or buoyancy apparatus accommodation for all passengers and crew; (b) Life jackets for all passengers and crew.

At the time of inspection non-compliance with requirements was found as follows:—Boularderie, 1926, engineer had no permit; 1928, engineers had no permits, 2 life-buoys required; Breton, 1928, engineers had no permits; Grandona, 1928, no certificated master, engineer had no permit, buoyant apparatus not fitted, 2 life-buoys required; Pont de Canseau, 1926, life-boats not approved, engineer had no permit; 1928, no certificated master or mate, 2nd engineer had no permit; Sir Charles Tupper, no certificated master or mate, 2nd engineer had no permit.

Note.—The Boularderie and Breton were being operated by the one crew of 4. The Pont de Canseau and Sir Charles Tupper were being operated by the one crew of 6.

4. Answered by No. 1.

EXCISE OFFICERS IN WESTMORLAND AND GLOUCESTER

Mr. PRICE:

1. How many excise officers are engaged in Westmorland and Gloucester counties, New Brunswick?
2. What are their names?
3. What salary does each receive?

Mr. EULER:

1. 16 customs excise officers at ports.
   8 customs excise officers on preventive service.

2 and 3.

Place—Name—Salary

Moncton, N.B., J. A. Girouard, $2,640 per annum; Moncton, N.B., F. A. Conroy, $1,740 per annum; Moncton, N.B., A. W. Henry, $1,740 per annum; Moncton, N.B., E. J. C. LeBlanc, $2,040 per annum; Moncton, N.B., O. B. McQuarrie, $1,740 per annum; Moncton, N.B., S. B. Murray, $1,740 per annum; Moncton, N.B., M. C. Steeves, $2,280 per annum; Moncton, N.B., R. H. Stewart, $1,500 per annum; Moncton, N.B., A. M. Frier, $900 per annum; Sackville, N.B., F. W. George, $1,920 per annum; Sackville, N.B., R. W. Duncan, $1,740 per annum; Sackville, N.B., J. C. Harper, $900

Place—Name—Salary

per annum; Bathurst, N.B., J. E. White, $1,920 per annum; Bathurst, N.B., A. E. Landry, $1,200 per annum; Bathurst, N.B., A. A. Blanchard, $960 per annum; Bathurst, N.B., A. G. Robichaud, $1,020 per annum.

The following officers are on the preventive service and are not allocated to any particular county or district but are mobile officers:

Name—Salary

G. W. Allen, $1,500 per annum; L. A. Chiasson, $1,200 per annum; P. O. Gauvin, $1,320 per annum; J. R. McKinnon, $1,500 per annum; P. G. Robichaud, $1,080 per annum; E. B. Savage, $1,500 per annum; M. Theriault, $1,320 per annum; A. G. Veniot, $1,800 per annum.

CANADA'S GOLD RESERVE

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. Referring to the statement of the Minister of Finance in this house on May 13th on "Canada's gold reserve", how much gold was held on March 30th at the Royal Mint, Ottawa, by the treasury of the Dominion of Canada?
2. Does the Royal Mint, Ottawa, hold gold other than for the treasury of the Dominion of Canada?
3. If so, what was the value of this gold on March 30th, and for whose acount was it held?
4. Referring to return of chartered banks for March 30th, 1929, third column of assets, "current gold and subsidiary coin, total", how much of this sum is gold?
5. What gold supplies are held by the chartered banks in addition to that referred to in the above questions and in addition to the gold in the central gold reserve?

Mr. ROBB:

1. $557,036.01.
2. No.
3. Answered by 2.
4. Returns made by banks do not show gold separately. So far as holdings in Canada are concerned, some $40,000,000 are in gold.
5. According to returns made by chartered banks, none.

MR. JAMES W. THORNTON

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. Is one James W. Thornton a member of the secretariat of the Canadian delegation at Geneva?
2. Has he passed any civil service examination?
3. What salary does he receive, and is such salary paid by the Canadian government?
4. Is he a son of the president of the Canadian National Railways?
5. What are the names of the other members of the secretariat of the Canadian delegation at Geneva, and what are the salaries paid to them?
6. What are the names of any of these members who have passed civil service examinations?

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No
2. No information.
3. No salary is, or has been, paid by the Canadian government.
4. No information.
5. The members of the staff of the Canadian advisory officer, Geneva, and salaries paid are as follows:—

Col. Vanier, $4,745; Mr. McGreer, $3,240; Miss Clark, $1,620; Miss McLennan, $1,200.

6. Mr. McGreer.

COST OF MOVING GOLD

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What does it cost per $1,000 to move gold from Ottawa or Montreal to New York?
2. What has been the average exchange rate during January, February, March and April, respectively, in 1929, between Canada and the United States?
3. Is it true that Canada sent the following amount of gold to the United States this year per month: January, $39,000,000; February, $3,000,000; March, $1,500,000; and April, practically nothing?
4. Is it a fact that of the $192,000,000 in Dominion notes issued as in February, 1929, the banks had $164,000,000 in legals, leaving approximately $28,000,000 in general, or hand to hand circulation?
5. When the banks need gold can they present Dominion notes and get specie from the Department of Finance?
6. If the banks exercised their rights now in asking for Dominion notes to be redeemed, would it not have a tendency to bring on a deflation in prices?

Mr. ROBB:

1. Approximately 11/64th of one per cent.
2. New York Funds, January, 1929, 15/64 pm.; February, 1929, 21/64 pm.; March, 1929, 37/64 pm.; April, 1929, 49/64 pm.
3. Exports of gold from Canada to United States: January, 1929, $37,992,621; February, 1929, $5,659,412; March, 1929, $4,339,411; April, 1929, $1,955,490.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. The exercising of the "rights" suggested in this question to such an extent as to bring about a deflation of prices by depletion of the gold reserves need not be seriously considered as, under the provisions of the Bank Act, each bank must hold at all times forty per cent of its cash reserves in Dominion notes and, further, an additional large amount of Dominion notes, particularly of the denominations of $1 and $2 is required for circulation with the public, the banks not being permitted to issue their own notes for amounts less than $5; deducting such notes from the total of our outstanding notes issued against

gold, the balance would not be available or sufficient to diminish seriously the gold reserves with the treasury.

There being a divergence of views held by various financial authorities as to relative importance of any one of the various conditions which operate towards deflation of prices, it would serve no good purpose to put forth an opinion as to the effect, if any, towards deflation of prices of suppositious transactions such as the reexchanging of Dominion notes, now doing the work of gold held in trust in the Dominion treasury, for the actual possession of the gold itself.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

LETTERS OF CREDIT

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What is the total amount of letters of credit for each department for the year 1927-1928?
2. Is the expenditure made under letters of credit audited by the Auditor General before or after the banks have been repaid?

Mr. ROBB: Order for return, which I now table.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

FISH TRAPS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—JUDGE ELLIS, COMMISSIONER

Mr. BRADY:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions and any other communications between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and any other persons or bodies, with reference to the appointment of Judge Ellis to sit in commission and take evidence in regard to the establishment of fish traps or otherwise in northern British Columbia waters.

GUS CARRIER—PRINCE ALBERT PENITENTIARY

Mr. CLARK:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to Gus Carrier, Prince Albert penitentiary, from January 1, 1925, to date.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): This man is an officer at the Prince Albert penitentiary and the matter in question is one of administration and discipline, which is presently under consideration by the department. I really cannot see that it would be in the public interest to lay these documents on the table; as a matter of fact there are no documents excepting reports by inspectors and the exchanges between the superintendent and the inspectors.

Mr. CLARK: Why should a member of parliament be denied access to that file?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because it is a matter of discipline and it would not make for good administration to take such action. After all, that is the practice. If the matter were settled it might be different, but it is actually under consideration now.

Mr. CLARK: Without entering into a debate on the question, would the minister let this motion stand for another day?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Very well. I am sure if my hon. friend knew what is involved in the matter he would not insist.

Mr. BENNETT: He persists because he does know about it.

Motion stands.

ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents relating to the activities of the Communist party of Canada during the year 1928?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is another case in which I must be disagreeable, but in connection with police reports concerning the communists or any other persons in Canada, they are strictly confidential, and I will not lay those papers on the table.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would point out that the Communist party is a political party in this country at present; in my own city of Winnipeg there is a member of the city council who belongs to that party, and they have run candidates in federal and provincial elections as well.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: On a point of order I would submit that if my hon. friend desires to debate this resolution he cannot do so now; he will have to transfer it to another order, and it will come up at the proper time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I was hoping the minister might reconsider his stand.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I certainly will not lay the police reports on the table.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then I would like to have this motion transferred to the other order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion will be dropped.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Transferred to motions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It will be dropped from this order and transferred to the other order.

Motion dropped.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 103, for the relief of Constance Mary Kearns.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 110, for the relief of Edna Louise Brown.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 117, for the relief of Wallace Evered Gillespie.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 122, for the relief of Florence May Forbes.—Mr. Bell (Hamilton West).

Bill No. 182, for the relief of Maud Parker. —Mr. Church.

Bill No. 183, for the relief of Eleanor Vair. —Mr. Church.

Bill No. 190, for the relief of Lillian Augusta Dunn.—Mr. Tummon.

Bill No. 192, for the relief of Catherine Goring.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 196, for the relief of Ivy Georgina Lloyd.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 197, for the relief of Helen Steele. —Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 200, for the relief of Annie Forbes Sangster.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 203, for the relief of Charles Stanley Cuneo.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 204, for the relief of William Allan Griffith.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 205, for the relief of Sydney Bishop. —Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 206, for the relief of Walter Henry Lyne Dixson.—Mr. Tummon.

Motions for third readings agreed to on division.

SUSANNAH MUSSON SAVERY

The house in committee on Bill No. 156, for the relief of Susannah Musson Savery—Mr. Bell (Hamilton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): One child, Mr. Chairman, who is now in the care of the petitioner.

Section agreed to.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

On section 2—Right to marry again.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to ask what the effect of this section really is. If I understand the matter aright, the solemnization of marriage is entirely a provincial matter. Both in the province of Ontario and in the province of Quebec, it is placed in the hands of the clergymen of the various religious bodies. We are told that certain churches in this country are opposed to divorce and refuse to allow remarriage. That means that a large number of clergymen both in the province of Ontario and Quebec absolutely refuse to conduct a marriage ceremony where the parties have been divorced. I take it that that means that those clergymen refuse to be bound by the findings of this parliament. We give the right to the innocent party to remarry, and by inference that right is given also to the other party, but certain clergymen refuse to be bound by the decision of this house. They set themselves up as being superior to parliament and refuse to permit the marriage of those people who this parliament say may be remarried. Perhaps it may be a theoretical question as to which is supreme, parliament or the church, but there is a practical aspect to this matter. As I have said, the solemnization of marriage in these two provinces is left in the hands of the officials of the various churches. In practice, that means that it is very, very difficult to secure a clergyman in Ontario or Quebec who is willing to remarry divorced people. It is possible in Great Britain for divorced people to be remarried before a justice of the peace. I do not know whether that is possible in any of our provinces, but it certainly is not possible in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec from which most of these cases originate.

Mr. NEILL: You cannot be married by a justice of the peace in Great Britain.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: By a magistrate.

Mr. FORKE: You can marry much easier than that in Scotland.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think I am correct, Mr. Chairman, when I say that there is a provision in Great Britain for civil marriage.

Mr. NEILL: That is a different thing; that is performed by a registrar, not a justice of the peace. I am perfectly correct in saying that a justice of the peace has no right to marry in Great Britain.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I accept the correction, but the point I was trying to make is that there is provision for civil marriage. I am told that in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec there is no provision for civil marriage, which means that these people will have to go to a clergyman to be remarried and since a great many of the religious bodies are opposed to the marriage of divorced people it will mean, as far as these two provinces are concerned, that this clause 2 amounts to very little. The person who has been given the right to remarry will have to go up and down the country in an endeavour to find a clergyman who will consent to perform the marriage ceremony. I raise this point simply because it reveals a very anomalous situation in that this parliament is given distinct jurisdiction over marriage and divorce while the provinces have jurisdiction over the solemnization of marriage.

Mr. MARCIL: Mr. Chairman, my well founded opinion, after many years in parliament, is that at least one-half or three-quarters of these applications would not be made if this second clause was not included in the bill. It has always been my opinion that a grave injustice is done by placing the guilty party upon the same footing as the innocent party. It is bad enough to give the innocent party power to remarry without giving the same power to the other party. As regards the religious law, if members of the Roman Catholic church want to comply with its rules and regulations, that church does not permit the remarriage of divorced people. The church of England in Canada has also made it known that it will not allow the remarriage of divorced people. There is good authority for that point of view in the Bible if those who are interested would only read the words of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. I hold that these churches are not governed, so far as their rules and regulations are concerned, by any decision of parliament. The religious authority is quite independent of the civil authority, and while the civil authority has complete jurisdiction within its own domain, in the religious domain each church is quite independent of parliament. I regret once more that parliament is allowing such a large number of divorce bills to go through, over three hundred of them, without full evidence, because the two parties have not been heard. We are giving a decision on ex parte evidence and I am glad to see that in the province of Ontario, where the great majority of these applications come from, there is a movement looking to a change in the procedure so that the power of granting divorces may be taken away altogether from the Dominion parliament.

Section agreed to

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

MARY BERTHA DUPUIS RANGER

House in committee on Bill No. 193, for the relief of Mary Bertha Dupuis Ranger.—Mr. Millar—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. MILLAR: There are no children.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 224, for the relief of John Carbery Hickman.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 225, for the relief of Lydia Alice Hinch.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 226, for the relief of Allan Plant.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 230, for the relief of Frederick Herman Schelke.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 232, for the relief of Alma Berlinda Swayne.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 240, for the relief of Frances Vera Carter Van Luven.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 243, for the relief of James Collingwood Darroch.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 244, for the relief of Ross James Smalley.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 248, for the relief of Fanny Green Fuchs Webber.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 249, for the relief of Henry Lawrence Jones.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 256, for the relief of Dean William Moncrieff.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 257, for the relief of William John Brett.—Mr. Heaps.

Bill No. 264, for the relief of Edna Marguerite Stroud Robinson.—Mr. Cahan.

Bill No. 266, for the relief of Joseph Richardson.—Mr. Young (Saskatoon; for Mr. McPhee).

Bill No. 269, for the relief of Angus John Archibald Blaine.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 271, for the relief of George Melville Fulton.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 276, for the relief of Gertrude Georgeanna Anderson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 277, for the relief of Lloyd Edward Angel.—Mr. Ladner.

Motions for second readings agreed to, on division.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 251, to ratify and confirm the organization and the election of directors of Family Trust, and to change the name of that company to Financial Trust Company. —Mr. Laflamme.

SOCKEYE SALMON FISHERIES TREATY

REFERENCE OF CONVENTION TO MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

On the notice of motion of the Secretary of State for External Affairs:

Resolved that it is expedient that parliament do approve of the convention for the protection, preservation and extension of the sockeye salmon fisheries in the Fraser river system, which was signed at Washington on the twenty-seventh day of March, nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, on behalf of His Majesty for the Dominion of Canada, by the plenipotentiary named therein, and that this house do approve of the same.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It has been intimated to the government that some hon. members of the house would like to have detailed information with respect to this treaty. In order to supply the information which they wish to have, it would appear to be desirable to have the resolution referred to an appropriate committee of the house where that information could be given. In the form in which the motion stands, it being a motion to approve a convention, nothing more is contemplated than formal approval after consideration of the resolution by this house while the Speaker is in the chair; it is not contemplated to have the resolution as it stands referred to the committee of the whole house. In the circumstances, believing that the select standing committee on marine and fisheries is perhaps the best committee to deal with this particular convention, I move:

That the subject matter of the government notice of motion standing on the order of proceedings for this day respecting the protection, preservation and extension of the sockeye salmon fisheries in the Fraser river system be referred to the select standing committee on marine and fisheries.

Among other advantages of having the resolution so referred is that of enabling the committee to hear at first hand from the officers of the department who have had to do with the negotiation of the treaty itself.

[Mr. Millar.]

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the course suggested by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is one which commends itself to our judgment for it affords an opportunity for detailed consideration of the merits of the treaty that might otherwise be denied, and I have great pleasure in supporting the motion that has just been made.

While I am on my feet may I venture to suggest to the right hon. the Prime Minister, as indeed I have already done, that he consider the propriety of approving a treaty of this character by legislation rather than by resolution. I shall not discuss that at this moment, but I think if he will look into it he will satisfy himself that this form of treaty which in its substance involves future legislation should be approved itself by an act of parliament. I have gathered together some of the authorities, and I shall be glad at a future time to give them to the right hon. gentleman. I think myself that the matter should be dealt with by a substantive bill and not by a mere resolution.

Motion agreed to.

GENEVA PROTOCOL

PROHIBITION OF POISONOUS GASES AND BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE

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

That it is expedient that parliament do approve of the protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare, which was signed at Geneva on the seventeenth day of June, nineteen hundred and twenty-five, on behalf of His Majesty for the Dominion of Canada, by the plenipotentiary named therein, and that this house do approve of the same.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as you have just indicated in reading the resolution, this protocol was signed at Geneva in June, 1925—signed, I understand, by some thirty-four different countries, including Great Britain and Canada. The protocol has since been ratified by a number of countries, but has not been ratified by either Great Britain or Canada.

At the meeting of the preparatory commission on disarmament which was held at Geneva this spring, Lord Cushendun, on behalf of His Majesty's government in Great Britain, intimated that it was the intention of His Majesty's government in Great Britain to ratify the protocol, subject to two reservations, the first being that its provisions should bind only vis-a-vis such countries as are also parties to the protocol; and the second being

that the provisions should cease to bind vis-a-vis a contracting party which ceases to observe the protocol's provision.

We instructed our representative on the preparatory commission on disarmament, Mr. Riddell, to inform the commission that it was the intention of the Dominion government to ask the approval of parliament to the protocol in order that it might be ratified at the same time on behalf of Canada as it is ratified on behalf of His Majesty's government in Great Britain. It is for that reason that the house is now being asked to approve the protocol. I do not think it necessary to go into the provisions of the protocol. They speak for themselves—" the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare."

Mr. CAHAN: Will the government of Canada make the two same reservations?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thank my hon. friend for asking the question. I should certainly have said that it is our intention that the instrument of ratification should contain the same reservations on behalf of Canada as are being made by His Majesty's government in Great Britain. The protocol is to assist in making binding upon the conscience and practice of nations the provisions which it contains, and thereby help establish international law in that particular.

Mr. BENNETT: Has the senate of the United States ratified the protocol?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not aware that the senate has.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the precedent has just been set in the previous resolution of reference to the most appropriate committee. Several years ago at the Prime Minister's own suggestion the committee on industrial relations was enlarged to be the committee on industrial and international relations. I think during the four or five years' existence of that committee there has never been any reference to it of any international matter. It strikes me that it would be highly desirable that the committee, and through the committee the house at large, should be more closely in touch with international affairs. In the past we in Canada have had very little to do with international affairs, and it is desirable that the general public should be familiarized more or less with the details and the implications of our international relations.

In order that this be accomplished I can see no better way than the discussing of these relationships in this house by going into details in regard to such matters before a committee, as is done with regard to other matters. Hence, since we have just referred the previous resolution to a committee, I would venture to suggest to the Prime Minister that similar action might be taken in this case.

Further, it seems to me that some time, either now or later, the Prime Minister ought to give us some reason for including in this protocol certain reservations. The only reason hitherto suggested is that Great Britain has done so. I do not think that is quite enough for us. It does seem to me that we ought to have some underlying reasons of our own for such action. It may be that Great Britain in this respect is right; and it may be that Great Britain is not right. The present policy of the British government is the policy of the Conservative party in Great Britain. I do not know why this government should necessarily follow the policy of the Conservative party of Great Britain. And in any case I think it is right that we should have definitely set before us the reasons for placing these reservations in this protocol.

I offer my previous suggestion to the Prime Minister in the hope that in this way we may gradually enter upon a better understanding of our foreign relationships.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in the observations made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that this is a purely formal matter. There is nothing in this protocol that can be said to be contentious. We are endeavouring to prevent a form of warfare, if the world ever again should know war, which we hope it may not, that has met with the universal reprobation of mankind. Asphyxiating and chemical gases we know wrought great havoc in the armies engaged in the last world conflict, and in one instance, which was well authenticated, use of bacteriological methods brought great disaster to a very large community. We are merely declaring in that with other nations of the world we will not have anything to do with that kind of warfare. I cannot see that there would be any use in referring this resolution to a committee, with due deference to my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). Certainly there is no analogy between this and the other resolution on the order paper.

With respect to the reservations, I apprehend that the reservations suggested by Lord Cushendun on behalf of Great Britain were reservations that were made as a result of the experience of Great Britain in the recent war. It was said that one of the greatest soldiers of the British Empire, as well as one of the great soldiers of one of the overseas dominions, was of the opinion that notwithstanding the fact that the enemy used poisonous gases, the allies should not do so; but ultimately that judgment was over-borne and recourse was had by the armies of Great Britain and the allies to the use of poisonous gases to combat the poisonous gases used by the enemy. Large quantities of such gases were made on this continent and sent to the field of hostilties.

All that I understand these reservations to mean is that in the event of one of the parties to this protocol being engaged in hostilities and breaking the terms of the obligations, and utilizing asphyxiating or poisonous gases or bacteriological methods of warfare, we would thereby be relieved from our obligations with respect to that country, and that country only. That is, there is no general release from our obligations, but only from those obligations that affect that party which has already broken its obligations under the protocol. That is how I understand it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT: With respect to the first reservation, it merely makes clear, what I think is already abundantly clear, that the terms and obligations of the protocol are binding only between those parties who have signed the protocol.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT: Under these circumstances, as I have said, it is a great pleasure to support the measure, although it does not afford scope for any discussion of large international problems which I fancy the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will avail himself of when his estimates are under consideration, and should the necessity arise.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) that the proper place for a resolution of this character would be the committee which has for its object the consideration of resolutions or other matters dealing with international affairs. One of my reasons for this statement is this. I recently found, in an answer to a question in the British house, the information submitted by the ministry there that they had used in the chemical laboratories in the Defence department some 1,142 animals since 1925 in the testing of chemical gas for warfare. Now we find this protocol before us, and I think our committee should investigate the sincerity not only of the government of Great Britain but of our own Department of National Defence in matters of this kind. Frankly, I am all in favour of any treaty or any undertaking between nations which will eliminate the use of chemical gases. Indeed, I would go further than the Prime Minister and would propose the elimination of all means of warfare—all of them, as an hon. member suggests. Frankly, I should be agreeable to that so far as Canada is concerned. I think we have the least to fear of any nation, and we are in a geographical position of the most extraordinary advantage as compared with other nations in that regard. But on this question of the use of chemicals and poisonous gases in warfare, I think we should acquaint ourselves thoroughly, in order that our people in turn may be acquainted, with what steps have already been taken by the British war office in connection with such matters. My interest was aroused by that answer made in the British parliament recently, and I should like to know whether the Prime Minister has any information regarding the point.

Mr. BENNETT: Why should we examine into what they are doing any more than they should examine into what we are doing?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Because they are a joint partner with us in this treaty.

Mr. BENNETT: No. It is stated that the treaty is signed on behalf of the British Empire but not for the overseas dominions, and our representative and no one else signed the treaty for Canada.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But having signed the treaty we become a party to it with the others, and we want to find out what they are doing in the matter.

Mr. DUNNING: Does my hon. friend seriously suggest that a committee of this house could possibly find out what is being done by all the countries that have signed the treaty? Does he suggest that a committee could get information along the lines he speaks of?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am quite sure that if the old system of secrecy still prevails there are great difficulties in the way. Certainly, however, so far as our own activities are concerned we should be made fully aware of them.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I have just a word or two to say, first, with regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) that the matter be referred to the committee. The provisions of the protocol now before the house contain Canada's stated and considered policy since at least 1922. In 1922, at the time of the Washington naval conference, Canada became a party to a treaty framed practically in the same terms as this, and which I understand was ratified at that time. This treaty goes further only in two respects. In the first place, it includes other parties not present at the Washington conference; as the Prime Minister indicated, it includes thirty nations. In the second place, it adds bacteriological means of warfare to those already prohibited by the Washington treaty. The special provision in the Washington treaty was article V:

> The use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and all analogous liquids, materials or devices, having been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world and a prohibition of such use having been declared in treaties to which a majority of the civilized powers are parties.
>
> The signatory powers, to the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of international law binding alike the conscience and practice of nations, declare their assent to such prohibition, agree to be bound thereby as between themselves and invite all other civilized nations to adhere thereto.

As has been said on both sides of the house, this is no new policy for Canada, and I submit that it does not involve any technical examination which would require reference of the matter to a committee.

Secondly on the point mentioned by my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland) with regard to the necessity for inquiring into the good faith of the various parties to the treaty, if that suggestion is valid in respect to this treaty, how much further would the hon. gentleman's argument carry him in connection with the so-called Briand-Kellogg pact?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Hear, hear.

Mr. RALSTON: It would mean the complete examination of the defence forces, of the armaments, and of every means for warlike preparation possessed by every nation which has signed the pact. I understand that the very heart of that treaty and, I believe, the very spirit of this one, is dependence upon the good faith of the contracting parties; there are no securities either in that treaty or in this one. There is no provision as to anything that will take the place of what is prohibited, there is nothing that provides any guarantee that the terms of the treaty will be carried out. There is simply the word, the good faith of the nations who have signed the treaty. It seems to me, therefore, that we should be flying directly in the face of these treaties, questioning the very spirit in which they were entered into, if we began immediately questioning the good faith of the parties by instituting an enquiry as to whether they intend to carry out their obligations and whether they are making preparations which might be suspected to permit of a violation at the first opportunity of the principles of the treaty.

With regard to the situation in Canada, may I say one word. Canada is not making any provision for the use of chemicals in warfare except in a defensive way. Training has been extremely limited. We have regarded the obligation imposed in the Washington treaty as our obligation and have endeavoured to carry it out not only in spirit but in actual practice. There are in Canada at the present time probably one thousand anti-gas masks, used for the purpose of training our personnel in anti-gas measures. We have no personnel whatever engaged in connection with research, nor have we any personnel engaged in connection with the manufacture of this means of warfare. And that is the policy which we propose to carry out. The personnel we have specially trained in this work comprises one officer and two non-commissioned officers trained in England who from time to time give instructions to a limited number who in turn qualify for instructors in anti-gas measures, and I trust that will be found to be the only necessity which Canada will have to meet in that respect

Mr. HEAPS: Can the minister give us any information regarding the manufacture of poison gases by any of the other nations who are signatories to the treaty?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry I can give no information in that regard. I can assure my hon. friend that we endeavour to keep in touch with progress in matters of this kind. It is, of course, very difficult to differentiate between chemicals used for industrial and for military purposes respectively; it is extremely difficult. The nation which has great transportation systems in connection with civilian activities is obviously better prepared for quick mobilization for war and in the same way a nation engaged in the manufacture of chemicals for purely civilian purposes, may in case of war be the quickest to adapt these agences to military uses. We know there are developments in chemistry throughout the world, and particularly in industrial chemistry. That always can be associated with the possibility of utilizing

such gases or chemical substances in connection with war. The department with which I am connected naturally must keep before it information which we get from time to time with regard to these developments, not in any critical or suspicious sense but simply with the idea of providing defensive measures should these agencies be used by any nation which is not a party to this treaty.

While I am on my feet I would like to refer to one point in reference to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) with regard to the reservations. I think that question has been dealt with already; the reservations are two. First there is a limitation that this treaty only applies as between us and similarly contracting parties; in other words the treaty is reciprocal, and in the second place we are not bound as against any enemy state who fails or whose allies fail to respect the agreement. I think that is a reasonable provision; I think the house will recognize the force of it and necessity for it, and I do not think it is a reservation which need be submitted to a committee or, with all deference to my hon. friend, which will require very much debate in this house.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): I would like to make just one observation, and it is this: Any country might be conscientiously and sincerely intending to live up to a treaty such as this while at the same time they are going thoroughly into the manufacture of poisonous gases or bacteriological methods of warfare. In the last war, for example, without being part of a treaty it was well understood among the civilized nations that such things as poisonous gases would not be used, yet they were used to the horror and disgust of the allies at least. In the same way, in the next war, should such an unfortunate event occur, a country desiring to live up to this treaty to the nth degree should be prepared in case one of the other countries should take the attitude which was taken during the last war. I believe no horror could have been greater than the feeling which was engendered among the allies when poisonous gases were used against them in the last war and therefore, with all due respect to other hon. members who have spoken, I think the fact that one of the allies might be conducting a thorough examination into these methods of warfare would not necessarily mean a lack of faith should war occur. I think that action should be taken as a defensive precaution in case one of the opposing countries adopted that method of warfare.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston): I see no objection to referring this matter to a committee, because I believe in that way much information might be gained which would be advantageous to a great many people. Chemical gases are used industrially, and I believe the work being done now is of great service to the industrial world and to people in general. We had an example of the effect of poisonous gases in Cleveland just a day or two ago, and if in our schools we can proceed with the study of these gases and discover defences against them we will do a lot of good, because defence against these gases is just as important as the use of gas. No country is going to produce gases for any purpose other than defence, so I think this question could be submitted to this committee with a great deal of benefit to everyone. They will find nothing prejudicial to themselves or to any other Anglo-Saxon country, but they will find a great deal of research work being carried on in order to protect human life against these gases.

The information obtained during the last war has been of great benefit to the world at large; perhaps many people will condemn the use of animals in experiments of this kind, but we must remember that these experiments have for their object the protection of human life, whether in war or in industry. The other day in Cleveland it would have been of great benefit if some protective measure had been available against the effects of the poisonous gases which were released during that accident; perhaps a hundred lives might have been saved. We saved thousands of lives during the war through our knowledge of how to protect our men against the effects of a common gas which, previous to the war, was used only in industrial fields. So I see no objection whatever to the suggestion that this question should be referred to a committee; I believe a great deal of information can be obtained which will assist in the protection of human life.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend who has suggested that this particular resolution should be referred to a committee that I had considered the possibility of following that course, but on reflection it seemed to me that the provisions of the protocol were so self-evident and would be so generally approved by every hon. member of the house that to have proposed the reference of the protocol to a committee might have seemed, at least to some people outside of this house, rather a questionable if not invidious procedure. I may say to my hon. friend however, that speaking generally I think he

is quite right in suggesting that the government should refer measures of an international character to a committee especially charged with questions of the kind, and I think I have shown with regard to the course recommended with respect to the preceding resolution that the government is entirely favourable to a committee, especially qualified to inquire into the subject matter of particular resolutions, being given an opportunity of so doing. With respect to future resolutions relating to international affairs I shall hope to have them referred to an appropriate committee wherever there appears to be reason for so doing. With respect to this particular resolution, my hon. friend may perhaps feel that his purpose has been served, in drawing attention to the wisdom of adopting such a course.

I should have told the house that the two reservations which are being made by Great Britain and Canada to the instrument of ratification have been made also by France and Russia; I omitted to mention that fact when the resolution was being discussed.

Mr. HEAPS: Purely as a matter of information, could the Prime Minister tell us what countries have signed this protocol?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend will find a list of the countries that have signed in the printed copy of the protocol which is before him.

Mr. BENNETT: I believe Belgium has signed since that list was prepared.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would also move:

That a message be sent to the senate to acquaint their honours that this House has adopted a resolution approving of the above protocol.

And that the Clerk of the House do carry the said message to the senate.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE

SALARIES OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL OFFICERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government to obtain the report of the commissioners considering the question of increased remuneration for technical civil servants in time to make their findings effective by legislation this session or whether the report will be brought down next session just prior to the election. I would also inquire if the commissioners have been notified and if formal instructions have been given them.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With regard to my hon. friend's reference to the election I might suggest that he should not be too sure that the election will be held next year.

Mr. LADNER: Will the Prime Minister say it will not be held?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the country is well satisfied with the government, and it may be the country's desire to have the government continue in office until well on towards the end of 1931. However, that is a matter which may be considered in due course. With respect to the report of the commission, I am afraid the government will have to allow the commission some latitude in the matter of time required to gather evidence and make a report. I do not think we can put any pressure upon them with regard to the time taken to consider the matter. I have no doubt that the commission will be anxious to make its report as speedily as possible. When the report is received we will then have to consider its recommendations.

Mr. LADNER: Have the commissioners been notified?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

PRESERVATION OF NIAGARA FALLS

CONVENTION WITH UNITED STATES

The house resumed from February 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King:

That it is expedient that parliament do approve of the convention and protocol for the preservation of Niagara falls by the construction of remedial works and for the experimental withdrawal of additional water from the Niagara river, which was signed at Ottawa, on the second day of January, nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, on behalf of His Majesty for the Dominion of Canada by the plenipotentiary named therein, and that this house do approve of the same

And that a message be sent to the senate to acquaint their honours that this house unites with the senate in the approval of the above-mentioned convention and protocol;

And that the Clerk of the House do carry the said message to the senate.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in respect to this resolution I would say that it was discussed quite fully by the house some little

time ago, but the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) was absent at the time and at the request of one of the hon. members opposite it was held pending his return, in case the hon. leader of the opposition might have some remarks to make.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I did not desire that the passage of this resolution should be delayed by reason of my absence, and I thought I indicated that fact before I left Ottawa.

In the first place I desire to observe that the procedure adopted in this case, in my judgment, is improper; this approval should be the subject matter of legislation and should be introduced by way of a bill and not by the method which has been adopted. A few minutes ago I directed attention to what I conceived to be the true principles which should govern in a matter of this kind, and perhaps I may refer to the authorities without taking up too much time of the house.

There is an article in the British Year Book of International Law for 1928 which summarizes the whole matter. The following appears at page 59:

Anson, writing in 1908, tells us that:
"where a treaty involves a charge upon the people, or a change in the general law of the land, it may be made, but cannot be carried into effect without the consent of parliament"; and also that
"apart from precedents relating to Indian territory, it has of recent years been thought desirable, if not necessary, that the consent of parliament should be given to the cession of territory in time of peace. Cessions made at the conclusion of peace or in course of a war, or of lands acquired by conquest or cession, for which parliament has not legislated, and for which the king has not by his own act deprived himself of the power of legislating by order in council, would seem to stand on a different footing."

The summary is as follows:

We may conclude by suggesting the following summary of the present state of British constitutional law and practice.

(1) Treaties which for their enforcement by British courts of law require some addition to or alteration of the existing law cannot be carried into effect without legislation. Therefore the king will not be advised to ratify them unless and until such legislation has been passed or parliament has given the necessary assurance that it will be passed. A treaty imposing on Great Britain a liability to pay money either actually (for instance, to make a loan) or contingently (for instance, to guarantee a loan), usually falls within this category, because as a rule the money could not be raised or expended without legislation.

(2) Treaties which modify the belligerent rights of the crown when engaged in maritime warfare will receive effect in British prize courts without legislation.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

(3) Treaties made expressly subject to the approval of parliament require its approval, which is usually given in the form of a statute.

(4) Apart from the Indian Empire, which stands on a special footing, it is the practice, amounting probably by this time to a binding constitutional convention, for treaties involving the cession of British territory to require the approval of parliament given by a statute.

The article was written by Arnold D. McNair, C.B.E., LL.D., fellow of Gonville and Caius college and university lecturer, Cambridge, and who I believe is also the editor of the last edition of Oppenheim's International Law.

The treaty made between the United States and Canada, and which we are considering, will involve the expenditure of public moneys. One parliament should not bind or restrict the full authority of another parliament unless it be done by statute, for resolutions have no place or binding authority in the courts. One of the anomalies of our system of legislation, as has been pointed out by some commentators, is that mere resolutions are not taken notice of by the courts at all; although it may be a resolution passed by the House of Commons and passed by the Senate as well it is not taken notice of by the courts because a law can be passed by the sovereign only with the advice and consent of the commons and senate in parliament assembled. That is, the three estates of the realm must unite to give effect and validity to legislation, but in this case we have only a resolution, which, although approved by the commons and the senate, has not the force or effect of a statute. It is a resolution which contemplates a charge upon the public revenues, and therefore it comes within the purview of the first rule laid down by Professor McNair.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Has that ever been the practice in Great Britain?

Mr. BENNETT: We are new at dealing with these matters in Canada, but where we have dealt with them we have endeavored to do so by legislation. Perhaps the most important of all international documents with which we have had to do was the one in connection with the International Joint Commission, and that is the subject matter of a statute which is to be found in the annual statutes for the year in which it was passed.

Another difficulty is purely a practical one, and I submit it to the Minister of Justice as being one which will commend itself to him. When rights are affected by a treaty information regarding such treaty should be easily available to those who are interested. When the treaty is attached as a schedule to a statute

it always appears in the statute books of the country and there is no difficulty in referring to it. For instance, the parliamentary approval of the treaty between Great Britain and France made in 1919, to which Professor McNair refers, is in these terms:

1. The approval of parliament is hereby given to the treaty set out in the schedule to this act.
2. This act may be cited as the Anglo-French treaty (Defence of France) Act, 1919.

That embodied the whole matter. It will be observed that the words used are "approval of," not ratification; for ratification means one of the prerogative rights of the sovereign. The approval by parliament means that sanction has been given to the treaty by the representatives of the people in the form of a bill which is the recognized procedure by which parliament expresses itself for the purpose of enabling it to be recorded as a part of its deliberations upon the statute books of the country. When parliament has expressed its approval of the treaty that treaty becomes a part of the schedule to the act.

Without going further into a matter which has been already discussed, it is sufficient for my purpose to point out that some of our treaty obligations create new obligations. To implement the obligations it will be necessary either to vote money or pass legislation. The voting of money is embodied in the supply bill, which is a legislative act, so that the principle which governs in such cases should, in my judgment, govern in this. Wherever a treaty is sought to be approved by the parliament of Canada, which consists of the Senate and the House of Commons acting with the sovereign, it should be by bill and not by resolution, for wherever the document itself contains provisions which obligate this country, as one of the high contracting parties, to discharge obligations or to do any act or thing mentioned or described in the document, that can only be given effect to through legislation, then there should be legislative approval of the treaty itself by act of parliament. When we endeavour to bind the hands of future parliaments, we cannot do so by means of resolutions, but only by acts of parliament, and, therefore, I submit that this matter should have been submitted to parliament in the form of a bill.

There is another ground upon which I desire to make a few observations, and that is this: the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) was charged with the responsibility in connection with this matter, But when the minister was considering the use and conservation of water of the Spray lakes, which are in the Rocky mountains some distance from the Bow river and in connection with which I think the minister will agree that not even the scenic beauties of the Rocky mountains park were affected, there was such a long delay that ultimately nothing was done and recourse was had to the development of additional power at the Ghost river site on the Bow river. It happens that the city of Calgary, a portion of which I have the honour to represent, is entirely dependent upon the Bow river for its supply of hydro-electric energy. The representations as to the water in that river in the early days appear, in the light of ultimate information, to have been very inaccurate and the quantity of water fell at one time as low as 600 cubic second feet in the winter season, and the minimum flow of a river is the important thing to ascertain when one is determining the question of power development. On the other hand storage possibilities are ever present in a country such as we have in western Canada, near the Rocky mountains. It was sought thus to utilize the waters of the Spray lakes. There are those connected with the parks branch of the minister's department who believe that the scenic beauties of the park would be so marred or interfered with by the construction of a dam to enable the waters of the Spray lakes to be utilized, with a tunnel to convey the water through to the river, that the matter should not be considered. A great agitation was carried on. Many of the papers in the west joined in the attack against the power company in an urgent endeavour to protect, as they said, the scenic beauties of the parks of the west.

The Niagara falls have been known in history for, I think, something like 250 years. I believe the first measurement of the falls was taken by one of the early explorers in the seventeenth century. The falls have undoubtely been gradually receding. The action of the water has been to destroy partly the falls on the Canadian side. On the United States side, where the fall is much wider, a thinner film of water has been spread over the rock and the result has been that there has not been as much erosion as on the Canadian side where the body of water is greater and its action more apparent. It has been represented by United States engineers in one of their journals that the rock on the Canadian side has receded as much as five feet a year in recent years. It seemed to me to be incredible that it should recede so great a distance, but that is the figure which has been given.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): In the Horseshoe.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, in the centre of the Horseshoe on the Canadian side. That is the figure, whether it be accurate or not. Many years ago Isham Randolph prepared elaborate plans for the purpose of conserving the beauties of the falls. I will not endeavour to deal with the plans he then put forward, but one of the gentlemen who signed the present convention between the United States and Canada, I think Mr. Macfarland, is the editor of a very important journal and I recall seeing upon the cover of that journal some years ago a picture of Niagara falls practically dry, with nothing but the rocks over which a thin trickle of water was flowing, the falls having been destroyed by the activities of the power companies. That was the position which was then taken by those who were endeavouring to project their minds into the future. No such condition has as yet arisen, but I suggest that the present convention is intended for one purpose and one only, namely, to enable more power to be secured from Niagara falls by both the province of Ontario and the interests that operate in the state of New York. It will be recalled that neither the state of New York nor the province of Ontario is a party to the treaty: it is a treaty made between the United States and Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend is entirely wrong with respect to that. While they are not parties, they are entirely in accord.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I am saying. They are not parties to the treaty. Naturally the United States speaks as a nation through the treaty just as does Canada. New York is a part of the United States and Ontario is a part of Canada. We are given to believe that Ontario is satisfied with the provisions of the treaty, but there is nothing to show whether the beauties of the park or the falls are matters to be considered. The point seems to be rather that more power may be available by diverting the water over a wider area and spreading it over the Horseshoe in a thinner stream, thereby causing less erosion, so that additional power will be available in Ontario and in the state of New York. It is already a matter of record that, because of this treaty, the state of New York has said to the private corporation operating on that side that while that additional water is to be available by the methods employed, they must pay to the state of New York a license fee not only for the additional water to be secured, but for water now being taken about which heretofore there was a grave question whether they would pay anything or not. That is a matter of record. I suggest that the principle that has governed in eastern Canada in considering this matter should also be applied in western Canada.

When the matter was actively before the department in connection with the Spray falls, I was a shareholder in the Calgary Power Company, although I was not a member of the house, When I assumed my present duties I disposed of such few shares as I had remaining in that enterprise, and therefore I feel I can speak with some degree of freedom with relation to it. It seems to me that you should not have one set of principles governing in the west where, for instance, in Calgary we are wholly dependent on that development for hydro-electrical energy, and another set in the east with respect to Niagara falls and the hydro-electric development dependent upon that large head of water.

I desire to refer to but one other matter—the method to be used is the construction of submerged dams. Mr. Isham Randolph, the elder, if I recall aright, according to a report he made, did not believe that was the best method to adopt. They had in mind at that time the creation of small islands, with sufficient loam upon them to enable some vegetation to appear so that the utilization of the water would be in harmony with the beautification of the park and the scenery surrounding the falls. The present scheme, so far as I can gather from the documents, contemplates nothing more than submerged concrete dams which will be close to the surface of the water and will not give any additional green appearance to the surrounding landscape and not add in any sense to its beautification. That at least, is the contention which has been made. I suppose the minister will say that this is a matter the details of which might be worked out by those charged with that responsibility. The treaty in the ultimate analysis is one made by the United States because of the insistence of the private power interests in the state of New York; and as regards Canada I suppose, not without the same measure of truth it may be said the treaty is largely the outcome of the representations of those who are seeking additional hydro-electrical energy in Ontario. Those are both desirable ends; both are ends to which we should try to lend our assistance in every way possible, but not if as a result the beauty of the falls is to be destroyed. If we are in any way to lessen the scenic beauty of these falls which, as I say,

have been world renowned for over two centuries, we should not even for the purpose of getting a little additional horsepower, become parties to the transaction. It was only because of that fear which I expressed to some of my colleagues a few weeks ago, that the matter was delayed, apart altogether from the discrimination which I thought was being practised between the east and the west in connection with this matter, scenic beauty is desirable both east and west, but the principle of utility should at least be applied in the same way in the east as in the west, and as I have said, I am firmly of opinion that the methods adopted are not those which one of the most eminent engineers of his time recommended should be applied, and departure from which will certainly detract from the scenic beauties of Niagara falls and park.

The first objection I have urged as to the method adopted is common to all these questions of the approval of treaties. We are entering upon a career of international treaties. It is highly desirable that we should settle the practice with some degree of certainty. I shall have something to say later as to section 132 of the British North America Act, which in terms does not contemplate this country making treaties with foreign countries apart from the empire. Section 132 I think should be closely studied having regard to the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in determining who is a "person" within that act for the purpose of taking a seat in the senate. Having regard to the terms of that decision, it does occur to me that it is not an unfair inference to conclude that section 132 of the British North America Act should be construed by the same canons of construction. In the event of the Prime Minister considering this fall amendments necessary to the British North America Act to enable Canada to exercise powers that belong to this Dominion if we are on an equality of status with Great Britain, I would suggest that he study section 132 in order that the treaty-making powers may be properly exercised without any question being raised in the courts, as might hereafter be done, as to the true interpretation and meaning to be placed upon section 132. There is only one purpose I have so far as the first matter is concerned, and that is that our practice should be settled along the lines that are supported by precedent and reason and that will be relied upon by future parliaments and future generations as establishing a system that is sound from every standpoint, and I cannot think that any approval of a treaty is sound that undertakes to bind the action of future parliaments without the consent of parliament expressed in the manner and form in the constitution provided—by His Majesty the King by and with the consent of the House of Commons and Senate in parliament assembled—and not by a mere resolution of the two houses of parliament.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): May I say a word or two with regard to the first point raised by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). I did not know that the matter was to be brought up in this manner, and I can only rely on my memory and on what I believe to be the sound principles governing this matter.

As my hon. friend knows, the ratifying power in matters of treaties varies with different nations. In some countries the ratification is made by parliament; in others it is made both by parliament and the king; in others it is made by one branch of parliament. In the United States, for instance, the power of ratification belongs to the senate. So far as British countries are concerned, it is His Majesty the King who ratifies the treaty. So far as the British practice is concerned, it is and it was only when money was to be expended under the treaty that the treaty was formally submitted to the imperial parliament before being ratified.

Mr. CAHAN: Or if it affected any vested interest.

Mr. LAPOINTE: When the Versailles treaty of peace was submitted for approval, I remember reading a speech of Mr. Lloyd George, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, in which he reiterated that the ratification power is vested in the king, but that that treaty was of such tremendous importance that he thought it proper to submit it to the approval of parliament before asking for ratification by His Majesty the King. In this country for the last few years we have taken the stand that no treaty should be ratified before it is submitted for the approval of this parliament. That course the government has followed in every instance, and it is following it in this case. When there is need of special legislation for the purpose of enforcing a treaty, legislation has been introduced, but introduced apart from the treaty. I remember an instance in 1923 or 1924 when the halibut treaty was ratified. I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries at the time the treaty was negotiated, but not, I think, when the treaty was approved by parliament. In that case it was found necessary, apart from

the formal approval of the treaty by resolution of this parliament, to amend our legislation concerning the protection of fisheries in order to make it conform to the provisions of the treaty. We had a special statute passed at the next session, providing, for instance, penalties for violations of the treaty —because it was necessary, as my hon. friend has said, that when matters relating to the treaty were submitted to the courts there should be statutes for the purpose of enforcing its provisions. I think this course should be followed in cases where special legislation is needed. I do not think there will be need of such legislation in this case, but if there is a need there is nothing to prevent the introduction of a bill for the purpose of enforcing every provision of the treaty. I may remark that not so very long ago we were bound even by treaties which not only had not been submitted to the approval of this parliament but, still less, had not been followed by a statute of this parliament. That is changed now. We cannot be bound unless this parliament approves, and I believe that under the circumstances the method suggested by my hon. friend that in every case there should be a statute is not the method that is followed in the British parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: Not in every case, but every case in which the document itself involves obligations necessitating future legislative action.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Even in that case I think my hon. friend will admit that a bill could follow when necessary after the formal approval of the treaty.

Mr. BENNETT: But the treaty should be part of the statute.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): It seems to me that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) has fallen into some confusion of thought in making an analysis of the legal situation as compared with the constitutional situation in Canada in respect of the ratification of treaties. I think one may suggest with great confidence that a treaty ratified by His Majesty the King in a legal sense may have full force and effect in Canada without any approval whatsoever either by resolution of this house or by statute of this parliament. Legal effect is given to many international agreements, conventions and treaties by the simple ratification by His Majesty the King. But in the constitutional sense my hon. friend has insisted that treaties, which affect and apply to Canada, prior to their ratification by His Majesty the King should receive the approval of the parliament of Canada.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend will allow me. I hope he did not misunderstand me. I never said we should do away with the approval of parliament. I am in favour of it entirely.

Mr. CAHAN: I am not misrepresenting the hon. gentleman, and I think we will agree on that. But we passed a resolution in this house, two or three sessions ago, to the effect that, before the government of Canada should advise His Majesty the King to ratify any treaty or convention which in terms affected Canada, the government of Canada should first submit that treaty or convention for the approval of this parliament. Now, in this case, the government of Canada in the name of His Majesty have entered into a treaty with the United States of America, and before advising the king to ratify that treaty, the government of the day have submitted that treaty for the approval of this house. This house may give approval by simple resolution, or by a statute of parliament confirming the treaty and providing for the carrying out of its terms. What is the distinction between treaties which are approved in the one form or in the other? This convention or treaty, which is now being approved by resolution, will have no more legal effect in Canada than if it had never received the approval of this house by simple resolution. This convention which is being approved by resolution merely has that effect in Canada which it would have had at any time during the last two centuries if simply ratified by His Majesty on the advice of his privy council at Westminster.

But there may be treaties and conventions containing terms which, even if His Majesty in the exercise of his royal prerogative, ratifies them by the advice, either of his privy council in England or of his privy council in Canada, would have no legal effect whatsoever, and would not be respected or enforced by any court in this country. You have only to look through the English decisions where you will find time and again that distinguished judges of the courts have declared that treaties merely ratified by His Majesty on the advice of His Majesty's privy council in England, or by formal resolution of parliament, sometimes contain terms which are not enforceable in those courts, because they had no statutory force or effect.

Therefore, I suggest to the Minister of Justice that the clear distinction is this. Any treaty which in times past could have been ratified by His Majesty alone on the advice of his imperial privy council, and by its terms may be made applicable to all the dominions

and colonies without any statutory legislation by the imperial parliament or by a dominion parliament, and which could be enforced without such statutory confirmation by the imperial parliament or by the Dominion, may have full force and effect in Canada to-day if approved by a simple resolution of this house, that simple resolution being strictly a moral support to the government of the day in taking the responsibility of advising the king, through His Majesty's privy council, to effect such ratification.

If the treaty or convention, however, which is to be submitted to parliament for approval before ratification by His Majesty, affects the revenues of the country, or provides for any expenditure of public funds, then, ever since the time that Anson collected his precedents, we know that no such treaty or convention can have full force or effect until it is submitted to parliament by a bill which, previously—as in England—has been authorized by His Majesty, or until it is submitted to this parliament by a bill, which has previously been authorized by His Excellency the Governor General.

But to go further. If the treaty or convention affects property rights or interests in particular sections of this country, and the treaty is only given effect to by ratification by His Majesty on the advice of His Majesty's privy council of Canada, then no court in Canada is bound to respect such treaty which has not been confirmed by statute, except to the extent that His Majesty by the exercise of his royal prerogative could, even without the advice of his privy council in Canada, have given by his ratification such force and effect to it.

I do not know whether I am making my idea clear. Whether hon. gentlemen opposite accept it or not is another matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is very interesting.

Mr. CAHAN: We are not raising any partisan discussion or issue. I called attention once before to the question as to which treaties became public law in Canada by mere ratification by His Majesty the King, and which treaties become public law in Canada only by statutory confirmation by the parliament of Canada. But take article 2 of this treaty—I am not raising objection to its terms—it provides for the construction of certain remedial works in the Niagara river above the Niagara Falls, designed to distribute the waters of the river for certain purposes. Article 2 says that concurrently with the construction and test of the remedial works, additional use of the water for hydro electric purposes may be permitted to a certain extent and subject to certain conditions, and further that additional diversions shall be permitted during only a certain period of the year. Those additional diversions to be permitted in the state of New York shall not exceed a certain aggregate. Additional diversions to be permitted within the province of Ontario shall not exceed a certain daily diversion at the rate of 10,000 cubic feet per second. Now, I wish to suggest that this is one of a class of treaties which should be confirmed by statutory enactment, because, unless it is so confirmed, any person living along the banks of the Niagara river, a riparian owner or other person interested in the flow of that water, whose rights are prejudicially affected, could go into the courts of Ontario and secure an injunction against the proposed diversion, if he showed that any right vested in him was injuriously affected thereby. And in the proceedings for injunction I suggest that this treaty dealing with private or public property interests in the province of Ontario, which has been ratified only by act of His Majesty the King and which has not been confirmed by act of this parliament, would not be considered in any court of justice as authorizing the diversion or the works which are contemplated by the terms of this treaty.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It should be confirmed by statute?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, confirmed by statute. Therefore it seems to me we should make a clear distinction between those classes of treaties which may be ratified by His Majesty, by reason of the exercise of his royal prerogative, and by reason of the exercise of such royal prerogative be given full legal effect to in this country, and those other classes of treaties which deal with matters of public revenue and expenditure or which alienate public rights in property or which prejudicially interfere with private property rights. And the latter class, if they are to be respected and enforced by the courts of the country, should receive statutory confirmation by the parliament of Canada or by the legislature of the province. I do not wish to discuss another aspect of the question because it is clear under the constitution that certain treaties made between the empire and foreign countries may be enforced by legislation of this parliament, even although the terms of the treaty may override and conflict with legislative enactments of the provinces.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): There are one or two aspects of

the case, and particularly the remarks of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), to which I wish to devote a moment or two. One statement made by the leader of the opposition was that the scenic properties were not given consideration, but that it was a matter of the securing of power. May I assure the hon. gentleman that that was not the purpose; the purpose rather was to take such steps as would prevent the very thing deprecated by the hon. member and others who are interested in the scenic properties of the falls, namely, the convergence of a large volume of water over the Horseshoe and the erosion at a very rapid rate of the Horseshoe itself.

Let me say that a great deal of study has been given this matter in the past ten years by the engineers who have investigated the methods suggested by my hon. friend. Those methods have been thoroughly examined and the consensus of opinion on the part of the engineers who have advised both the provincial government and the state of New York, the federal government at Washington and our government here, was that the submerged weir would ensure the best results. The diversion of twenty thousand feet more is merely incidental to the trial of what the engineers in their judgment consider the best method whereby to preserve the scenic qualities of the falls. That is all I have to say in that respect.

As regards the question of not considering the Spray lakes matter from the same standpoint as the Niagara falls question, I may say to my hon. friend that exactly the same study was made in both cases, and that study indicated that no great damage would ensue from the proposal of the Calgary Power Company. Later on some delay occurred owing to the fact that the provincial government intervened and was desirous of utilizing this storage basin as a provincial undertaking. Naturally there was a delay in order to allow them to study the whole question.

Mr. BENNETT: Several years, was it not?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Well, we have been about ten years altogether studying the Niagara falls proposition, and the same care has been taken in connection with both projects. My hon. friend will agree that in Canada there is a very considerable public opinion on the desirability of preserving, as nature left them, many of the scenic spots which are to be found throughout the country. With that view I have no quarrel. Let me say, however, that my study of the Spray lakes problem, the study made by the officials of the department, has convinced me that the proper thing to do is to leave the Spray lakes out of the Banff park reservation altogether. It will be outside the park reservation, and so long as a flowage of 350 cubic second feet for the three summer months, is guaranteed in the Spray river, we are prepared to issue a license to anyone who is desirous of going in there. The first opportunity to develop will be given to the provincial government, then to any power company that may wish to develop the undertaking, provided they build a tunnel to carry the water.

I have nothing to say with respect to the small controversy that has arisen as to whether this resolution shall be statutory or by the approval of parliament.

Mr. CAHAN: It is not a small controversy; the matter is important.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I must take exception to the last statement of my colleague (Mr. Stewart, Edmonton) who dismisses this weighty matter as a small affair. Hon. gentlemen in this house will feel that my hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) has rendered a very helpful service in making clear the distinction between public law and statute law, which I gather was one of his objectives in the debate.

With regard to what we are doing at the moment, I think my hon. friend will agree that we are not attempting more than to carry out the third article of the treaty, which provides that:

> The present convention shall be ratified by His Britannic Majesty in accordance with constitutional practice, and by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the senate thereof.

As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) has said, the constitutional practice which we are following in this parliament is to have all treaties approved in the first instance by both houses of parliament; and that is what just now we are seeking to have done. But it is possible that, in carrying out the provisions of the treaty, further enactments in the nature of statutes may be necessary. The only point that seems to me to come up in the way of difference between us is whether both the approval of the treaty itself in a broad way and the statutory provisions that may be essential to the carrying out of all its provisions, must be a part of the one document and effected simultaneously.

Mr. CAHAN: If the Prime Minister will pardon the interruption, I tried to make the distinction between the constitutional practice to which he is now referring, and the other

practice which I shall presently mention. The constitutional practice to which the Prime Minister is now referring is a practice largely inaugurated by himself for the purpose of protecting the autonomous position of Canada, to which end he submitted to parliament his resolution that the government of Canada should not give assent to the ratification of a treaty unless approval had first been obtained from the Canadian parliament. But there is another constitutional practice of equal importance in vogue in Great Britain whereby parliament has asserted its right in respect of treaties proposed to be ratified by the king, namely: that when such treaties involve the revenues or expenditures of the country, or alienate property within the territory of the country, or prejudically affect private vested interests, in these cases it is in accord with another constitutional practice, I believe, that such treaties before ratification by His Majesty should be first approved and confirmed by imperial statute. I was trying to make that point clear.

Motion agreed to.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

The house resumed, from May 16, consideration in committee of Bill No. 179, respecting juvenile delinquents—Mr. Lapointe —Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 22—Parent or guardian may be ordered to pay fine, damages or costs.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I wish to make two changes in this section. In the third line of subsection 2 the word "sixteen" should be "twenty", and in subsection 4, line sixteen, the word "nine" should be "ten". Perhaps that is why some hon. gentlemen thought the other night the parents might not receive notice. Section 9 was not the proper reference; under section 10 notice is given in every case.

Mr. BENNETT: Does my hon. friend now think subsection 4 is sufficiently connected with subsection 2?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend was referring the other night to section 9, which has nothing to do with notice to parents; he will see that section 10 provides that parents and guardians always must receive notice.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister will pardon me if I point out that in addition I was endeavouring to suggest that I had some doubt whether that notice would bring sufficiently home to the parents the possibility of their being charged with financial responsibility, because the notice under section 10—

Mr. LAPOINTE: —is a notice of the prosecution against the child.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so, and I though we should make it clear in the terms of the notice that there was a possibility of the parent being mulcted by a fine or by having to assume financial responsibility. In other words, a notice might be sent in a casual sort of way, directed to one of several persons, but after the hearing the magistrate might order the parent to assume the responsibility, and it might be successfully contended that it is doubtful whether the parent had notice of that particular point—if I make myself clear. In other words, I might ask for a judgment against some person for $25,000; the name of another person might be in the complaint, with an inferential direction to that person. That person might not turn up; he might say, "I am not interested in this case; it is just a judgment against someone else." What I feared was that the parent might not be given ample notice of what might result by not appearing.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of course, this not only has the approval of but is urged by the committee. Probably the first two lines of subsection 4 might be sufficient:

> No order shall be made under this section without giving the parent or guardian an opportunity of being heard.

Mr. BENNETT: That is exactly what I think.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have no objection to making this subsection read as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps we can go through the rest of the bill and then return to this section later. I believe the minister and I are of the same opinion, and it is only a question of method.

Section stands.

Sections 23 and 24 agreed to.

On section 25—Children under twelve.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The only change is that the words "of neglected children" are left out after the word "superintendent". They are unnecessary because the word "superintendent" is defined in the general section.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—Children to be separated from adults.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How is it that with a section of this kind we still have forty children in our penitentiaries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will see that by subsection 2 this does not apply to a child who has been proceeded against by indictment under section 9 of this act, and it does not apply to places where there is no juvenile court. As I said the other day, this act applies only in certain places where provision has been made for a juvenile court and where a proclamation has been issued to that effect.

The other day I was asked as to the number of places under this act; at that time I had no information, but now I can give those places in Ontario if my hon. friend would like to have them.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): If you please.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In Ontario there is the city of Ottawa; the city of Toronto; the city of Stratford and the county of Perth; the judicial district of Timiskaming; the city of Berlin—now the city of Kitchener—and the county of Waterloo, which came under the act in 1914; the city of Brantford and the county of Brant; town of St. Marys; city of Galt; city of Windsor; town of Walkerville; town of Ford; county of Grey; county of Huron; county of Haldimand; city of Hamilton; district of Nipissing; county of Lincoln; town of Port Colborne; county of Middlesex; city of London; town of Cochrane, excepting certain townships; town of Dundas; and city of Oshawa. Apart from those places in Ontario, there can be no juvenile delinquent under the act. A boy of sixteen has to stand his trial under the criminal code in the ordinary way.

Mr. McNUTT: Does that apply to Nova Scotia?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will give the list for the rest of Canada: city of Winnipeg; city of Vancouver; city of Victoria; city and royalty of Charlottetown; town of Summerside; city of Halifax; city of Montreal; province of Alberta; county of Pictou; district of Dauphin; province of Saskatchewan; each electoral district of British Columbia; province of Manitoba.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Of the forty juveniles in the penitentiaries, twenty-six have come from institutions. It would look as though a boy could be taken up under this juvenile system and sent to an institution, but if he escaped he would be sent immediately to a penitentiary.

Mr. STEVENS: If he is incorrigible.

[Mr. A. E. Ross.]

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The warden of the penitentiary has told me that just as soon as they escape they are sent down to the penitentiary, and that does not look as though they are complying with this section.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That would show the advisability of having separate institutions for the young offenders, whether they have been tried by way of indictment or otherwise. I will try to get the Minister of Finance to help me in that regard.

Mr. BENNETT: If it does not involve any money he might help you.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): We have been working along these lines for years and I thought there would be something done when this meeting was held last fall. We have been told that when juveniles are sent to penitentiary they will not be permitted to come in touch with "lifers," and yet just two weeks ago I found one in a penitentiary who was sitting on a bench with a "lifer." It does not look to me as though a boy would have a chance if he is treated in that way, and the report of the superintendent of penitentiaries shows many cases of this kind. These boys are placed side by side with the "lifers," they work at the same benches, and they cannot be disputed. I have followed up a couple of cases myself and have found that to be true. Once a boy escapes from one of these institutions to which he has been sent he is immediately sent to the penitentiary.

Section agreed to.

On section 27—Juvenile court committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Subsection 3 provides that a petition must be presented before the power can be exercised.

Section agreed to.

On section 28—Duties of committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no change in this section except by the elimination of four words which were thought to be unnecessary.

Section agreed to.

Sections 29 to 31 agreed to.

On section 32—Probation officers.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would like to explain the exception for the province of Alberta. In that province the probation officer does not function directly under the juvenile court judge because the judge is not appointed. An existing official is designated to act in that capacity and the probation officer is directly responsible to a central authority at Edmonton.

Section agreed to.

On section 33—Adults liable.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This section extends the jurisdiction to persons other than the parents or guardian of the child. Under the old section only the parents or guardian could be held responsible.

Section agreed to.

On section 34—Penalty for inducing.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is really nothing contentious in this section.

Section agreed to.

On section 35—No preliminary hearing.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The only change is to make the provisions of the criminal code applicable.

Section agreed to.

On section 36—Contempt of court.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is making the court a real one in this respect.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the hon. minister will agree that this matter is one which has engaged the attention of tribunals to a great extent. There were two prominent cases in England during the last few months, and perhaps the minister has had his attention directed to them. It is a very extraordinary power to confer upon any court, this power to punish for contempt of the court itself. Perhaps the section may not be used to any great extent, but I suggest to the minister that under the circumstances he make the penalty somewhat smaller.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I share the view of my hon. friend to a large extent, but the committee of the child's welfare organization suggested imprisonment as well as a fine for contempt of the juvenile court. After discussion with my officials I came to the conclusion that we should limit it to a fine only. I have struck out "imprisonment."

Mr. BENNETT: Under the circumstances I think that is right.

Section agreed to.

On section 37—Appeals by special leave.

Mr. BENNETT: This is a new section.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. It is to give the right of appeal. In this case I again did not go as far as the committee asked me to do. They recommended appeal as of right. I came to the conclusion that we should not grant the appeal in indictable offences, but still, to meet their views to some extent, I have made it subject to special leave granted by a judge of the supreme court in the province. Then, instead of going to the appeal court as under the criminal code, the appeal will be heard by a judge of the supreme court of the province.

Mr. BENNETT: The right of appeal to a judge of the supreme court should be ample, but it having been made possible to go to the court of appeal, might it not be better to go there first of all and thereby save two appeals?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is only one appeal.

Mr. BENNETT: The section reads:

> Save that the appeal shall be to a supreme court judge instead of to the court of appeal, with a further right of appeal to the court of appeal by special leave of that court.

What I have in mind is this: that as the procedure is inexpensive when you get into that kind of litigation, there is always a desire to exhaust the courts to which it may be taken. The only query I make is whether or not it might be advisable to permit an appeal to the court of appeal if a judge of that court granted leave. That would end the matter because the cases would be very few. As it stands now, it goes by leave to a single judge; he hears it and then the court of appeal may grant leave of appeal.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What would my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. BENNETT: I daresay only extraordinary cases would ever go to the court of appeal.

Section agreed to.

On section 38—Act to be liberally construed.

Mr. BENNETT: I think this would be a very good section to have at the end of the bill. As a matter of drafting, it should be the last section of the bill except the repealing section.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But there is no change.

Mr. BENNETT: This is a declaration which appropriately comes after you have given all the other sections of the act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but we have merely followed the old act in that respect, because the subsequent sections followed in the old act also.

Section agreed to.

On section 39—Not to affect provincial statutes.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a change in the third line by the addition of the words "intended for the protection or benefit of children," after the word "statute."

Mr. LAPOINTE: That was to make it clearer.

Section agreed to.

On section 40—Repeal of former law.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No change.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the former section 35.

Section agreed to.

On section 41—Sections 12 (4) and 17 (3) in force in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: This is new.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is a necessary self-explanatory provision on account of the rest of the legislation.

Mr. BENNETT: This is the one about publications in newspapers. It is a very serious innovation. It provides that special provisions of the statute shall be in force in all parts of Canada whether this act is otherwise in force or not. While it is highly desirable that newspaper references to these cases should disappear, the fact is that this is very peculiar legislation. The section reads:

> Subsection (4) of section 12 and subsection (3) of section 17 shall be in force in all parts of Canada, whether this act is otherwise in force or not.

It is substantive legislation applying to every part of Canada, regardless of the application of the act otherwise in any province or city or town.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will see, if not the necessity, the importance of it. The first clause mentioned in section 41 concerns newspapers. Of course, as regards the province of Quebec, I think only the city of Montreal comes under the provisions of the act.

Mr. BENNETT: Now the act will apply to the whole province.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If it were not for this provision it would be possible for a newspaper published in Quebec City and read in Montreal or the Montreal district, to contain the names and other details concerning young offenders.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. BENNETT: I am wholly in accord with the principle, but the method by which it is brought to operation may cause difficulty in connection with some newspapers which are trying to conform to the law. This section is really a new statute with respect to the publication of accounts of these proceedings in newspapers in every part of Canada. It is highly desirable, but it is put in such a way in the statute that it is made difficult to understand.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend suggests that it should be clearer.

Mr. BENNETT: It is making this part of the substantive law of the country apply to every part of Canada. Regardless of whether the act is in force, for instance, in the city of Moose Jaw, this portion of the statute will be applicable to the whole of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and to that extent it curtails properly the license heretofore exercised by newspapers in connection with matters of this kind. The question is only one of making it plain to the newspapers. They will be anxious to obey the law once they know what it is, but it is not clear with a little section in the statute bringing other provisions into force with respect to the whole of Canada.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think this section is necessary. Subsection (4) of section 12 already states:

> Subsection (3) of this section shall apply to all newspapers and other publications published anywhere in Canada, whether or not this act is otherwise in force in the place of publication.

This should be sufficient without section 41 of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: But the section must have been put there for some purpose.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It merely gives effect to what is already stated in subsection (4) of section 12.

Mr. STEVENS: It includes subsection (3) of section 17.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Even there it is made clear. Subsection (3) of section 17 reads as follows:

> (3) If a person, whether a child or an adult, against whom any warrant has issued out of a juvenile court cannot be found within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court out of which the same was so issued, but is or is suspected to be in any other part of Canada, any judge or deputy judge of a juvenile court within whose jurisdiction such person is or is suspected to be, or if there is no juvenile court having jurisdiction in such place, then any justice within whose jurisdiction such person is or is suspected to be, upon proof being made

on oath or affirmation of the handwriting of the juvenile court judge or other officer who issued the same, shall make an endorsement on the warrant, signed with his name, authorizing the execution thereof within his jurisdiction.

So the two things which are mentioned in section 41 are, already in the bill. We might do without section 41. It merely repeats what is already in the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: I think it is desirable to continue it there so that there shall be no doubt as to its application.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If those two things were not already there, I agree that this would not be sufficient.

Section agreed to.

On section 42—When act shall be enforced.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no change there except, "subject to the provisions of section forty-one."

Section agreed to.

On section 43—Any city or town may ask for this law.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am struck by the unfairness of this thing. For instance, you have children from the county being tried in the city, and they are being treated differently from the city children.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is there any county my hon. friend has in mind?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The county of Frontenac. The city of Kingston may have a juvenile court, but the children of the county of Frontenac will be treated in a different way from the city children. They must go to the penitentiary or prison.

Mr. BENNETT: Not necessarily the penitentiary.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): To the prison or penitentiary. The juvenile courts have the privilege of treating the city children in a different way and sending them to some other place of detention. It may be claimed that more crime exists among city children, but I do not think so in proportion to the number. The unfair thing is that children from parts of the province where there is no juvenile court will be sent to the penitentiary or prison, whereas the city children will go elsewhere.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend understands the obstacle that we have in the British North America Act. The penitentiaries are under federal jurisdiction, but all other prisons and institutions, hospitals and asylums, are under the province, and we could not enforce this act except with the cooperation of the province and the local authorities.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): When I asked the minister in regard to these forty children he claimed that some would be from districts outside the jurisdiction of this act. That is what I point out as an unfair feature, that those outside the jurisdiction of this act must go to penitentiary or prison.

Section agreed to.

Section 44 agreed to.

On section 45—Operation of act.

Mr. CLARK: I cannot see any really new provisions in the act that ensure the segregation of juveniles from adult criminals in the penitentiaries. I would ask the minister to point to the sections of the bill with respect to that phase of the matter which make provisions not contained in the old act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As far as that goes we have not changed the old act. The amendments are rather on questions of procedure, providing for the right of appeal, for instance, and to make the act more workable.

Mr. CLARK: Then there is no attempt by this act to ensure the segregation of juveniles from adults in the penitentiaries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not in this act.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Has the minister any intention of dealing with that matter this session?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is my intention—I am speaking for myself just now—and I have warned the Minister of Finance that I shall appeal to him before the session is over.

Mr. CLARK: Will it require a special act, or just an amendment to some existing act?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Merely an item in the estimates.

Mr. CLARK: It will be done by regulation rather than by legislation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, absolutely.

Section agreed to.

Section 46 agreed to.

On section 22—Parent or guardian may be ordered to pay fine, damages or costs.

Mr. BENNETT: I think this section might be improved upon, but I do not think it will work any great injustice as it is.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend thinks of some amendment we can have the section changed in the senate.

Mr. BENNETT: The senate may amend the bill, but in view of the fact that cases such as I mention will not often happen, I am not going to insist upon an amendment.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. LAPOINTE moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): May I ask the minister if during the discussion of his estimates on penitentiaries he will have an announcement to make in regard to the detention of juveniles in penitentiaries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend has already asked me what my intention was, and I have told him. I hope I shall be as persuasive with my colleagues as he was with me.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I just wished to say that I have some suggestions to make in regard to the matter when the estimates are up.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the third time and passed.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY

CONVENTION OF 1924 BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES RESPECTING REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, on the motion to go into committee of supply to consider the estimates of the Department of External Affairs, I would ask the privilege for a few moments of referring to the enforcement of the National Prohibition Act of the United States, particularly in regard to British shipping and shipping of Canadian registry.

On January 16th, 1929, the eighteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States was ratified. That constitutional amendment inaugurated an entire change in the attitude of the government and people of the United States to the sale, transportation, exportation and importation of intoxicating liquors. It has one remarkable omission, that neither in the amendment itself nor in the Volstead Act, known as the National Prohibition Act, which was passed in October, 1919, is any prohibition or penalty imposed upon the purchase or consumption of intoxicating liquors within the territorial domains of the United States. Therefore those residents there who can induce others to sell may legitimately purchase, and there is no penalty imposed for their consumption of the liquor so purchased. This act came into effect in January, 1920.

To prevent the smuggling of liquor into the United States from the sea, the United States congress included in its tariff act of September, 1922, the provisions of section 581 of that act, authorizing federal officials of the United States—

> —to go on board of any vessel or vehicle at any place in the United States, or within four leagues of the coast of the United States, to examine the manifest and to inspect, search and examine the vessel or vehicle, and every part thereof, and any person, trunk or package on board, and to this end hail and stop such vessel or vehicle, if under way, and to use all necessary force to compel compliance, and if it shall appear that any breach or violation of the laws of the United States has been committed whereby or in consequence of which such vessel or vehicle, or the merchandise, or any part thereof, on board of or imported by such vessel, or vehicle, is liable to forfeiture, it shall be the duty of such officer to make seizure of the same, and to arrest any person engaged in such breach or violation.

This tariff act of 1922, which has been held to be binding upon the courts of the United States, extended their jurisdiction beyond the three-mile limit up to the twelve-mile limit, and to that extent purported to authorize infringements upon the rights of other nations beyond the three-mile limit, rights which are clearly established by the well recognized rules of international law.

Therefore, while the courts of the United States are legally bound to enforce the provisions of the tariff act of 1922, which provides for the twelve-mile limit, no other nation is bound to recognize that twelve-mile limit, and United States customs officials beyond the three-mile and up to the twelve-mile limit have, so far as established rules of international law are concerned, no right to inspect or seize vessels flying the flag of any other nation.

In discussing proposed amendments to the tariff act of 1922, Senator Sterling said that the United States Secretary, Mr. Hughes, had taken up with the British government the question of reaching an agreement whereby searches of British vessels outside of the three-

mile limit would be permitted. He stated that the Secretary of State was of the opinion:

—that the three-mile limit was generally accepted among the principal maritime nations of the world as the limit of a nation's jurisdiction over the adjacent sea, and that the government had on more than one occasion committed itself to that limit. Hence, in the view of the Secretary, there should be an international understanding or agreement in regard to the matter. Otherwise interference with foreign vessels, outside the three-mile limit, might bring about international complications and subject the government to claims for damages.

I am quoting from the Congressional Record, volume 62, Part II, page 11593. Under the conditions which then existed, the seizure by the United States coastguard service of a British vessel within twelve miles from the coast of the United States was authorized by the statute law of that country, which its courts were bound to respect but which other nations, to preserve their rights under international law, would be bound to protest. And the government of Great Britain did persistently protest against seizures of British vessels at any greater distance than three marine miles from the coast of the United States.

In 1922 the case arose of the Cunard Steamships Company versus Mellon, which is reported in 262 United States Reports, page 122. Mr. Justice Van Devanter in delivering the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States said:

It is now settled in the United States and recognized elsewhere, that the territory subject to its jurisdiction includes the land areas under its dominion and control, the ports, harbours, bays and other enclosed arms of the sea along its coast and a marginal belt of the sea extending from the coast line outward a marine league or three geographic miles.

So that by that unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States up to the three mile limit was recognized as the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, as it had been recognized throughout the British Dominions by the Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Act of 1878, which declared that:

—any part of the open sea within one marine league from the coast measured from low water mark, be deemed to be open sea within the territorial waters of Her Majesty's Dominions.

To show how completely the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States coincided with the opinion entertained by the government of Great Britain, I find that in 1923, in 163 Commons Hansard, column 961, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs stated the views of the British government in these terms:

The doctrine of territorial waters is not laid down in any international instrument, but the jurisdiction of nations over coastal waters has been accepted by usage and is now a recognized rule of international law; His Majesty's government have always maintained that by international law and practice, the general limit of territorial jurisdiction is three miles, but from time to time claims to extend the three mile limit have been advanced by different states. Such claims, which amount to annexation of the high seas, could only be made effective by international agreement.

The convention between the United States and Great Britain, of 1924, had its inception in a letter written by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, United States Secretary of State, and dated June 26, 1922. This letter was addressed to the British Ambassador at Washington with regard to the possibility of aid by the British government by means of—

Cooperation on the part of the British and American authorities with regard to the smuggling of liquor.

It does seem to me most peculiar indeed that authentic copies of this correspondence between the British governments and the United States government, which was given to the press by the Department of State at Washington some two years ago and which has been cited by various legal authorities in the United States in the discussions before their own courts, and in contributions to their legal reviews, should not be available to the House of Commons of Canada, which is directly concerned in those negotiations and in the interpretation of the convention which was consummated as the result of those negotiations; because there is one rule of interpretation of treaties which I think is accepted by all modern nations, namely, that the correspondence leading up to the completion and ratification of a treaty is relevant always for the purpose of construing the purport and intent of the treaty so negotiated. Therefore it is rather surprising that when we desire to construe the terms of that convention, which has now been laid upon the table of the house, there should not be available to us the correspondence which led up to the consummation of the treaty. In this diplomatic note the United States Secretary of State, on June 26, 1922, suggested that an—

—international arrangement between the United States and Great Britain, under which the authorities of each nation would be authorized to exercise, beyond the three mile limit of territorial waters, a measure of control over vessels belonging to the other—

—was most desirable. The note proceeded to allege that:

The situation with which the authorities of this government are confronted has become so serious that this government feels prompted to inquire whether your government would be dis-

posed to enter into a treaty for the purpose of checking the illegal practices in question. Such a treaty might contain reciprocal provisions authorizing the authorities of each government to exercice the right of search of the other beyond the three mile limit of territorial waters, to the extent of twelve miles from the shore.

There was implied in that note an admission that the United States government had a right of search and seizure within the territorial limit of three miles, but that its right of search and seizure between the limit of three miles and the limit of twelve miles, enacted by the United States Tariff Act of 1922, depended upon the acquiescence of foreign governments.

On November 13, 1922, the British government replied at length, stating in detail the measures which they had taken to prevent breaches of British laws by persons engaged in the liquor trade with the United States. The British note then proceeds:

His Majesty's government had thus taken steps, even before the receipt of representations from the United States government, to prevent the practices, to which attention has now been drawn. They have now, as already indicated, issued supplementary instructions in the matter and hope that the measures taken will prove successful in preventing any breaches of the local law. They feel, however, more difficulty in accepting the proposal that a treaty should be made authorizing the authorities of each government to exercise a right of search of vessels of the other beyond the three mile limit of territorial waters up to a distance of twelve miles from the shore.

His Majesty's government have consistently opposed any extension of the limit of territorial waters such as that now suggested. They feel that the outbreak of smuggling which has led to the proposal cannot be regarded as a permanent condition, but is one which will no doubt be suppressed by the United States authorities within the not-distant future. While, therefore, they are desirous of assisting the United States government to the best of their ability in the suppression of the traffic and in the prevention of the abuse of the British flag by those engaged in it, they do not feel that they can properly acquiesce, in order to meet a temporary emergency, in the abandonment of a principle to which they attach great importance.

In communicating the above to you I am directed to add that while His Majesty's government are, as already indicated, unable to acquiesce in the proposed treaty for the extension of territorial waters, they are nevertheless most desirous of taking any steps within their power to prevent any infractions of the local law by persons engaged in liquor smuggling.

In the meantime, on September 13, 1922, the British vessel Gardner was seized twenty-two miles from the coast of the United States, and the British government protested against this seizure on the ground that it had taken place beyond the three mile limit. On account of, or at least following, this protest by the British government, on November 9, 1922, instructions were issued to the United States collector of customs by the United States Secretary of the Treasury, as follows:

The department is in receipt of your telegram of the 8th instant, relative to the seizure of the British auxiliary schooner M. M. Gardner on September 13, 1922.

It appears from your report that the seizure was made outside the three mile limit, and that while the master admitted unloading part of the cargo beyond the three mile limit there is no evidence that the vessel was communicating with the shore by means of her own small boats or equipment. Under these circumstances it is the desire of the Department of State and the Department of Justice that all foreign vessels so seized shall be released, and you will be governed accordingly. A report should be made to the department in each instance.

So that the government of the United States at that time, even before the negotiation of the treaty, by its acts and its orders, acquiesced in the contentions contained in the protest of the British government. The newspapers at that time reported that approximately twenty vessels were released under this order, but the United States government retained possession of a British vessel named the Grace and Ruby, which they claimed had been searched and seized beyond the three mile limit but which had been in communication with the shore by means of her small boats. In regard to the retention of the Grace and Ruby, on December 30, 1922, the British ambassador wrote the United States Department of State as follows:

In order to avoid the possibility of any misunderstanding, I am desired by my government to make it clear that His Majesty's government are unable to acquiesce in what they understand to be the ruling of the United States government, namely, that foreign vessels may be seized outside the three mile limit if it can be shown that they have established contact with the shore for illegal purposes by means of their own small boats. My government must reserve their right to lodge a protest in any individual case in which action may be taken by the United States government under this ruling.

That was a clear protest on the part of the British government against the search and seizure beyond the three-mile limit of British vessels which were or had been in communication by their own boats with the coast of the United States.

On January 18, 1923, the United States Secretary of State replied as follows:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note, No. 973, of December 30, 1922, stating that your government desires you to make it clear that it is unable to acquiesce in what it understands to be the ruling of the United States government, namely, that foreign vessels may be seized outside the three-mile limit if it can be shown that they have estab-

lished contact with the shore for illegal purposes by means of their own small boats. You state that your government must reserve the right to lodge a protest in any individual case in which action may be taken by the United States government in cases of this character.

I have the honour to state that consideration has been given to the statements contained in your note, and the conclusion has been reached that the government of the United States should adhere to the position it has previously taken, that foreign vessels outside the three-mile limit may be seized when it is established that they are using their small boats in illegal operations within the three-mile limit of the United States. This conclusion is supported by the position taken by the British government in the case of the British Columbia schooner Araunah, which was seized off Copper island, by the Russian authorities in 1888, because it appeared that members of the crew of the schooner were illegally taking seals in Behring sea by means of canoes operated between the schooner and the land, and it was affirmed that two of the canoes were within half a mile of the shore. Lord Salisbury stated that Her Majesty's government were of opinion that, even if the Araunah at the time of the seizure was herself outside the three-mile territorial limit, the fact that she was, by means of her boats, carrying on fishing within Russian waters without the prescribed license warranted her seizure and confiscation according to the provisions of the municipal law regulating the use of those waters.

Therefore the negotiations at that period had this result: The United States abandoned their claim that they had the right to seize British vessels outside the three-mile limit except those which were communicating for illegal purposes, or in breach of the laws of the United States, with the shore of that country by their own boats. On April 30, 1923, that was followed by a statement made by Mr. McNeill, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in the British House of Commons at Westminster, in which, referring to the case of the Grace and Ruby, he said:

> His Majesty's government have questioned the right of the United States government to make this seizure, and diplomatic correspondence on the subject is proceeding.

Therefore, at that time the government of Great Britain did not acquiesce even in the claim of the United States government that it had a right to seize beyond the three-mile limit British vessels which were in communication with the shore by their own small boats.

On July 10, 1923, the British Charge d'Affaires at Washington wrote to the United States Secretary of State in reference to the condemnation of the Henry L. Marshall, which was alleged to have transferred her cargo of liquor to an American vessel at a point ten miles off the coast of the United States; he stated that this vessel was not entitled to British registry. There had been a fraudulent transfer to British registry, the vessel really being owned by a citizen of the United States, and the British government intimated that they did not intend to exercise their diplomatic privileges for the protection of an American who had procured a fraudulent certificate of registry under British law. However, the British Chargé d'Affaires continued:

> In order to avoid the possibility of any misunderstanding on the part of the United States government as to His Majesty's government's attitude in this matter I have the honour, under instructions from His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to inform you that any attempt on the part of the United States authorities to seize a British ship outside the three-mile limit would be regarded by His Majesty's government as creating a very serious situation. In regard to the Henry L. Marshall case, I have been instructed to explain that the absence of a protest by His Majesty's government against the condemnation of this vessel in no way implies any alteration in the views of His Majesty's government with regard to the principle at stake, inasmuch, as that vessel, owing to the circumstances in which she secured her British registry, was not recognized by His Majesty's government as entitled to British registry. Consequently, His Majesty's government have not felt called upon to assert the principle at stake on her behalf, since, as far as His Majesty's government are concerned, the Henry L. Marshall remains an American vessel.

Again, in diplomatic language, the British government made a most emphatic protest against the seizure of this vessel beyond the three-mile limit from the American coast. On July 16, 1923, before the negotiations for the 1924 liquor convention were consummated, Mr. Charles E. Hughes, United States Secretary of State, replied to the note which I have just read, justifying the seizure of a British vessel if the facts show—I quote:

> —that its direct and single effort was by fraudulent means to introduce the cargo, and all of it within the territory of the United States; and that the vessel prior to and at the time of its actual seizure, even though more than three miles from the shore, was hovering off the coasts of the United States and engaged in an attempt to violate the laws of the United States by the introduction of liquor into its territory.

This is the first time that the American doctrine was expressed that vessels hovering near the three-mile limit, but just beyond that limit, were liable to seizure by the United States authorities and thereupon liable to forfeiture by decree of the United States federal courts.

In the meantime a draft treaty had been prepared by Mr. Hughes, Secretary of State, and submitted on behalf of the government of the United States to the British Secretary

of State for Foreign Affairs. The terms of the draft treaty proposed that each of the two governments would be permitted to board vessels of the other within a distance of twelve geographical miles from the coast, in order to make inquiry whether such vessels or the persons on board were engaged in an attempt to violate the laws of the other party to the proposed treaty. That was a clear suggestion of the desire of the United States to incorporate into the rules of international law, which limited the territorial jurisdiction to three miles, that provision of the United States Tariff Act of 1922 which extended the jurisdiction of their officials and of their courts to a limit of twelve miles from their coasts. In pursuing the discussion on this treaty, on July 19, 1923, Mr. Hughes, the Secretary of States for the United States, wrote to the British government making an official declaration. Before I read that declaration I wish again to emphasize the contention that in respect of a treaty which intimately concerns the Dominion of Canada, and in the interpretation of which the correspondence which preceded its ratification is absolutely necessary for a clear understanding of its import, we should not be denied access to that official correspondence. I have a part of that correspondence as published in the American press and also as quoted in some of the briefs submitted to the United States federal courts in cases arising out of the seizure of British vessels. Mr. Hughes made this declaration:

> The proposed special agreement would bear only upon those vessels which came within twelve miles but hover off the three-mile limit for the purpose of aiding in the smuggling of intoxicating liquor, or other prohibited articles, into the territory of the United States.

That is a clear declaration that the proposed special agreement would give the United States government officials the right of search and seizure only within the proposed twelve-mile limit of the original draft agreement. Mr. Hughes proceeds:

> It may confidently be asserted that there would be no disposition on the part of the American authorities, and the special agreement would not justify any attempt, to seize a British vessel, save within the limits proposed and when it was clear that the vessel concerned was directly involved in an attempt to introduce its illicit cargo into the territory of the United States.

I think that declaration is one which binds the honour of the government of the United States in dealing with these seizures of British and Canadian vessels beyond the three-mile limit; it was a declaration involving the honour of the United States that no seizures would be made beyond the limit provided for in the draft agreement which was subsequently consummated, signed, ratified and confirmed by this parliament of Canada.

On September 17, 1923, the British government replied, saying:

> So far as British subjects are concerned, there is no violation of any law, British or international, in the sale of such liquors on the high seas to purchasers of any nationality; therefore there is no obligation upon His Majesty's government to interfere with the prosecution of a perfectly legitimate trade. Nevertheless, the whole question has been carefully examined with an earnest desire to afford the United States government any proper assistance in the difficulties which they are encountering in the enforcement of the Volstead Act.

I then omit some matter which is irrelevant for my purpose, and the note concludes:

> I am to add, in view of the difficulties of the case, that His Majesty's government could not agree to the extension of the three-mile limit, even for a limited purpose, until the matter has been submitted to the imperial conference, which will meet within a few weeks in London.

These negotiations clearly disclosed that the British government objected to fixing a distance defined in miles for the exercise of the proposed search and seizure beyond the fixed territorial limit of three miles from the shore; but that, if the territorial limit of three miles were affirmed, the British government was willing to agree not to object to the boarding and search of vessels flying the British flag "outside the limit of territorial waters," but not at a greater distance from the coast than can be "traversed in one hour" by the vessel suspected of committing the offence, except in those cases where the cargo of liquor is intended to be conveyed to the shore by a vessel other than the one boarded and searched, in which event the distance from the shore is determined by the speed of the other vessel.

While these negotiations were pending and under discussion by the two governments, a meeting of the American Society of International Law, held at Washington, D.C., in April, 1923, discussed the matters then at issue in the correspondence between the government of the United States and the government of Great Britain. Mr. Frederick K. Nielson, counsel with the United States Department of State, was present at that conference. His remarks I have taken from the proceedings of the American Society of International Law for the year 1923, at page 38. After Mr. Nielson had stated the position

which the United States government had taken in years past with respect to the freedom of the seas beyond the three-mile limit, he said:

I have tried to emphasize the position taken by the United States in the past. It seems clear that until an appropriate agreement respecting the alteration of the well-established rule shall have been reached, the United States, in view particularly of this positive position, cannot justify a departure from that rule for the purpose of dealing with an isolated or temporary situation.

He was referring to the isolated or temporary situation which was created by the enforcement of the Volstead Act and the eighteenth amendment throughout United States territory. At page 46 of the report, Mr. Nielson continued:

Writers who have discussed the so-called Hovering Acts, authorizing the boarding of vessels on the high seas bound for a port, point out that such action cannot be taken pursuant to the exercise of a right, but that it is a permissive jurisdiction in which a nation whose vessels are boarded may acquiesce.

I should like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to that remark, which I believe to be a correct statement of a rule of international law. Mr. Nielson continued:

Of course the action authorized by the so-called Hovering Acts is something different from undertaking to interfere generally with vessels beyond the three mile limit with a view to the prevention of smuggling. We can hardly expect nations to acquiesce generally in such action solely for the purpose of preventing smuggling. The violation of our law is, to be sure, a serious thing, but to other nations there is merely presented a case of difficulty in preventing smuggling. They do not think that drinking wine will destroy or degrade their civilizations. I do not know whether it will or not. I have never made any sociological studies along those lines, but as I say, they do not consider the question so serious as to warrant its being dealt with pursuant to principles underlying the so-called right of self-preservation, and surely they would never concur in the idea expressed by Doctor Stowell—

Who had preceded him.

—as I understood him, that they would assist us in punishing infractions of our laws relating to smuggling. We have enacted such laws and it is incumbent upon us to enforce them. They, of course, concede our sovereign right to do so within our jurisdiction. Surely, they will not admit our right to call upon them to help us exercise our sovereign rights. And in view of positive statements often heard in this country with regard to exclusive sovereign rights, to deal with matters relating to control over imports and immigration, it might not be considered desirable by the people of the United States that foreign countries should volunteer to help us to enforce those rights.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Whose words are those?

Mr. CAHAN: Those of the counsel with the United States State department, Mr. Nielson. At this stage—in November, 1923—the imperial conference assembled at London, and in the correspondence and documents recently brought down by the Prime Minister I find this extract from the summary of the imperial conference of 1923:

During the session of the conference, the question of the regulation of the liquor traffic off the American coasts and of the measures to be taken to avoid a serious conflict either of public opinion or of official action was seriously debated. The conference arrived at the conclusion that while affirming and safeguarding as a cardinal feature of British policy the principle of the three-mile limit, it was yet both desirable and practicable to meet the American request for an extension of the right of search beyond this limit for the above purpose, and negotiations were at once opened with the United States government for the conclusion of an experimental agreement with this object in view.

There was a clear statement of the understanding of the representatives of the various dominions and the British government at that imperial conference in 1923, namely, that, assuming, as they did assume, and as they had a right to assume, that the United States had no right of search beyond the three-mile limit from her coast, nevertheless, in order to assist the United States in the enforcement of its smuggling and other tariff laws it was expedient to meet the United States request for an extension of the right of search beyond this limit for the above purpose, and negotiations were undertaken with that end in view.

I should like to place the treaty on Hansard where it can be read by everyone who takes Hansard, but I suppose I shall not be permitted to do that and I do not wish to take up the time of the house in doing so. Is there any objection?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not at all. Far from it.

Mr. CAHAN: That treaty should be known throughout the length and breadth of this country. It is as follows:

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India;

And the President of the United States of America;

Being desirous of avoiding any difficulties which might arise between them in connection with the laws in force in the United States on the subject of alcoholic beverages;

Have decided to conclude a convention for that purpose;

And have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India:

The Right Honourable Sir Auckland Campbell Geddes, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., his Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America;

The President of the United States of America:

Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State of the United States;

Who, having communicated their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:—

Article 1

The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that three marine miles extending from the coastline outwards and measured from low water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters.

Article 2

(1) His Britannic Majesty agrees that he will raise no objection to the boarding of private vessels under the British flag outside the limits of territorial waters by the authorities of the United States, its territories or possessions in order that enquiries may be addressed to those on board and an examination be made of the ship's papers for the purpose of ascertaining whether the vessel or those on board are endeavouring to import or have imported alcoholic beverages into the United States, its territories or possessions in violation of the laws there in force. When such enquiries and examination show a reasonable ground for suspicion, a search of the vessel may be instituted.

(2) If there is reasonable cause for belief that the vessel has committed or is committing or attempting to commit an offence against the laws of the United States, its territories or possessions prohibiting the importation of alcoholic beverages, the vessel may be seized and taken into a port of the United States, its territories or possessions for adjudication in accordance with such laws.

(3) The rights conferred by this article shall not be exercised at a greater distance from the coast of the United States, its territories or possessions than can be traversed in one hour by the vessel suspected of endeavouring to commit the offence. In cases, however, in which the liquor is intended to be conveyed to the United States, its territories or possessions, by a vessel other than the one boarded and searched, it shall be the speed of such other vessel and not the speed of the vessel boarded, which shall determine the distance from the coast at which the right under this article can be exercised.

Article 3

No penalty or forfeiture under the laws of the United States shall be applicable or attach to alcoholic liquors or to vessels or persons by reason of the carriage of such liquors, when such liquors are listed as sea stores or cargo destined for a port foreign to the United States, its territories or possessions, on board British vessels voyaging to or from ports of the United States, or its territories or possessions, or passing through the territorial waters thereof, and such carriage shall be as now provided by law with respect to the transit of such liquors through the Panama canal, provided that such liquors shall be kept under seal continuously while the vessel on which they are carried remains within said territorial waters and that no part of such liquors shall at any time or place be unladen within the United States, its territories or possessions.

Article 4

Any claim by a British vessel for compensation on the grounds that it has suffered loss or injury through the improper or unreasonable exercise of the rights conferred by article 2 of this treaty or on the ground that it has not been given the benefit of article 3 shall be referred for the joint consideration of two persons, one of whom shall be nominated by each of the high contracting parties.

Effect shall be given to the recommendations contained in any such joint report. If no joint report can be agreed upon, the claim shall be referred to the claims commission established under the provisions of the agreement for the settlement of outstanding pecuniary claims signed at Washington the 18th August, 1910 but the claim shall not, before submission to the tribunal, require to be included in a schedule of claims confirmed in the manner therein provided.

Article 5

This treaty shall be subject to ratification and shall remain in force for a period of one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications.

Three months before the expiration of the said period of one year, either of the high contracting parties may give notice of its desire to propose modifications in the terms of the treaty.

If such modifications have not been agreed upon before the expiration of the term of one year mentioned above, the treaty shall lapse.

If no notice is given on either side of the desire to propose modifications, the treaty shall remain in force for another year, and so on automatically, but subject always in respect of each such period of a year to the right on either side to propose as provided above three months before its expiration modifications in the treaty, and to the provision that if such modifications are not agreed upon before the close of the period of one year, the treaty shall lapse.

Article 6

In the event that either of the high contracting parties shall be prevented either by judicial decision or legislative action from giving full effect to the provisions of the treaty the said treaty shall automatically lapse, and, on such lapse or whenever this treaty shall cease to be in force, each high contracting party shall enjoy all the rights which it would have possessed had this treaty not been concluded.

The present convention shall be duly ratified by His Britannic Majesty, and by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the senate thereof: and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present convention in duplicate, and have thereunto affixed their seals.

Done at the city of Washington, this twenty-third day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four.

(Seal) A. C. Geddes.
(Seal) Charles Evans Hughes.

Article 1 of the treaty reads:

The high contracting parties declare that it is their firm intention to uphold the principle that three marine miles extending from the coastline outwards and measured from low water mark constitute the proper limits of territorial waters.

That was a declaration made, as I said, in accordance with the unanimous decision of the

Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Mellon versus the Cunard Company. It was in accord with the pronouncement, which I read, which was made on behalf of the British government in the House of Commons a short time before. Article 2 provides that:

(1) His Britannic Majesty agrees that he will raise no objection to the boarding of private vessels under the British flag outside the limits of territorial waters by the authorities of the United States, its territories or possessions in order that inquiries may be addressed to those on board and an examination be made of the ship's papers for the purpose of ascertaining whether the vessel or those on board are endeavouring to import or have imported alcoholic beverages into the United States, its territories or posessions in violation of the laws there in force. When such inquiries and examination show a reasonable ground for suspicion, a search of the vessel may be instituted.

Then clause (3) of article 2 expressly declares:

The rights conferred by this article shall not be exercised at a greater distance from the coast of the United States, its territories or possessions than can be traversed in one hour by the vessel suspected of endeavouring to commit the offence.

Or in the alternative, in case she is communicating with the shore by means of another vessel, one hour's sail of such other vessel.

The treaty is on the record and can easily be read. In view of the correspondence that took place between the two governments, in view of the solemn declaration made by the United States Secretary of State as to the extent and scope of the proposed treaty, that it would confer no rights whatsoever upon the United States authorities beyond the new limit of one hour's sail therein defined, I suggest that from the date of the ratification of this convention of 1924 the sole and exclusive right of the United States to deal with shipping flying the British flag must be found within the four corners of that convention. That contention is supported by a number of decisions of the federal courts of the United States. I do not pretend to have run all of them down or to have examined all of them closely, but I wish to call attention to a few of them.

After the treaty had been ratified, the case of the Frances Louise arose in the year 1924, in the federal district court of Massachusetts. This vessel was seized sixteen and a half miles off the coast of Cape Cod in the state of Massachusetts and the case was heard and decided by Judge Morton, one of the most distinguished judges of New England. He held in his decision that:

Both nations intended the treaty to deal with the matter in a complete way.

Then he proceeded to state that the terms of the treaty were conclusive in the case of this vessel which had been seized sixteen and a half miles off Cape Cod.

In the following year, 1925, there was the case of the Marjorie E. Bachman which also came before the same judge in the same federal district of Massachusetts. This was a case against a vessel seized twenty-one and two-tenths miles from the Massachusetts coast. Judge Morton dismissed the seizure and said:

In extending the rights of this country, we are invading those of other nations. The question is really one of international law. Moreover, as to British vessels, this country has expressly agreed not to seize them except within the provisions of the treaty. As to them, if there is no case under the treaty, there is no case at all when they are on the high seas.

The next case that I have found was the case of the Sagatind, a Norwegian vessel. After the liquor treaty of 1924 between the United States and Great Britain had been ratified, similar treaties were ratified with a number of other European governments, one with the Norwegian government. The Sagatind was a Norwegian vessel which was seized twenty-two and seven-tenths miles from the coast, after she had delivered, while at anchorage, a cargo of liquor to the Canadian vessel Diamantina, which was also seized the following day at a distance of 16.5 miles from the coast. The federal district court of Massachusetts dismissed the cases against both vessels. The court, commenting upon the Norwegian treaty, which in respect to the Norwegian vessel bore the same relationship as the British-American treaty would bear with reference to a British vessel, said:

The foregoing treaty extends any limitation which might exist upon the jurisdiction of the court to proceed against offending vessels for violations of our laws, prohibiting the importation of alcoholic beverages, to such cases as may come within the terms of the treaty, and I think also implies as an alternative rule of treaty-made law that vessels shall not be proceeded against for violations of such law when seizure was made beyond the distance from the coast prescribed in the treaty. In other words, the treaty deals with the extreme right of seizure upon which initial jurisdiction of the cause of forfeiture depends.

On appeal to the circuit court of appeals, a federal court, the decision was delivered by Judge Hough, one of the most distinguished authorities in admiralty law sitting in the federal courts of the United States. The court of appeals held that the questions involved in the case were exclusively determined by the terms of the treaty, and that the only arguable point was whether the

treaties had authorized the proceedings avowed in the record before the court. He also added:

> Nowhere in the treaty can any words be found indicating an intent on the part of the contracting parties to change or extend the limits of the territory of the United States. In fact, the contrary is plainly indicated by Article 1 of each treaty.

Then there arose the case which was heard in 1926 of the Francis E., a British vessel, seized sixteen miles off the Florida coast. On appeal in that case, the circuit court of appeals for the district, a federal court, held:

> There is nothing in the treaty from which it could reasonably be inferred that it was the intention of the high contracting parties to extend the criminal laws of the United States beyond the three-mile limit. The vessel may be seized if those on board have violated any law within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States that would subject her to forfeiture except as to provisions relative to seastores and compensation for loss occasioned by improper acts, not germane to the subject here under discussion. That is the extent of the agreement.

Referring to the treaty, the court also held that "the American-British treaty did not in fact enact criminal legislation" and that no statute had yet been enacted by the United States making illegal the acts committed by foreigners on foreign ships on the high seas, nineteen miles from the coast of the United States.

After I had run these cases down, through the courtesy of the Department of External Affairs, I had access to Jessup, an American authority, who has recently issued a work dealing with marginal waters. After referring to these cases to which I have called attention, Jessup says that the weight of judicial authority—

> —certainly sustains the view first enunciated by Judge Morton, in the case of the Frances Louise, that the treaties deal completely with the subject and exclude all extraterritorial seizures not made in conformity with its terms.

I have some other cases, but I do not wish to tax the patience of the house.

I wish to direct the attention of hon. members to the correspondence which has been laid on the table by the Prime Minister between the Hon. Vincent Massey, Canada's representative at Washington, and the State Department of the United States relating to the sinking of the Canadian vessel I'm Alone. The first letter is of March 28, 1929, addressed by Mr. W. R. Castle, Jr., for the United States Secretary of State, to the Hon. Vincent Massey, and simply recounts the facts from the American report. The reply is dated April 9, 1929, and is subscribed by the Hon. Vincent Massey, and directed to the Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State of the United States. The Canadian government takes a very, very strong position, a position I think irrefutable in law, in view of the terms of the convention of 1924 and of the correspondence which I have cited to-night and the decisions of the American courts to which I have made allusion. Paragraph 8 says:

> It was of the essence of the convention that its provisions covered the whole field of extra-territorial seizures.

So far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to be critical, but I wish, for the sake of preserving a strong position on the part of the Canadian government for all future time, that that note had practically ended with paragraph 8. I am sure the government will agree with this proposition, that, in our diplomatic correspondence with foreign governments, any formal admission made by this government stands registered for all time against any future claims of this country arising out of a similar situation; and therefore it is very necessary indeed that statements of law should be made only after the most careful consideration and reflection, and that they should be made in such express terms as to leave no doubt whatsoever as to their meaning. This note of Mr. Massey is in the nature of a pleading before a court. I do not know who wrote it, but I am sure that, if he had been accustomed to preparing pleadings in our courts of law, he would realize the advisability on all occasions of stating one's client's case quite fully both as to the facts and the law on which he based his claim; but it is always advantageous to leave the opposing attorney to state his own case, so that in reply you may place your own objections more pertinently and expressly before the court which is to consider the issues. In paragraph 12 of this letter Mr. Massey continues:

> In any case the pursuit lasted through two days and two nights, far beyond the starting point, and the sinking took place over two hundred miles southward in open sea. It has been intimated that pursuit and seizure on the high seas might be justified on the ground of hot and continuous pursuit. It is agreed that international law recognizes that pursuit begun within territorial waters may be continued on the high seas, if immediate and continuous.

Now, first, in the prior correspondence there was no such intimation as Mr. Massey suggests. It had not been intimated that pursuit and seizure on the high seas might be justified on the ground of hot and continuous pursuit. It might better have been left to the American Secretary of State to make that contention, and, in my opinion, such an ad-

mission should not in any event have been made on behalf of this government. It will be noted that Mr. Massey proceeds:

It is agreed that international law recognizes that pursuit begun within territorial waters may be continued on the high seas, if immediate and continuous.

I take this opportunity of suggesting that that is not a statement of international law which is generally recognized to-day, and that the admission so made may prove most prejudicial to the interests of Canada in this prospective arbitration, and possibly most prejudicial to the interests of Canada in such cases as may subsequently arise during the existence of that treaty. After making that admission Mr. Massey proceeds:

The validity of this doctrine has been fully recognized by the Canadian courts.

I beg to suggest that there is only one case in which this doctrine has come before the Canadian courts, and I also suggest that it has not been recognized to the extent and in the terms which Mr. Massey has expressed. I refer to the case of the ship North versus the King, reported in the Supreme Court of Canada reports, volume 47, page 385, et sequitur. I wish to call attention to the decision of Mr. Justice Davies,—more recently known, before he died, as Sir Louis Davies,—who gave the decision of the majority of the court. But first let me state the facts under which the decision arose.

The American schooner North was discovered fishing illegally within the three-mile limit with four of her boats out fishing within three miles of the Pacific coast in violation of the treaty of 1818. One of these boats was seized by the Canadian fisheries protection cruiser "Kestrel". The North was pursued and overhauled one and three-quarters miles beyond the three-mile limit. Her boats were out within the three-mile limit, and the "Kestrel" was delayed in overtaking her by stopping to seize one of these boats. Now the North was seized, it is true, beyond the three-mile limit. It was a hot and continuous pursuit. But if I understand that decision correctly, our Supreme Court held that, in the case as between the owners of the American vessel and the King, they were not called upon to consider or to decide whether the vessel had been rightfully seized in accordance with the rules of international law, at the point where she was seized, one and three-quarters miles beyond the three-mile limit. The court held that although the seizure may have been illegal and the first arrest illegal, inasmuch as the vessel was brought within the jurisdiction of Canada, and a proper attachment made subsequently to her being brought into Canadian waters, the court could decide on forfeiture as against the owners, leaving the government of the United States—the vessel being of American registry—either to acquiesce in the seizure having been made, at the place where it was made, or to make a claim for damages on behalf of the owners, which claim would be settled by some international tribunal. Mr. Justice Davies said:

But even if there was a reasonable doubt as to the power of the officers of the cruiser to seize the schooner on the high seas beyond the three-mile limit, under the circumstances before us, I am of the opinion that such irregularity could not affect the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court to hear and determine the offence charged against the schooner. That offence being within the jurisdiction of the court and the vessel being also within such jurisdiction and properly attached and libelled could not plead an alleged irregularity in the mode of her being taken on the high seas as a defence.

The manner in which she was brought into port and within the jurisdiction of the court was, if wrong or irregular, matter for diplomatic protest at the instance of the country to which she belonged or for civil action by the owners of the ship. If that country does not complain of any offence against its honour and dignity the ship libelled cannot do so. If the poaching schooner had escaped into the territorial waters of her own country and had been chased there, captured and brought back the government of that country might well justify intervention. But short of such intervention I think the ship charged with illegal fishing within the three-mile limit being within the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court and properly libelled there for an offence committed within its jurisdiction procedings cannot be defeated or the jurisdiction of the court ousted merely by an irregularity in the taking of the ship.

The principle underlying the decisions relating to persons kidnapped and brought before magistrates having jurisdiction over the offence with which they are charged are, I think, in point. These cases show that the remedy for the illegal arrest and the kidnapping of the prisoner is by proceedings at the instance of the government of the foreign country whose law or territory has been violated or at the suit of the injured party against the trespasser.

This doctrine of hot pursuit has been suggested at times by the United States in respect of the pursuit of vessels which have been found within the three-mile limit, committing offences against the customs laws of the United States and which, when an attempt has been made to seize them, have escaped beyond the three-mile limit and have been seized. But I suggest that no British authority has ever made the clear, bald admission, with respect to the validity of this American doctrine of hot pursuit, in the terms in which Mr. Massey makes it in the note from which I have just quoted. And although up to this time the Americans had never suggested in this correspondence that

they could vindicate their actions by reason of the hot pursuit of the I'm Alone, Mr. Massey continues in paragraph 14:

It is believed, however, that the government of United States will agree that it is essential for the effective operation of the convention of January, 1924, and for the attainment of the definite and agreed procedure, which was the object of the contracting parties, that the terms of the convention should be strictly observed.

Having thus taken his ground accurately, in express terms and in the most convincing manner, he nevertheless proceeds in the next sentence:

His Majesty's government in Canada trusts that the government of the United States will further agree that the search and seizure of vessels beyond territorial waters should be exercised in accordance with the terms of the convention,—

Splendid; but he unfortunately adds:

—that pursuit should not be continued beyond an hour's sailing distance from the shore unless initiated within territorial waters.

This subsidiary contention destroys the force and effect of his main and valid argument that the United States had no jurisdiction beyond such limits as are defined within the four corners of the treaty. He says that pursuit should not be continued beyond an hour's sailing distance from the shore unless initiated within territorial waters; but clearly the whole purpose and intent of the convention was that pursuit, hot or otherwise, wherever initiated, could never be carried beyond the distance covered by one hour's sail of the pursued vessel from the coast of the United States. To determine that fact, and to secure from the United States an agreement to that end, was the sole purpose of the long continued negotiations between Great Britain and the United States. Moreover, it was due to the express declaration of the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, to which declaration I have already referred, that under this convention there would be no seizure beyond the twelve-mile limit, that the government of Great Britain and, I believe, the government of Canada also were induced to approve of and authorize the ratification of that treaty. That the United States Secretary of State very speedily placed his finger on the weak point in our contention will appear from his letter of April 17, 1929. It is to be found on page 15 of this printed report, about two thirds of the distance down the page:

It is not understood that your government questions the validity of the doctrine of hot pursuit as such but merely its application in the instant case.

[Mr. Cahan.]

Then he goes on to suggest that since Mr. Massey has attached the doctrine of hot pursuit to the express terms of the convention of 1924 he, on behalf of the United States, will press his new vantage point to the extreme. He says:

In the estimation of this government, the correct principle underlying the doctrine of hot pursuit is that if the arrest would have been valid when the vessel was first hailed, but was made impossible through the illegal action of the pursued vessel in failing to stop when ordered to do so, then hot pursuit is justified and the locus of the arrest and the distance of the pursuit are immaterial, provided:

(1) That it was without the territorial waters of any other state;

(2) That the pursuit has been hot and continuous.

Then I would direct attention to the final letter from Mr. Massey, the date of which does not appear to be printed. Paragraph 5 of that letter reads as follows:

5. Even, however, were it not established that the I'm Alone was beyond the treaty limits when ordered to stop, the government of Canada cannot agree that any adequate ground has been established for pursuit on the high seas. They have previously indicated their view that the doctrine of hot pursuit which has been advanced is not applicable to a pursuit which, as is agreed to have been the case in the present instance, did not begin in territorial waters.

There we are endeavouring to limit the application of the doctrine of hot pursuit which we, quite unnecessarily, were led or induced to admit in the very first statement which we made as to our legal position.

I simply wish to direct attention to this and to suggest that if we are to engage in diplomatic correspondence of this nature with other countries, dealing with the rights of Canadian citizens on the high seas or in other parts of the world, it is absolutely necessary that our Department of External Affairs should obtain access to the Department of Justice for legal advice; if that access is not open at the present time, or, if that department is not now thoroughly equipped to deal with the international issues which are sure to arise from time to time, immediate steps should be taken to provide for such thoroughly experienced and competent legal advice as is certainly necessary in dealing with a nation such as the United States which, I say with deliberation, having, through the United States Secretary of State, pledged its honour to one interpretation of that treaty in the most formal manner, now undertakes to sink British shipping on the high seas and to bolster its act of almost deliberate wantonness, by developing an entirely different interpretation

of an international convention, which, in its plain terms, does not admit of any such construction.

It seems very clear to me—and I say this deliberately—that under the tariff laws of the United States as they may be construed by their express terms, the coastguard of the United States was not authorized to seize British or any other shipping, save perhaps American shipping, at any point more than twelve miles distant from its coast. In this case the evidence seems clear that this pursuit of two days continued to a point on the high seas 215 miles from the coast, and in my opinion the second coastguard vessel, the Dexter I think, which then came upon the scene, would never have sunk a British ship by cannon shot 215 miles from the coast, unless by wireless she had received direct instructions from the political authorities of the United States to commit that act which, if actually authorized by the executive political authority of that country, was an act of war, or which, if not authorized by that political authority but actually committed on the initiative of the United States coastguard alone, was the equivalent of an act of deliberate piracy.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope the house will recognize that in discussing a matter which has been referred to arbitration under an important treaty the government occupies a position very different from that occupied by an hon. member of this house who also happens to be a member of the opposition. I think it is even questionable whether my hon. friend, though sitting on the opposition side, in view of the fact that at the moment this case has been referred to arbitration, should have gone the length he did this evening in presenting what, to his mind at any rate, will be the Canadian side of the case when the matter comes to be argued before the proper tribunal. Certainly it would be an extraordinary procedure were the government, in the circumstances, to argue with my hon. friend with respect to any aspect of the case.

As a result of correspondence which has taken place between the two governments the I'm Alone incident has been referred to arbitration, and the arbitrators are about to be appointed. In these circumstances I think any criticism which the opposition may have to take against the administration, considering all the factors, might well be raised at a time when it is not calculated to embarrass in any particular those who will be charged with presenting the Canadian side of the case.

May I say that with respect to the correspondence which Mr. Massey, as the Canadian minister at Washington, presented to the American government, our government of course takes full responsibility. Mr. Massey acted under the instructions of the government, and any criticism which may be directed against any communication of his would be properly directed against the administration itself.

My hon. friend has spoken at great length and has given a very lucid and comprehensive statement of the grounds on which he believes the case should be decided in favour of Canada. In so doing he has displayed his great abilities as a counsel, but again I submit that in the interests of the country at large he might have presented his argument to better effect in some other form to those who are at present at work upon this case.

I shall not attempt in any way to review what my hon. friend has said. He began by speaking of the domestic law of the United States of 1922 with respect to the tariff and certain discussions which related thereto. He then reviewed at some length the cases of seizures which had taken place beyond the three-mile limit prior to the enactment of the convention to which he subsequently referred. He made mention of a remark by the Hon. Mr. Hughes, Secretary of State of the United States, which he said in honour bound the United States to a certain position, and having said that much he then came to the convention under which the I'm Alone incident has arisen and said that everything relevant to that particular incident must be contained within the four corners of the convention; in other words, all that he had said up to that time was more or less beside the mark.

Mr. CAHAN: Not beside the mark, but rather in support of the position.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope my hon. friend's whole argument will prove to have been in support of the position, and I think it would have been much stronger in that direction if it had not been so critical towards its close. The hon. member next spoke of the cases which had arisen since that convention was concluded all of which undoubtedly will be brought up in the course of the discussion before those who may be appointed as arbitrators in this matter. He came finally to one point in the correspondence between the Canadian government and the United States government and he said in effect: Here

is a very serious mistake which has been made on the part of Mr. Massey in his communication with the United States government. He has made mention of the doctrine of hot pursuit. That doctrine, he went on to say, was not raised by the United States government at the outset in correspondence with the Canadian government and should not have been raised by the Canadian minister at Washington in correspondence with the American government. If my hon. friend intended to imply by his remarks that the United States government had not at the inception of the discussion put forward the doctrine of hot pursuit in any form, he was quite mistaken and quite wrong in what he said. Very shortly after the I'm Alone incident occurred, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States defended the seizure and the action of the United States government on the ground of hot pursuit, and this contention was therefore referred to by Mr. Massey in his communication.

Mr. CAHAN: Was that in an oral conversation?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it was a statement issued as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States government in charge of coast guard operations. It was apparent to our government that the United States was basing its whole claim on the doctrine of hot pursuit. Had we ignored that position in our communications to the United States I think my hon. friend would have been the first to have directed our attention to the fact that we had overlooked what the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States had said publicly on behalf of the United States government as to its attitude.

May I say again that in speaking on this matter I feel the restriction which is necessarily imposed on myself as a member of the government in attempting to give all the reasons why mention was made of that particular doctrine in the first communication sent to the American authorities. I think that will become wholly apparent when the case is argued, and until it is argued I would prefer to leave the statement just at that point.

Throughout our negotiations with the United States government we have worked in the closest cooperation with the British government with respect to the substance of the communications which have passed between Canada and Washington. The British government is interested as a party to the treaty and Mr. Massey has been in the closest touch with Sir Esme Howard, the British ambassador at Washington. The Department of External Affairs at Ottawa has been in close communication with the Foreign Office in Great Britain. I may say that so far as the government is concerned we take much greater pride in the commendation which we have received from the British government with respect to the manner in which this incident has been handled than concern over anything which my hon. friend has said tonight.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Did I understand the right hon. the Prime Minister to say that other cases would be referred to this arbitration?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think the hon. member could have understood me to say that; I made no reference to other cases.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, without in any sense reviewing the authorities or discussing the matter which has been so fully and admirably dealt with by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan), may I say this: My appreciation of the correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of the United States was and is that there were dangerous admissions made on the part of the Canadian plenipotentiary. I do not believe that it is right or proper for any official, much less a plenipotentiary, to anticipate, in replying to a Secretary of State of a foreign country, what his contentions will be, because of what was said publicly or otherwise by an official of the treasury. In one instance you are dealing diplomatically with a great nation by means of a despatch and you are making a serious and considered communication, in the other instance, the secretary of another branch of the government, the law-enforcing branch, the Treasury department, has made a statement with respect to the matter, a statement which I saw in the papers, and which others saw, and which was not necessarily the statement of a lawyer. In this instance, however, we have the considered judgment of the plenipotentiary of the Dominion of Canada anticipating a defence to be made by the authorities of a foreign country in their formal despatch. In pleading in courts of law we would regard that as very bad practice and I did think, as my hon. friend has just pointed out, that by so doing—to use language which is not unfamiliar to those of us who play bridge—we lost a trick.

With reference to the second point, which arises out of the first, it seemed to me to be reasonably clear that our plenipotentiary had

not abundantly satisfied himself that the doctrine to which he alluded was a doctrine which had any application under the circumstances admitted in the case, and the Canadian authorities to which he referred certainly do not fully bear out his contention. It was for that reason that I then concluded, and I still think, that a little more care and the exercise of a little more considered judgment with respect to the legal position, especially with reference to the Canadian authorities which I think, in careful analyses, would bear out the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, would have enabled our minister to have presented a vastly different contention with respect to the matter.

In diplomatic despatches such as these we have once more the evidence of that principle of our jurisprudence about which so many people have complained from time to time: We are bound by precedent and governed by authorities. We remember what Tennyson said about that codeless myriad of precedent. When we come to deal with diplomatic controversies I do submit that it never should be forgotten that so far as this treaty is concerned we have placed a construction upon it which governs this Dominion of Canada for all time. That is a tremendously serious matter and one which I think should have and I am sure must have occasioned much anxious thought on the part of the hon. minister in charge of that department. I cannot think that any minister should have so lightly anticipated the objections of his opponents and endeavoured to traverse them before the objections had been made, as was done in the despatches we now have before us, if there had been that clear and distinct understanding of the serious implication of those admissions upon the future conduct of this country's diplomacy with the United States in connection with that treaty.

I will refrain from making any further observations this evening with respect to the matter. But because of its serious character and the far-reaching consequences of this single precedent and the wrongful and erroneous admissions made by our minister in respect to the matter, I desire to associate myself with what has been said so ably by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, so much better than I could have said it, and to protest against these explanations in anticipation of contentions that may be made by one's opponent. My friend beside me says that the science of pleading has disappeared because of our modern judicature acts but those of us who were trained under the old common law acts and the old system of pleading will recall the advice that I remember was once given to me by an old judge. He said: "Do not anticipate your opponent's case in pleading. Wait until he makes it."

Mr. JACOBS: Did my hon. friend do that last Friday night?

Mr. BENNETT: I certainly did not do that last Friday night. I found the hon. member for Cartier endeavouring to make, on false statements, a case which he did not succeed in making.

Mr. JACOBS: I deny that. That is false.

Mr. BENNETT: I expect a gentleman who would make it would also deny it, because the capacity to do the one is quite consistent with the desire to do the other. I shall refrain, I say, from traversing the case further, but I cannot but think a very serious injury has been done to this Dominion by our minister in dealing with this matter on an assumption which is unwarranted in law, which is based apparently upon a misapprehension of the facts, and which places upon a doubtful doctrine of international law a construction that, had he read the case in the lower courts, he would have found was substantiated by United States decisions which have never been fully recognized as applying to other than cases of blockade, and not to breaches of revenue laws or domestic statutes of that country. He is setting up that country's contentions just as we were, in regard to the seizure of this ship beyond the three-mile limit, which according to my appreciation of international law is the limit within which continuous pursuit can be commenced. The words are not "hot and continuous pursuit" in the case to which reference has been made, but "continuous pursuit'" and so strongly was that doctrine relied upon that it was a question of grave doubt whether or not when the pursuing ship stopped to arrest the dory of the ship and its crew within the three-mile limit, she had not broken the continuity of the pursuit so as to render the doctrine asserted by the Supreme Court of the United States to be no longer tenable. In this case the closing observations of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George clearly indicate the alternatives that must be in the mind of every Canadian, having regard to what happened to that ship some 200 miles from seacoast at the time she was destroyed by shot and shell from a vessel of a friendly power.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier): I am sorry that I was not in the house when the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) began his argument in this case, and my object in rising is merely to say that I question the propriety of bringing this matter before the house at the present juncture when the case is sub judice.

Mr. CAHAN: It is not sub judice under any doctrine of law in regard to sub judice that I have ever heard of.

Mr. JACOBS: It is being submitted to arbitration and a thorough ironing out by the arbitrators will be made. I represent the owners of the cargo and the schooner, and as such I want to say that we are thoroughly satisfied with the present status of the case. We feel assured that justice will be rendered in the matter and that when a decision is given the owners of the cargo and the schooner will be satisfied. There is a radical difference between the language of the notes which passed between the United States and Canada and the language of the debate in this chamber this evening. It is well known —I think it was Lord Randolph Churchill who said, that the business of an opposition is to oppose. That is their business, and strange to say, the opposition in this house knows its business thoroughly. It opposes everything which is brought up by the government; whether it be a matter of a diplomatic nature or not, the opposition opposes; but I would have thought that an eminent lawyer like the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, and an equally eminent lawyer like my good friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) would know something of the rule in regard to cases before the courts, namely, that when a case comes before or is about to be tried by a court, all criticism should be allowed to rest until judgment is rendered.

Mr. CAHAN: This is neither before a court nor coming before a court, and it is subject to public criticism.

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend not think that when a case comes before the arbitrators it is not before a court?

Mr. CAHAN: No arbitrators have been appointed. We have an official statement from both Washington and Ottawa to that effect.

Mr. JACOBS: They have both agreed upon it.

Mr. CAHAN: You cannot say it is before a court when a court is not constituted.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. JACOBS: Does my hon. friend think the case of Canada is to be improved when they read to-morrow in the newspapers in Washington of the criticism of our minister by the opposition?

Mr. CAHAN: Certainly it will not be prejudiced.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not think it will do the case any good; I think it will do it harm.

Mr. CAHAN: In what way?

Mr. JACOBS: My hon. friend is doing disservice to his country when he rises to criticize the conduct of the government in this matter so far as it has gone. I am rather surprised at the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAHAN: In what way is it doing a disservice?

Mr. JACOBS: Criticising the conduct of our minister and of our government because, after all, the minister is the mouthpiece of the government in the stand they have taken in regard to the question.

Mr. CAHAN: Will the hon. gentleman admit that the government of this country, through its minister, may be allowed to take, in a diplomatic note, a position which stands as the view of this government for all time without criticism if the opposition deems it worthy of criticism?

Mr. JACOBS: This is not the time for criticism.

Mr. CAHAN: This is the only time we have.

Mr. JACOBS: This is not the time, when the case is before the court.

Mr. CAHAN: It is not before the court.

Mr. JACOBS: The case is sub judice. The time for criticism is when the decision is rendered and it then comes before parliament. Then my hon. friend can move a vote of non-confidence or anything else he likes.

Mr. CLARK: Is this the appropriate time for counsel in the case to make his speech?

Mr. JACOBS: My hon. friend does not seem to know that a private attorney acting in a case is not permitted at all to speak before this court. The government will appoint counsel learned in the law, who will know all about the case. I am acting merely for the parties and I have no status before the court.

Mr. GEARY: And know nothing about the case.

Mr. JACOBS: It may be that when the government appoint counsel they may look to the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark). I have no doubt they will find in him a very able man who will do justice to the case and see that the interests of Canada are properly presented. I am merely a private member of parliament expressing my views, and I question the propriety of this matter being raised in this house at this juncture.

Mr. BENNETT: Might I ask, on a question of grave parliamentary privilege, in view of the observation just made by the hon. member for Cartier that we have agreed upon the arbitrators, whether the right hon. gentleman will be good enough to tell us who they are? It is passing strange that a private member of parliament should know, when parliament is denied that right.

Mr. JACOBS: Who said that a private member of parliament knows?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman said, "We have agreed upon them."

Mr. JACOBS: Not at all. I am as ignorant on that matter as my hon. friend is on many subjects.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter to be treated with levity. The hon. gentleman said that the matter had been referred to arbitration, whereupon the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George stated that there had been no arbitrators appointed; at least he said that a denial had come from Washington and from Ottawa to that effect. Thereupon the hon. member for Cartier said, "We have agreed upon them."

Mr. JACOBS: Agreed upon arbitration.

Mr. BENNETT: "Agreed upon them." That is what he said. The record will show it. Let us send for the record.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think what my hon. friend wants most to know is who the arbitrators are. Up to the moment no arbitrators have been appointed, and I did not understand my hon. friend from Cartier to say that any arbitrators had been appointed.

Mr. BENNETT: He said that they had been agreed upon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understood him to say that arbitration had been agreed upon. As to the arbitrators themselves, they have not yet been appointed, not yet, in fact, agreed upon.

Mr. CAHAN: Then the Prime Minister will admit that there is no constituted court at present.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Quite the contrary. The two countries have agreed to refer this question to arbitration. I think my hon. friend will admit that. Having agreed to refer this matter to arbitration, from the moment of agreement upon arbitration until the award is given I think members of parliament might well refrain from giving arguments to our opponents in the case.

Mr. CAHAN: It is not sub judice until the arbitrators are appointed.

Mr. BENNETT: The arguments we were making were all in favour of this country and against the argument which the minister was trying to establish.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

Civil Government—office of the Secretary to the Governor General—salaries, $34,335; contingencies, including house allowance of $1,500 per annum to Secretary to the Governor General, $72,500.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The details of this vote will be found on page 75 of the estimates. The messengers' staff has been decreased by one. The appropriation asked for this year is less than last years's vote. There are no increases.

Item agreed to.

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE

Privy Council—salaries, $55,170; contingencies, $7,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The details will be found on page 100 of the estimates. It will be seen that there are no increases in the staff, and no increases in salaries with the exception of the allowance to the deputy head, to the clerk of the privy council, whose salary has been increased from $8,000 to $9,000, an increase of $1,000 as the deputy head of this department.

Mr. SPENCER: I notice that the deputy ministers whose salaries are being increased are not all getting the same amount of increase. Would the Prime Minister inform the committee on what basis the salaries of these deputy heads are being increased?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend will recognize that some of the departments of government are very much larger than others and involve rather more in the way of expert knowledge and continuous pressure of duties. I do not wish to say that all departments of the government do not require ex-

pert knowledge on the part of the heads, but certainly it will be admitted that some of the departments, from the point of view of the class and amount of work involved, are not as considerable in their demands upon the deputy heads as others. The privy council is a department of the government which is all important, but it has not been felt by the administration that the deputy head of that department should receive an allowance comparable, for example, with the deputy head of some of the large administrative departments, carrying on work without cessation from day to day and month to month. The work of the Privy Council is not wholly comparable in the way of continuous duty to that of some other departments.

Mr. GARDINER: The first item in the details shows an increase to the deputy head. I understand from the estimates that the deputy heads of departments have been granted substantial increases. I think probably it is due the committee for the Prime Minister to make a statement as to the basis on which the government, in view of their refusal to increase the salaries of the lower paid civil servants, have decided to increase the salaries of the deputy heads.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend knows the agitation there has been with respect to technical and professional officers in the government service and the difficulty there is to obtain those who are required to fill the high positions relatively to the difficulty experienced in regard to filling positions in the service commanding less in the way of knowledge and ability. The deputy heads, I submit, come very much within the class of those requiring technical and professional knowledge and whose special service in that regard should receive special consideration.

Mr. BENNETT: There is only one observation I have to make with respect to that at the present time, because the whole matter will be under consideration before we finish the estimates. But there must be some principle governing matters of this kind. In some instances the increase in the salaries of the deputy heads has been $1,000 and in others $2,000, while still other deputy heads have received no increase at all. Perhaps the Prime Minister as the head of the administration would give us some idea on what basis these increases have been granted. If it is on a percentage basis, it does not work out; if it is on the basis of the work done, it does not work out; if it is on the question of length of service it does not work out. It is difficult to ascertain just what principle has been followed. If it were known on what principle the increases were being made one would be better able to determine what his course of action in the matter should be.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend will realize that there are departments of government recognized as such with responsible ministers at their heads. It is only the deputy heads of these departments that for the present the government has considered in the matter of increases. There are some branches of the government service which have at their head officers with the rank of deputy, but who are not deputy ministers in the sense in which the word is used without qualification. The question of their increase has not been finally considered up to the present time. There are important officers of state performing duties, some of them undoubtedly of a character similar to those performed by a deputy head. As I have said, up to the present time their position has not been finally considered by the government. We felt that inasmuch as a commission was being appointed to inquire into the whole question of the salaries of those who are expected to have technical and professional qualifications, its members would wish to consider the cases of all those in the public service who hold positions which demand qualifications of that kind. Later the government may have something to say with regard to the additional remuneration, if any, to be accorded to them. But certainly with the difficulty the government is experiencing in retaining the services of some of those who are at the head of the departments of state, it has been felt that, having regard to the salaries paid for similar services by private organizations, and having regard also to the length and quality of the services rendered, we should make the increases which we have made.

Mr. BENNETT: I think, Mr. Chairman, the observations of the Prime Minister answered a portion of the questions which I asked. The maximum appears to be $10,000. Now, if there has been an increase in the amount of work that has to be done by deputy ministers, I should think in one department in which it would be reflected, if not two, there has been no increase, apparently $10,000 being the maximum. Then there are other departments which are being gradually shorn of their responsibilities, by reason of the provinces being likely to receive their resources some time in the next century, and presumably those deputies having less work

to do, should not be receiving increased compensation. Now, all these are matters that I find it difficult to reconcile. If the maximum to be paid a deputy minister is $10,000, then the matter is clearly settled, because there are no increases with respect to the two deputies who now enjoy that salary. With respect to others we have increases of $1,000 and $2,000, and, as I have said, neither upon the basis of length of service and character of the work rendered, nor upon any other factor of that character, could you say why one should receive an increase of $1,000 and another $2,000. It is a little difficult to reconcile these various factors in order to arrive at a common policy. It has been suggested that the political predilections of some of the gentlemen before they were appointed have had a great deal to do with determining whether or not they should receive additional compensation. That has been stated by friends in and out of the house who have not been considered. It is a matter, I think, upon which a statement should be made.

I do agree with the Prime Minister that it is difficult nowadays to get men to remain in government service. There has never been a time when the demand for competent and qualified executives was greater than it is to-day, and if the country is to be well served it must be prepared to pay. The difficulty I experience in connection with the whole matter is that we have a multiplication of employees in Canada to whom we pay indifferent wages and compensation, with the result of a steady increase of the number, spreading over too wide an area—spreading it very thinly, if I may use a term that is easily understood—the number which would give efficient service. I listened to some explanations made during the passing of the estimates the other night, and as I thought over what was involved I began to understand why the minister was unable to recommend any increase having regard to the number employed. The figures given in the last civil service report indicate that this country pays $82,000,000 for permanent servants of the state, temporary employees and casual labour. Under these circumstances the right hon. Prime Minister will understand why we should like some explanation as to the principles which govern in connection with this matter, why some should be left on one side, and why some should be selected for a preference of $2,000, some for $1,000, there being no relation, as I have said, between the increase and the length of service or the character of the work that has to be done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say first of all to my hon. friend with respect to political predilections that I can assure him they have had nothing whatever to do with the decisions of the government in this matter. The particular vote that we are considering at the moment relates to the position of the Clerk of the Privy Council, who is the deputy head of that department, and who was, as I think hon. members are well aware, for many years private secretary to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and has been a life-long Liberal. I assume he is a Liberal still.

Mr. BENNETT: I would think so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But he receives an increase of $1,000 only. And my hon. friends, I am sure, will realize that the work of the Clerk of the Privy Council is not comparable, for example, with that of the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, the next vote to be referred to, in what it demands in the way of sustained effort, expert knowledge and tax upon time and energies. There has been in the latter case an increase of salary from $8,000 to $10,000, because the government is of opinion that the Department of External Affairs is one of the most arduous, difficult and exacting departments of the government for whoever may be administering its affairs permanently. In no case has an increase been granted beyond $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT: I was going to mention to the right hon. Prime Minister only one case. The head of the Civil Service Commission has a very difficult task. He was a former supporter of the Conservative party and a member of the privy council in Sir Robert Borden's administration. His salary certainly is not increased in these estimates, and he has been in office eleven years, if my memory serves me aright. I suggest that he probably would think it very improper for me to mention his case; for I have not had any conversation with him, much less a discussion in any way, shape or form; but it did seem to me that there is one, the deputy head of a department, whose services certainly are continuous and arduous. Having regard to some observations made by one of my hon. friends opposite, whom I do not see in his seat to-night, those duties are certainly very arduous. Under those circumstances I think there is some discrimination in leaving his salary at $6,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is $7,000. May I say to my hon. friend that, as

I mentioned, the government has not attempted up to the present time to take account of the salaries paid to any of those who have the rank of a deputy as distinguished from the position of the deputy head of a department. The head of the Civil Service Commission has not the position of a deputy minister corresponding to the permanent head of a government department. He is an officer who is appointed for a term of years under statute, and the Civil Service Commission, I think, reports through the Secretary of State.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: His position is different from that of the deputies who have been considered up to the present time. No doubt that position and many other positions of officers of state holding high and responsible posts will be considered in connection with the work of the present commission looking into salaries.

Item agreed to.

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER—SALARIES,

Office of the Prime Minister—salaries, $29,255.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The particulars of this vote will be found on page 97. It will be noted that there is an increase of two stenographers; that is all.

Item agreed to.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

External affairs—salaries, including appointment of Laurent Beaudry and John E. Read at $6,000 each, notwithstanding anything contrary in the Civil Service Act, $98,890; contingencies, $50,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The details of this vote will be found on page 80 of the estimates. It will be noticed that there is provision for one stenographer and additional provision for a legal adviser. I fancy that after the discussion we have had on the I'm Alone, and the importance that has been ascribed to the necessity of having communications in external affairs very carefully considered, from the legal point of view, hon. members will agree that it is wise to make this provision forthwith.

Mr. BENNETT: I have no hesitation in saying that the department is exceedingly fortunate in securing the services of Mr. Read. For many years Mr. Read was dean of the faculty of the law school of Dalhousie university, Halifax, and he has made for himself an enviable reputation as a lawyer. My memory is that he was a Rhodes scholar. I may be wrong—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: That is my memory. But we have counsellor and legal adviser as well in that department. Why are there two? There is usually only one.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This department had formerly a legal adviser, Mr. Christie, but from the time of his resignation we have had no legal adviser attached to the department.

Mr. BENNETT: But there was no counsellor.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The work has grown considerably since Mr. Christie left the department, and both positions are necessary. For some time past there has been a counsellor, Mr. Desy, but he has gone to Paris and his place is being filled by Mr. Laurent Beaudry, who has been at Washington.

Item agreed to.

London—Salaries and expenses of the office of the High Commissioner for Canada, including $2,000 additional salary for the High Commissioner to that authorized by chap. 15, R.S.C., $117,260.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The department has been seeking to bring about a certain uniformity between the salaries paid to the heads of the different legations and to the High Commissioner in London. The salary fixed for the minister at Washington, the minister at Paris and the minister at Tokyo has been $12,000; the salary for the High Commissioner in London is, under statute, $10,000. We have felt that, the position of High Commissioner in London, being the oldest of the quasi diplomatic posts, and the most important of them, the salary attaching to that office should be made the same as the salary paid the ministers in the capitals I have mentioned. For that reason we are asking the additional $2,000, notwithstanding the amount fixed by statute.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the total cost of the High Commissioner's office in London? The Prime Minister, when speaking on the budget, made a statement with reference to the cost of this office and he challenged some figures which I had used and, of course,

some remarks I had made. I should like to know what the total cost of this office is at the present time. Is it the sum of $117,260 which is asked for under this item?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the total sum which the Department of External Affairs pays for the work carried on in the office of the High Commissioner. There is an additional amount which is paid by the Public Works department for upkeep of the building.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much is that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: $35,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then do these two items —$35,000 paid by the Public Works department and $117,000 paid by the Department of External Affairs—constitute the whole cost of that office?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They constitute the whole cost, yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But there is another item of $10,000 for salaries, to be found at page 10. Would that be added to the total expenditure authorized by statute?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; I should have added that. It is the salary of the High Commissioner as provided by statute.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then, if my right hon. friend will add these figures, he will find that I was not far wrong in what I said in connection with the budget. The office costs much more than I stated, and the increase has been enormous.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The comparison I was making was between the figures my hon. friend quoted as prevailing now and those that prevailed at the time he was in office. He will find that I paralleled the columns in both cases.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But my right hon. friend when he paralleled them did not add the $10,000 and the $35,000 paid by the Public Works department.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Neither did my hon. friend.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not know about them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was in the same position in my comparisons.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The increase is greater than I stated.

Mr. BENNETT: Are there any details of the vote?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are not detailed.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the Prime Minister give the committee some information as to the duties of the High Commissioner in London? Friends of mine who have been in London have made a very striking comparison between the High Commissioner from Canada and the High Commissioner from Australia in relation to the duties performed by these gentlemen, and I regret to say that the comparison is not to the credit of this country. Most visitors seem to think that the Canadian High Commissioner is there more or less for the purpose of introducing Canadians to high society, and I think it would be well for the Prime Minister, if it is possible for him to do so, to dispel such an idea and give the committee an understanding of the High Commissioner's duties.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No one familiar with the important and varied duties of the High Commissioner could entertain such an idea. The Canadian High Commissioner represents the government of Canada in innumerable transactions, and particularly in its relation with the government of Great Britain. For the barest outline of last year's activities I would refer my hon. friend to page 10 of the report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. At the bottom of the page he will find an account of a few of the duties performed by the office of the High Commissioner during 1928. Perhaps I might read a paragraph in point:

> The High Commissioner's office in London has discharged its usual multifarious and important duties, acting as the organ for maintaining the necessary detailed relations between the departments of His Majesty's governments in Canada and Great Britain, as well as in connection with the government expenditures and contracts in Great Britain, with measures for informing the British public as to Canadian matters and extending requisite assistance to Canadian visitors. The office was represented at the periodical meetings of the Pacific Cable Board, the Imperial Institute, the War Graves Commission, and the Imperial Shipping Committee.
>
> In pursuance of his usual practice with the object of keeping in close touch with Canadian public life, the High Commissioner visited the Dominion during the month of August, delivering speeches and holding interviews at various places. He was actively engaged also in the conclusion of an agreement with the Bulgarian government under which the property of Bulgarian nationals in Canada sequestrated by the Custodian of Enemy Property is to be restored to them, and also in the arrangements connected with the transfer to the Royal Canadian Navy of the Champlain and Vancouver as well as the building of two new destroyers for the Canadian navy.

This makes no mention of the many financial transactions for which the High Commisioner's office has been responsible in part in the past and is responsible at the present time—for example the collecting of outstanding debts from the governments of Great Britain, Roumania and Greece, as well as many other highly important transactions. It may be stated that the High Commissioner in cooperation with the Minister of Finance was instrumental in securing, during the seven years Mr. Larkin has been in office, the settlement of outstanding accounts resulting from war transactions, averaging $29,500,000 per annum. As one instance of the effective service of the High Commissioner during the past year I would mention his success in cooperation with the Imperial Shipping Committee in doing away with the discriminations previously in force in the insurance rates charged by the underwriters upon ships voyaging to Canadian ports, particularly Halifax and St. John and in some measure St. Lawrence and British Columbia ports, a practical service to every Canadian exporter and importer.

I do not know from what source my hon. friend obtained the information which occasioned him to make the comparison he did between the High Commissioner for Australia and the High Commissioner for Canada. Nothing could possibly be further from the mark. I think anyone who has any knowledge of the work being done in London by Canada's High Commissioner will say that we have been extremely fortunate in having in the Honourable Mr. Larkin a gentleman of exceptional business ability and administrative capacity and one who has been most industrious and efficient in watching over Canada's interests in London. I think Canada's office will more than bear comparison with any similar office in Great Britain.

Mr. SPENCER: In support of the criticism of the hon. member for Acadia I may say that I visited London in 1927, and from my inspection of Canada House as compared, say, with Australia House, I would say that we do not go far enough in advertising Canada except possibly in the advertising matter which is on the shelves of the ground floor. It is a very nice office and they have very fine reception rooms, but when it comes to the advertising the wares of Canada certainly we can take a leaf from Australia's book; from a commercial point of view there is no comparison between the two. If you go into Australia House—and any members who have been there will support me in this statement—you will find a miniature Australia before you; you will see every state; you will see pictures of the various industries, of the fields and of the farms; their products are on display where any vistor can see them. On the other hand, if you go to Canada House you will find a very nice office, and commodious waiting and reception rooms, but that is all you can say. What the high commissioner does there in his capacity as Canada's representative I cannot say. The Prime Minister is in a position to give the house that information, but from the point of view of advertising Canada to the public I certainly think we take second place to Australia.

Mr. FORKE: I should like to say a few words with regard to the statement made by the hon. member for Battle River. He forgets that Australia concentrates entirely on London; all the advertising they do in Great Britain with regard to the products of Australia is done in the city of London, and as far as London is concerned it is well done. However, my hon. friend must bear in mind that Canada has ten offices in the principal cities of Great Britain, where splendid exhibitions of Canadian products are maintained, advertising Canada all over Great Britain. We consider that a much better way of advertising Canada than by concentrating everything in London where it can be seen only by the people of that city

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might add to what the Minister of Immigration has just said that so far as Australia is concerned not only is all the immigration work centralized in London but the work pertaining to their railways and in regard to trade and commerce and so on is carried on there as well. The Canadian Department of Trade and Commerce while partially housed in the Canadian Building has in London its separate offices for exhibition purposes, and the advertising work carried on by the Canadian National Railways is handled through their own offices as well. I think if the entire advertising of the two countries were taken into account it would be seen that Canada is well looked after in comparison. Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that Australia pays her High Commissioner a salary of £3,000 a year, together with an allowance of £2,500. Then there is an allowance of £29,037 for salaries and allowances for the High Commissioner's staff, a further allowance of £9,034 for contingencies, and an allowance of £20,000 for the upkeep of Australia House. Australia has purchased and furnished an official residence for her High Commissioner and made substantial pro-

vision for its upkeep. Canada's High Commissioner has provided and maintained a residence in London at his own expense. If a comparison were made as to the cost of maintaining these officers I think it would be found that Australia allows about twice the amount we pay for the services rendered.

Mr. HEAPS: Could the Prime Minister tell us the cost of the construction of that building?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We discussed that matter six or seven years ago, and I am afraid I have not the figures with me at present.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Then will the Prime Minister say what all these little sub-offices cost?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The estimates of the Department of Immigration will be down to-morrow, probably.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It might be worth while to get the aggregate cost if we are to make a comparison with Australia.

Mr. CANTLEY: Do I understand the Minister of Immigration to say that Australia does no advertising in Great Britain except in the city of London?

Mr. FORKE: I would not say they do not carry on any advertising in the counties, but they have no exhibitions in the different large centres such as Liverpool and so on, and Canada does carry on work of that kind. I suppose the Australian government has immigration agents throughout the counties, but there is no exhibition of Australian products such as we have of ours.

Mr. CANTLEY: Am I to understand that no advertising is carried on in the city of Glasgow, for example?

Mr. FORKE: I do not think there is any exhibition there; not to my knowledge.

Mr. CANTLEY: I referred to advertising and I am certain I have seen such several times. I have also seen such advertising in Edinburgh, and in other places.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A moment ago I gave some figures relating to the office of the Australian High Commissioner in London. I have before me some additional figures given recently by the Premier of Australia. These include £2,600 for advertising in addition to what I have given for the High Commissioner's office and Australia House; £19,000 for immigration salaries; £12,000 for immigration contingencies; £1,000 for the council for scientific and industrial research; £2,000 for marketing, and so on. Then there is the dairy officer, the fruit officer and so on, giving a total of £139,988.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): All connected with Australian House?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: These are in addition to the other figures I gave. The activities they represent are centred in Australia House.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The only reason I ask the question is that the remarks of the Minister of Immigration would seem to indicate that Australia had just the one centre in London, whereas I think the figures now given by the Prime Minister show that the work is carried on all over Great Britain.

Mr. GEARY: Would the Prime Minister tell us, without going into great detail, the reason for the $5,000 increase, excluding the $2,000 increase in the salary of the High Commissioner?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Due to the increased work of the London office—and I may say this work has grown considerably even within the last year coincident with our having in Canada a High Commissioner from Great Britain—we have thought it advisable to make provision for another clerk in the Canada House office, and there is an appropriation of $3,000 for that purpose.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if this $2,000 increase was requested or suggested by the High Commissioner, or whether it is a bonus offered by the right hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I can assure my hon. friend that it was not asked by the High Commissioner. As I said a moment ago, the department is seeking to adopt some uniformity in the scale of allowances for salaries and other purposes as between the different offices. We have felt that London is the first of the positions abroad, and that the salaries and allowances should be made proportionate in relation to what is being paid elsewhere. I do not think I am wrong in saying that the High Commissioner spends many times the total of his salary and allowance in connection with the services which he is rendering the country overseas.

Mr. BENNETT: He must spend at least $100,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sure it is more than that.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I think the Prime Minister is absolutely right when he says that the High Commissioner spends more money than he is paid by this government. What I am afraid of is that while this matter is being taken care of with regard to London we will have the ambassadors extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary at Tokyo and Washington stating that their services are worth more money than they are paid.

An hon. MEMBER: I think they are.

Mr. RYCKMAN: We have had very distinguished men occupying the office of High Commissioner at London but it can never be said that the present High Commissioner has done more than Lord Strathcona did, and I never heard it suggested that more money should be offered to Lord Strathcona. I think the position should be an honorary one; but if it comes to the point where money is to be paid for these services, then let the matter be carefully weighed. This is one of the first positions under the government. It is well known that the office has been adorned by men who have been anxious to serve their country, and I am unwilling to see it put on a pecuniary basis. If an offer of $2,000 has been made, put it on a business basis and if necessary offer more.

Item agreed to.

Passport office—salaries and expenses, $28,500.

Mr. MANION: Are there branch passport offices throughout the Dominion where passports are issued without applying direct to Ottawa?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, there are not.

Mr. MANION: Someone has made the statement that there is one at Montreal; is that correct?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the income derived from this office?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Last year the income amounted to $140,000.

Mr. COOTE: Is it necessary for people coming from Great Britain to Canada to have passports?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. COOTE: Then why should it be necessary for British subjects going from Canada to Great Britain to have passports before they are permitted to enter that country?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That question has been asked repeatedly of the British government by our administration. The British government takes the position that they have adopted the passport regulations to enable them to control the admission of aliens. They contend that those who are British citizens will, in the long run, be occasioned less discomfort, if I may use that term, in their admission to Great Britain through having a passport than if they came without one. There is a process of examination which they desire to have in Great Britain in order to satisfy themselves as to persons not being aliens, and a passport apparently avoids any questioning. For that reason the British authorities have considered that plan as being preferable to having individuals undergo a course of examination and questioning on arrival. The matter has been taken up by correspondence, and it was taken up at the last imperial conference. If I am not mistaken, it was taken up at the previous imperial conference but the British government up to the present time has not seen fit to do away with the passport regulation.

Mr. HEAPS: The Prime Minister has said that this is done to make it easier for Canadians to enter Great Britain. I wonder if something could not be done to make it easier for Canadians to return to Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is no trouble getting back.

Mr. HEAPS: There is much more trouble for a Canadian returning to Canada than there is for one going to Great Britain.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. HEAPS: That has been my experience.

Mr. COOTE: I have been told that there is considerable delay in the passport office in the issuance of the passports. I do not know whether the complaints are all justified but some cases have come to my attention where the parties have been held up for three weeks without receiving a reply from the passport office. Some of these people had engaged a berth on a certain ship and had to use the telegraph to speed up the passport office in order to receive their passports in time. Would the Prime Minister look into this matter and see whether there is any unnecessary delay or whether the passport office is requiring information which perhaps is not necessary?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should be very much obliged if the hon. member would give me the names of any persons who have

experienced delay in obtaining passports, and I will undertake to let him have a statement as to the date on which their applications were received and the date on which they were given their passports. I have heard from many sources that the passport office at Ottawa is particularly efficient and the government has been complimented over and over again on the fact that there is less delay and less red tape in the matter of getting a passport from the Canadian office than from any other. I think the information of the hon. member probably has been given to him in an exaggerated form, but I should like to look into it.

Mr. COOTE: It is quite possible that the applicants may not have completed the form, or something of that kind. I have not the particulars, as these cases came to my attention when I was at home. Does the Prime Minister think unnecessary questions are being asked before a passport is granted, and that the procedure is quite as simple as it might be?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I am right in saying that the question of passports was taken up at the League of Nations with a view to having a similar set of questions asked in all countries. We have endeavoured to simplify our passports as much as possible and have brought the questions down to the minimum.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the hon. member for Macleod must be wrongly informed. I doubt if there is any other office where passports can be obtained as readily and with as courteous service as in this country. From my own personal experiences, one in Great Britain and one in France, I have come to the conclusion that we have nothing to learn in either promptness or courtesy in this regard. I think the difficulty arose through the correspondents of the hon. member having omitted to reply to what they thought to be an irrelevant question. Sometimes the signature is not put on the back of the photograph, and obviously that might give rise to a very difficult situation, because the country as such certifies to the validity of the passport, and with no signature there is nothing to indicate that the photograph is that of the person in question. If one is desirous of going to Great Britain the railway companies will take the requisite fee, have the form filled out and send the passport on to meet the passenger at the boat. I know of three cases since the opening of navigation this year in which that has been done. I only say that in justice to the gentlemen in charge of the office. One must speak of them as one finds them, and they have shown not for me alone, but for any person I have known who has had to communicate with them, a willingness to assist, a great courtesy, and an earnest desire to serve the public.

Mr. SPENCER: I think the trouble lies largely in the fact that the public do not understand the full information that is required of them with regard to passports. I am glad indeed to say that in any communications I have had with the passport office, I have been given the very best service. But I have had complaints from people who, not having the full information, have been wondering why their passports have been held up. That is where the trouble lies. The passport situation is a nuisance, but I am glad to say that I have received most excellent service from the passport office in Ottawa.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: My experience has been the same; that is, I have received great courtesy, most efficient service and had the matter I was dealing with expedited as much as possible. But having many complaints with regard to delays that have taken place, just to see how long it really took, I followed step by step the case of a friend in my part of the country who was applying for a passport. Living, as many do, some distance from a railway, he received his mail by rural mail carrier twice a week. When he wrote me I went to the office and had the necessary form sent out to him, but it required about two weeks for his letter to reach Ottawa and for a reply to be sent. He wrote to Ottawa, and the application was promptly mailed to him, but this took two weeks. The application was sent back to Ottawa improperly filled out and had to be returned with explicit and courteous instructions as to what should be done. This took two more weeks. When he finally got the passport, a little over six weeks had elapsed, but almost the whole of that delay was due to the distance and the time required for the application to reach that outlying point and then to be returned. It took six weeks, without the slightest dilatoriness on the part of the passport office, the necessary information having been sent at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. COOTE: So far as I have had any communications with the passport office they have been answered as promptly as possible, but I have had cases where the time elapsing between the making of application for a passport and the receipt of it was just as long as in the instance quoted by the hon. member

for Red Deer. I am speaking only from memory, but in some cases it seems that an unnecessarily long time elapses between the despatch of a request for a passport and its being received. The delay may have been accounted for by circumstances which were not brought to my attention. Personally I have had the best service possible from the passport office.

Mr. BENNETT: As I understand the matter, they deal with the applications in sequence.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I do not want in any way to criticize or to sound a note of discord in regard to what has been said as to the work of the passport office. We are moving far away from the war and the post war period, and it seems to me that the work should therefore be lighter and easier. The sum of $5,500 is an important item. If an explanation were given why at this date the expenses of the office are increased, it might be illuminating.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As times are improving, people are travelling a great deal more. The cost of printing passports is in itself a considerable item.

Mr. RYCKMAN: But there is the money collected.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But a larger number are required to attend to the business as there is more business to attend to.

Item agreed to.

Washington—representation, including salaries and allowances for minister plenipotentiary, secretaries and staff, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, or any of its amendments, $100,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Would the Prime Minister give the details of this?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend will notice that the amount asked for this year is the same as last year. I would refer him, if I might at this hour of the evening, to the report of the Department of External Affairs on the work of the legation at Washing. I think the extent of the work of the legation is now pretty generally known.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): In view of the statement the Prime Minister has made regarding such cases as the I'm Alone incident, namely, that he is not prepared to refer them to arbitration, I am afraid that in justice to one of my constituents I shall have to take up the time of the committee for a little while.

[Mr. Coote.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not say that I was not prepared to refer them to arbitration. I said that I thought this was perhaps not the time to make a decision on that point.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): My statement will take up some time, and I do not wish to take the time of the committee now if the Prime Minister will assure me that he will give my case the consideration it deserves. I think his deputy will assure him that I am pressing pretty strongly in connection with it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He has told me about it several times. I have said to him that we must give it every consideration, and we shall do so.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): I am afraid if I let this opportunity go by I shall not haave another one for a year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can promise my hon. friend another opportunity during this session.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Before the session is over?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): That will be satisfactory.

Item agreed to.

Paris—representation, including salaries and allowances for minister plenipotentiary, secretaries and staff, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, or any of its amendments, $80,000.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Why the increase?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend will realize that the legation itself was opened within the past year and the premises in which it is at present housed are different from those which we had heretofore. There have been some additional expenses in connection with the new building and they account for the slight increase.

Mr. SPENCER: What extra work will our representative in Paris do to-day that he did not do before his change of position?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might mention just one matter which may help to illustrate the increase in his duties. Heretofore the Canadian Commissioner General had no right of immediate approach to the French government. Matters of a governmental character were dealt with by the British ambassador.

Mr. BENNETT: He had no right of audience.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He had no right of audience, as my hon. friend says. To-day all the duties that were formerly carried out through the British ambassador's good offices are attended to immediately by our own office. The interests which Canada has in France have been increasing from year to year. The number of Canadians visiting France and wishing to be assisted in many ways in the matter of information and in connection with the business in which they are engaged has increased considerably and altogether the importance of the position has grown with the years.

Mr. BENNETT: Do I understand that our diplomatic representatives do not, except in cases of difficulty with the country to which they are accredited, deal with questions of trade and commerce and commercial matters?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They deal with all matters of governmental character.

Mr. BENNETT: I am speaking of—

Mr. DUNNING: Trade promotion?

Mr. BENNETT: Not only trade promotion, but questions connected with trade and commerce. I was advised, and I said that when I got the opportunity I would ascertain whether or not it is correct, that our diplomatic representatives do not deal with questions of trade except for the purpose of making representations. For instance, I assume that our representatives at Washington made representations with respect to the proposed new United States tariff, and that our diplomatic representative at Paris might make representations with respect to contemplated action by the government of France in connection with duties and matters of that kind. But in the development of trade, as distinguished from the diplomatic side of trade, do I understand that our plenipotentiaries do not deal with such matters?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend would include in the diplomatic phases of a plenipotentiary's work the giving of a great deal of information on commercial matters, I should say that he was in the main right in saying that the direct and detailed promotion of trade is left to the commercial representatives of the government, but the diplomatic representatives have much to do with furnishing information not only to departments of the government but to individuals with respect to important trade matters in the countries to which they are accredited, and in creating the interest and affording many of the facilities essential to the promotion of trade.

Mr. KAISER: In what manner and to what extent can a member of parliament ascertain what is being discussed by our diplomatic representatives? How can we ascertain, for instance, what matters have been placed before the United States government by our diplomatic representative at Washington?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The report of the Department of External Affairs gives some indication of the work that is being done. There is a committee of this house on industrial and international relations, and I think it would be advisable at some time to have the question of the work of these legations referred to that committee so that the ministers themselves, were it so desired, and others connected with the legations, might appear and advise members of the house at first hand of their various services. I think that would be preferable to attempting to discuss these matters on the floor of the house.

Mr. KAISER: The Prime Minister must admit that the Department of External Affairs publishes only a very meagre report. I read it through very carefully, and I confess that I was more confused than I was before. I could form no idea of what matters had been under representation by our diplomats.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend knows that it is part of the art of a diplomat not to say too much about what he is doing.

Item agreed to.

Tokyo—representation, including salaries and allowances for minister plenipotentiary, secretaries and staff, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act or any of its amendments, $75,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Will this pay the whole cost for this year?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We hope it will.

Mr. BENNETT: You are not buying a building, I take it.

Mr. GEARY: There is an increase of $25,000 in this item. A minister has been appointed, I believe, and last year his salary did not appear in the estimates. Perhaps the Prime Minister would give us details of the increase.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the estimate was being prepared last year it was understood that no appointment could be made and no steps taken in the matter of the organization of the legation until possibly the beginning of the present year. Accordingly parliament was not asked to appropriate the amount which we now feel is necessary for another year. We feel that the additional amount will be necessary for the coming year.

Mr. GEARY: The item last year was $50,000, and this year it is $75,000. What is the extra expense for?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The amount last year was the estimated amount, part of which, but not all, has been spent, in providing accommodation and equipment for the legation in Tokyo.

Item agreed to.

Geneva—salaries and expenses of the office of the Canadian advisory officer, $22,500.

Mr. MANION: This question may come more pertinently under the next item, but perhaps the Geneva items will all be dealt with together. What check-up is there on the League of Nations in regard to its expenditure? I have seen a good deal of criticism in various sections of the press regarding the expenses of the league, and what appears to be everybody's business is nobody's business. That seems to be the impression of some of the English and Canadian journals that I have read. Would the Prime Minister give some explanation of how the expenses are checked?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals was on the budget committee at the last meeting of the League of Nations and can probably answer that question.

Mr. DUNNING: It is more difficult to get estimates past the budget committee of the League of Nations than past any legislative body of which I have been a member. The debates regarding what might be called the internal economy of the league and the presentation of the estimates for the various branches of the league's work certainly arouse very strong and very critical discussion. One can understand that when one remembers that some of the nations are not interested in certain phases of the league's work, and naturally they are very critical of expenditures on those phases which do not particularly interest them. The procedure is almost identical to that followed in this house. I can assure my hon. friend that I was surprised at the thoroughness with which the representatives of the various nations criticized the estimates and brought about from time to time reductions in the votes brought before the budget committee of the League of Nations.

Mr. MANION: I do not dispute that, but at the same time. I have seen a good deal of criticism of the expenses of the league. I notice, for instance, that Canada's contribution, and we are one of the small countries of the world, is increased by over $21,000 this year. I am not trying to hold up the estimates of the Prime Minister, but he cannot get these four items relating to the league through to-night, so it does not really matter very much. It would be interesting to the committee if the Prime Minister when next these estimates are up would give a brief sketch of how the expenses of the League of Nations are made up and how our proportion is worked out. I do not expect anything lengthy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps in the meantime we can pass this item.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, May 21, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Eleventh report of select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Brown.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Mr. L. S. R. MORIN (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville) moved:

That the sixth report of the select standing committee on standing orders, which was presented on the 17th May, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar, for Mr. Parent) moved:

That the tenth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills, which was presented on the 17th May, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

VICTORIA DAY ADJOURNMENT—MORNING SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the work of the session has been proceeding fairly rapidly of late. We have exhausted most of the legislation on the order paper with the exception of supply. There are still one or two reports of committees to be received, with possibly one or two bills to be based thereon, and maybe another bill or two. I would suggest that on and after Monday of next week the house might begin its sittings in the mornings. I think this an appropriate time to bring the matter to the attention of the house. If there is no objection I would present the formal motion now; if it is desired to enter upon a discussion of the matter I should be glad to have it proceed immediately.

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): personally, I would object to morning sittings for the reason that those of us who are trying to keep in touch with what is going on find it absolutely impossible to do justice to our work. I agree with what the right hon. the Prime Minister has just said that we are getting on very nicely and if we do not sit in the mornings it will only mean an extra two or three days, or we could possibly start at two o'clock in the afternoon. I would remind the house that it is particularly hard on the Hansard staff who have to sit here working while the house is in continuous session.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) who has just taken his seat, apparently mistook the thunderous applause which was given on the appearance of the hon. member for Mount Royal (Mr. White) for approval of his observations. In view of the fact that we have reached the point we have in connection with legislation and that the major part of the business which must engage our consideration during the balance of the session will be the estimates—I might say here that the government has been very derelict in not proceeding with them earlier in the session—I think we could get in two hours extra work in the morning without very much difficulty. It is impossible, strive as we may, to keep in touch with everything. I do my best but I realize that the government put it over on us very frequently and I agree with the hon. member for Battle River as to the necessity of having several supporters to watch what is going on. I am quite sure my hon. friend will find it difficult to follow the intricacies of the operations of the mind of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb), especially on the tariff, in this or in any other house. Some of my hon. friends have pointed out that it has not been customary to sit on Empire day. The other day I asked the right hon. the Prime Minister whether he expected the house would sit on that day and he said that was the intention. My memory was that the house did sit last year but I never trust my memory in a matter of that kind and I have not looked it up, but there seems to be an opinion on the part of many of our friends that as that day is being kept as a holiday by one-quarter of the world's population it might be well for us to reconsider what our attitude should be in the premises.

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Ever since I have been in the house we have always had towards the end of the session late sittings while at the early part of the session we have always had a number of holidays. This year we had quite a long Easter recess and now at the end of the session we are asked to hurry along with the result that much legislation will be ill considered. I join with what the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has said, that we should have the twenty-fourth of May as a public holiday. We observed the holiday on May ninth, I believe some religious or church holiday, and if we observe a religious holiday I do not see why we should not observe Empire day. Not that I am an imperialist by any means; I join with my friend, David Kirkwood in the statement that he belonged to the British commonwealth of nations not because he was an imperialist but because he thought it was the greatest movement for peace which we had ever had.

These things are apparently arranged by the government as the private members of the house would seem to be just pawns in the game. I hope that the next session of the house will be so arranged that we will not have a number of holidays at the beginning of the session and then finally have to resort to morning and Wednesday evening sittings in the effort to rush things through.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): I have been in this house long enough to realize that anything I say will have no effect, but nevertheless I am going to exercise the privilege of free speech. Personally, I have no objection to the house sitting in the mornings when the committee work is finished. Some of us who come from western Canada are

particularly interested in the Canada Grain Act and have been attending one or two meetings daily of the agriculture committee. On one or two occasions this committee has sat three times in the one day and we find it impossible to keep in touch with the work which is going on in the house. There is to be a very important meeting of that committee this afternoon and I understand that there will be a motion to go into supply on the Immigration estimates. I am finding it difficult to decide which is the more important matter for my constituency, the question of immigration or the Canada Grain Act, but I suppose I will have to decide that matter before four o'clock. I do protest against this house sitting three times a day while some committees are sitting twice a day, as it is not fair to the members of the committees. We find it difficult now to get a quorum in our committee and I do not think the members of this house should be practically precluded from taking part in what is going on in the house, and that is what will happen should the committees be sitting twice a day while the house is sitting three times a day.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, for nine years I have been looking for an opportunity to support the right hon. the Prime Minister, and at last I have discovered something. I should like to put myself on record as being in favour of morning sittings. As the leader of the opposition has said, it is impossible to keep in touch with all the different committees anyhow. The hon. member who has just taken his seat pointed out that he had a committee meeting this afternoon. If the house were sitting in the mornings conditions would not be different as both the committee and the house would be sitting at the same time. Some of us who have not rented our farms would like to get back to attend to our professional duties, and I am one of those.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As hon. members know, in matters of this kind the government is anxious to meet as nearly as may be possible the wishes of the house as a whole. With respect to Empire day may I say to my hon. friends that we did feel that probably the greatest service which could be rendered the empire by this parliament on that day would be to put good legislation upon the statutes. However, if there are hon. members who were counting on Empire day as an opportunity to visit their constituencies or to take part in Empire day celebrations of one kind or another, certainly it would be the wish of the administration not to disappoint them in that particular.

Mr. CAHAN: Has the right hon. the Prime Minister considered that for thirty years, without exception, this House has kept Empire day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was not under the impression that such was the case.

Mr. CAHAN: Except once, when it came on Sunday.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend says that such is the fact I will accept his word; I would be willing to accept his word on almost anything, particularly where it relates to Empire day. The government is quite prepared to have a motion presented immediately providing that the house shall not sit this year on Empire day. But might I suggest, seeing this is a matter of accommodation, that the two motions be put at the same time. We shall be losing a day out of this week if we give up Friday. We might as well make up that time next week by sitting in the mornings, and if that is agreeable, I would move:

That when this house adjourns on Thursday the 23rd of May, instant, it stand adjourned until Monday, the 27th of May; and that on and after May 27th instant until the end of the session, this house shall meet at eleven o'clock in the morning and that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock, p.m., there shall also be an intermission every day from one to three o'clock p.m.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): May I suggest to the government and to the house that, instead of or even in addition to sitting in the morning, we sit until a reasonable hour at night. It is ridiculous to stop work just when we are getting into our stride. We are like a lot of school children being sent off to bed at eleven o'clock. This is absolutely out of proportion to our capacity for work or for happiness. My suggestion would satisfy those who wish to sit on committees in the morning and in the afternoon. We could make it a rule of the house that committees would not sit in the evening and that in the evening and until the early hours of the morning we proceed with the business of the country. In the few years that I have been in the house I have found that we get through more work in a much more intelligent manner after eleven o'clock than we do before. I would submit for the consideration of the house that at any rate we ought to be able to pass up our privilege of going to bed at eleven o'clock for a week or two until the end of the session.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): We find it hard enough to maintain a quorum until eleven o'clock now.

Motion agreed to on division.

PRIVATE BILLS

JOSEPH EDWIN WOOD

Mr. J. P. HOWDEN (St. Boniface): The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Edwards) is out of the city and probably will not be back again this session on account of sickness. At his suggestion and with the permission of the house I will substitute my name for his.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent, Mr. Howden for Mr. Edwards (Ottawa) moves that bill No. 290 for the relief of Joseph Edwin Wood be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 255 for the relief of Marion Rose Harrison.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 258 for the relief of Robert Wilson Reoch.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 268 for the relief of John Wilson Pickering.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 273 for the relief of Wallace Wellington Corkum.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 280 respecting Alliance Nationale. —Mr. Mercier (Laurier-Outremount).

Bill No. 286 for the relief of Marion Annie Terry.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 287 for the relief of Frank Milsom Ruggles.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 291 for the relief of Dora Chearnley Chearnley.—Mr. Howden (for Mr. Edwards, Ottawa).

Bill No. 295 for the relief of William Edgar Baird.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 296 for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker.—Mr. Sanderson.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE PROSECUTIONS —MR. HARRY BRONFMAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Does the responsibility of carrying out the prosecutions recommended by the Customs commission fall upon the Department of Justice, or upon the attorney general of the province in which the accused is a resident? If it is the duty of the federal Department of Justice, why has the prosecution of Mr. Harry Bronfman of Regina, as recommended by the Customs commission, not been proceeded with?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Perhaps my hon. friend will allow his question to stand, and I shall see to it that he receives an answer.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): I desire to direct to the attention of the government the fact that on May 6th, an order was passed by the house for the production of papers in connection with the prosecution of Harry Bronfman. I should like to know when the papers will be brought down.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I will look into the matter and see if I can expedite the return.

FISHERIES PATROL SERVICE OFF BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. C. BRADY (Skeena): As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) is not in the house, I bring to the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), with a view to having action taken, a telegram that I have received stating that great dissatisfaction is felt along the British Columbia coast because the patrol boat Malaspina has been tied up in the harbour of Prince Rupert since she seized five American fishing boats on May 11th, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is urged to take immediate steps to release this boat to carry on patrol service, which is imperative if poaching and illegal fishing of American fishing vessels in Canadian waters is to be checked. I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fsheries will take action in this matter because it is very important.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I shall be glad to see that the representations in the telegram which my hon. friend (Mr. Brady) has just read are brought to the attention of the minister.

DIAMOND JUBILEE OF CONFEDERATION

COMMEMORATION MEDAL SUGGESTED FOR CANADIAN MAYORS

On the orders of the day.

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston City): Has any promise or suggestion been made that mayors of Canadian cities during the jubilee year of confederation are to be presented with a bronze medal?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I do not recollect any such promise being made, but I think it would be a very appropriate action to have taken.

NOVA SCOTIA COAT OF ARMS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. A. BLACK (Halifax): The other day the Secretary of State laid on the table some correspondence with reference to the coat of arms for the province of Nova Scotia. I find that the return is not complete because reference is made in a letter of the premier of Nova Scotia dated May 3rd, to a letter of Mr. G. Law Samson, who put an interpretation upon the matter that might have an important bearing on this question. I would like to have a copy of that letter and also a copy of any further correspondence that may have been received since this return was brought down.

May I be permitted to say that the province of Nova Scotia was granted in 1625 by Charles I an armorial achievement. It is a very beautiful and artistic piece of work, which I am sending to Your Honour for your examination, because I think it is worth looking at.

It would seem that when after confederation the Department of the Secretary of State was called upon to prepare coats of arms for the provinces, not knowing that the province of Nova Scotia had a coat of arms, and I believe it is the only province in Canada that held a coat of arms, one was prepared for the province by the department and it took the place at Ottawa of the one granted by Charles I. I note that it is suggested in this correspondence that the coat of arms prepared by the department should supersede the one granted by Charles I. To that the province of Nova Scotia objects, and I believe that legislation and the necessary consequent steps have been taken to have the original coat of arms as granted put in use here. The one now in use here was prepared by the Department of the Secretary of State in 1868.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I think he might very well bring up this question on the estimates of the Secretary of State. The coat of arms is certainly beautiful and I would call the attention of the government to it.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. E. KAISER (Ontario): I draw the attention of the Acting Minister of Agriculture to the fact that on April 25th I placed a question on the order paper in regard to the slaughter of diseased cattle. The question was passed as an order for a return. Up to the present time the return has not been brought down. When may I expect it?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is in the city but not in the house, so there is no acting minister at the moment. I shall be pleased to bring the hon. gentleman's question to his attention when he returns.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 278 to amend the Special War Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On section 4—stamp tax on sale or transfer of stocks, bonds and so forth.

Mr. COOTE: This section caused a good deal of discussion when the resolution preceding this bill was in committee, and I think that there is not much doubt that the majority opinion of the committee was not in favour of the section as it is printed. The hon. member for South Timiskaming (Mr. Lang) made out such a good case, I think, against this section that it is not necessary for me to enter into any argument at all. Personally I think that whatever tax is imposed on the transfer of these stocks and bonds should be based upon the amount of money that is involved in the transaction, which I think almost everyone admits bears no relation whatever to the par value of the securities traded in. I therefore beg to move:

That section 4 of the bill be amended by striking out all the words after the words "a die of the value of" and substituting therefor the words:

three cents for every one hundred dollars or fraction thereof of the amount paid for the bonds or shares so sold or transferred.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the difference between that and the old rate?

Mr. COOTE: I am sorry that I have not the old act here, but under it the tax was imposed on the par value. The amendment bases it on the actual value of the shares or bonds sold or transferred.

Mr. MANION: Will this increase or decrease the tax as compared with the old tax?

Mr. COOTE: That would be hard to say. In some cases there would be an increase, in others a decrease, but the amount of tax payable would be on the actual consideration given for the transfer of shares.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to delay the committee by reviewing the arguments presented when the resolution was before the house. Since it was passed in committee it will be recalled that there has been some objection from our friends in British Columbia. But I recall one telegram from a mining man in Nelson expressing satisfaction with the legislation as adopted.

Mr. CLARK: I would not be much surprised because I have had many, many more telegrams the other way.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the hon. minister really advance as a serious argument the fact that he received one telegram in favour of the change? That is as ridiculous as the principle underlying this measure.

Mr. IRVINE: Apparently one man outside of the house is worth forty inside.

Mr. CLARK: There is one man left in British Columbia ready to support the Minister of Finance.

Mr. ROBB: I would direct your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the proposed amendment would involve an increase of taxation; consequently it is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: It does appear to me that this amendment would mean an increase in taxation. Subsection 555 of standing order 60 provides:

> No increase can be considered either of an existing, or of a new or temporary tax for the service of the year, except on the initiative of a minister acting on behalf of the crown.

I must therefore rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. COOTE: Is the chairman satisfied that this amendment would involve an increase?

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance has so stated, and from my reading of the amendment I would think it would mean an increase of taxation.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May we have the reasoning underlying the ruling?

Mr. COOTE: If the minister does not base his opinion on any principle more solid than that under which he introduced the tax, I think the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee have my ruling. I rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. COOTE: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that your ruling is made without proof that the amendment would involve an increase in taxation.

Section agreed to on division.

Sections 5 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY

EXPORT OF LIQUOR TO THE UNITED STATES

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I should like to call attention to a situation in this country which in the view of at least a great many citizens is far from satisfactory.

Early in the session I gave notice that I intended to move a resolution urging parliament to introduce legislation to prohibit clearance being granted to vessels carrying intoxicating liquor to United States ports. That resolution was not reached before private members' day was taken away. I should like very much to have been able to secure a recorded vote on a resolution of this kind. I think it would have been of considerable advantage to the country at large if we could have been able to see just where members stood on this question. To-day I have not moved an amendment, simply because that would be regarded as a vote of lack of confidence in the government, and I should like, if possible, to see a free expression of opinion on the question itself and not have the discussion merely along party lines.

There has been considerable interest shown in this question, as is indicated by the large number of petitions from the various parts of the country that have been presented to this house. I am hoping that this discussion may afford an opportunity for those members who have presented their petitions—the member for South Essex (Mr. Gott) and others—to back up those petitions on the floor of the house.

Mr. GOTT: Why single out the member for South Essex?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The member for South Essex comes from a part of the country which is very vitally concerned in this question, and I have no doubt that, having received the congratulations of the Speaker he will be able to make a very eloquent appeal to the house. The government, although questioned in regard to this matter, has not given us its policy. Again and again throughout this session we have tried to arrive at the position the government intended to take, and I hope to-day that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) will state very clearly the policy of the government in this regard. The papers which were tabled last Thursday indicate nothing whatever except what might be called a "stand pat" policy. I regret to-day the absence of several members of the cooperating groups here—the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell), the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Fansher), the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy)—all of whom were keenly interested in this question, and intended to take part in the debate.

Let me say that this is by no means a fight between prohibitionists on the one hand and, on the other, the advocates of so-called government control. I hope that from the very first we shall clear our minds of the idea that this is simply a question either of enforcing prohibition on this side of the line or assisting to enforce prohibition in the United States. It is a much more serious question than that of prohibition. It strikes at the root of organized government itself, and involves the most serious problems in international relations. First of all I would suggest that there is involved in this question the responsibility of government to parliament. You may remember the resolution which was passed by this house on June 18, 1926. I shall read only two or three paragraphs from the report of the special committee appointed to investigate the administration of the Department of Customs and Excise. Section 10 of that report reads:

> The committee find that it is the common practice of the department to grant clearances to vessels wholly or partly laden with liquor for the United States, or allegedly bound for a foreign port, but admittedly sailing to "rum rows", and that false landing certificates have been produced to obtain cancellation of bonds given for foreign export of cargoes so cleared.
>
> The committee further finds that a strong presumption is raised that some proportion of the liquor so shipped and cleared finds its way back into Canada for consumption. The committee, therefore, recommend that excise and sales tax be levied on all Canadian-made intoxicating liquors released from bond, no matter where they are carried and consumed, and that duty and sales tax be levied on all alcoholic liquors entering Canada, whether in bond or otherwise, irrespective of their ultimate destination.
>
> Doubts have been cast upon the sufficiency of existing legislation to prohibit or authorize regulations prohibiting the illegal export of intoxicating liquors to the United States. To the extent to which such legislation may be insufficient the committee recommends that it be amended. The committee further recommends that, as soon as possible, regulations be made to prohibit clearances being granted to vessels carrying liquor as cargo, sailing from a Canadian port to a United States port, such regulations to make an exception in favour of liquor being imported into the United States in accordance with the laws of that country.

I wish the house would recall the circumstances under which that resolution was passed. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) a little earlier in the session, had made, an impassioned appeal to the house to get rid of some of the evils connected with smuggling. The government was fighting for its very life. I confess that I was one of those who gave the government a chance for its life, and a number in this corner agreed in that policy. The government accepted the resolution. I doubt very much whether the session could have continued had the government not accepted it. The report was passed by the house. Now I take it that such a report, especially when passed under such circumstances, would be mandatory in character. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) often speaks of the necessity of maintaining responsible government in this country. May I ask him, to whom is the government responsible? Surely to the House of Commons itself; and if the government is not responsible to the house then we have ceased to have responsible government. What have we to-day? To a very large extent, as I understand the situation, the cabinet is controlled by the Prime Minister; the party is very largely dominated by the wishes of the cabinet; and these groups undertake rather autocratically to carry through certain types of legislation with very little reference to the house at large. Do we call that responsible government?

It seems somewhat curious that the Prime Minister, who rather likes to boast that his grandfather helped to establish responsible government in this country, may be lending himself to a procedure which is undermining responsible government. I recall some words of Mr. Henry W. Nevinson, the great English war correspondent, in which he points out that at each stage in history we have to struggle to maintain those things which our forefathers won.

For freedom, we know, is a thing that we have to conquer afresh for ourselves every day

like love; and we are always losing freedom, just the same as we are losing love, because after each victory, we think we can settle down and enjoy it without further struggle. The battle of freedom is never done and the field never quiet.

I submit that we ought to have a very clear pronouncement to-day from the Prime Minister as to why he has disregarded a resolution passed by the house under those very peculiar circumstances. It is true that a royal commission was appointed; I myself, I think, was responsible for the suggestion as to the appointment of a commission. Though my own amendment was lost, the idea was incorporated into another amendment that carried. I had thought that we were suggesting a constructive policy which might take this matter out of the heated atmosphere of party discussion, and that we might have an impartial tribunal which would guide us in deciding what was the best policy for the country to pursue. The commission was appointed and in due time reported. I quote a few paragraphs from its report:

> The evidence adduced before us disclosed that a great majority of such shipments never reached the named destination, and the inference was strong that the liquor comprised in such shipments had been smuggled into the United States. In many cases landing certificates were produced to customs that our investigation showed to be forged and fraudulent. In some cases the bonds were released, but in other cases the department was not satisfied, and the bonds are still outstanding. We have dealt with this aspect of the matter in our interim report No. 10.
>
> For some time past an additional method has been adopted which is to export duty-paid liquor. The practice is to enter at customs the liquor as being for export to certain ports in the United States, but the liquor is never landed at a port recognized by the United States authorities, and is smuggled into that country in various places where there are no recognized ports or customs houses.
>
> Many regulations have been framed and enacted for the purpose of meeting this method of smuggling, but they have proved ineffective.
>
> We are convinced that the export houses are established in practically every case for the sole purpose of selling liquor to be smuggled into the United States and that they exist for no legitimate purpose whatever. Some of these export houses have customs bonds, and we would recommend that all these bonds be cancelled.
>
> As all of the provinces of Canada have either assumed control over the sale of liquor or have prohibited it altogether, the principle of the Doherty Act should in our opinion be extended to prohibit the export from any of these provinces by anyone other than the provincial governments or the manufacturer.

And this is the paragraph to which I call special attention:

> We also express our entire concurrence in the recommendation of the special committee of the House of Commons as contained in paragraph 10 of that committee's report. An effective method of carrying out the intent of the treaty referred to would be to prohibit clearances to vessels or vehicles of all kinds carrying a cargo of liquor to the United States, contrary to the laws of that country.

One would have expected action to be taken by the government but nothing whatever has been done. In addition to that, the Prime Minister himself gave a serious pledge to this country; on September 11 a full page advertisement appeared in the Toronto Globe under the heading "A pledge From the Liberal Leader." It said:

> When returned to power I pledge myself to continue relentlessly the investigation of the customs service and to carry out without fear or favour the needed requirements.

What were the needed requirements? The committee of this house, after sitting for weeks, decided that one of the needed requirements was the prohibition of clearances, and their decision was confirmed by a royal commission appointed by the government. There is not the slightest doubt in the world as to what those requirements were; the Prime Minister stood solemnly pledged to carry out the needed requirements, yet nothing whatever has been done. I recall the high praise accorded by the Psalmist to the man who, when he made a pledge, carried it out notwithstanding the cost involved:

> He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not . . . . He that doeth these things shall never be moved.

Nothing is said about what will happen to the man who does not do so. I would like to ask why the government has refused to act in this regard. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre is in his seat; I hope we shall have his support in this connection. We remember the work he did, for which I think we must give him due credit, as I did at the time; I think he should complete his work and help straighten out this international situation.

Why has the government refused to take action? It may be because we are still going on the old principle of complete national sovereignty; sometimes I think perhaps the government has been unduly influenced by the "red-blooded" speeches of the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), who has told us again and again that we should maintain our national honour by doing this, that or the other thing. I think the time has come when we should realize that this old doctrine of complete national sovereignty is becoming obsolete. It used to be that each individual householder believed that his home was his castle and that he could do as he pleased

without regard for his neighbours, but in our modern city communities we know that this doctrine cannot be maintained. I am curbed in a hundred ways by the desires and wishes of my neighbours who surround me. In the old days each city could do as it pleased, but to-day even the cities must conform to certain general regulations, because we are no longer living isolated lives. In my opinion the same thing is true to-day in international affairs; No one nation lives to itself. We are bound together by a hundred ties and we must have regard to the convenience and the welfare of other nations if we are to preserve our own national life and if we ourselves are to be treated decently. In the great street of the nations we are but one house, and we must remember that we must live in that street with the others.

If I might give a simple illustration, it sometimes occurs to me that our position is very similar to that of two old women who have adjacent back yards. The one old lady keeps hens and the other keeps a garden, and in one way or another the hens from the one back yard wander into the garden, and of course the old lady who keeps the garden is very indignant over it. She says to the other, "You keep your hens at home" and when the other old lady answers that she will let her hens run and scratch where they please, the first old lady replies, "If they come over here I will wring their necks." So the quarrel goes on, and at last the old lady owning the garden says, 'We must live as neighbours, I am going to erect a fence in order to try and keep your hens from my garden, but will you not help me do so? At least help me to stop the holes in the fence." The old lady owning the hens replies, "If you would only keep hens like I do there would be no trouble about your old garden; we would live as neighbours, without trouble." So the squabble goes on.

That is about the situation as between Canada and the United States; we have government control and they have prohibition, and our government takes the position that as long as they have a different system from ours we cannot settle anything. We say, "If you put up your fence and make it tight enough nothing will happen", to which they reply that they cannot make it tight enough to keep out all the hens, so they ask our help. I believe that in ordinary law affecting community life we are beginning to recognize certain rights of neighbours. My little illustration indicates at least my position with regard to this international situation. I believe international neighborliness is essential.

Mr. Woodsworth.]

There is a suspicion that powerful interests are behind the people who thus evade the law of the United States; hon. members will recall the reports of the royal commission, and from interim report No. 10 I have selected a few paragraphs. With regard to the Cosgrave Export Brewery Company Limited, the report stated:

> An audit of the books of this company disloses the fact that certain moneys were deducted from the gross earnings of the company which were paid as contributions to compaign funds, in respect of certain plebiscites taken in the province of Ontario. There does not appear to be any justification for these deductions and as these were improper there would be due considerable arrears of income tax.

With regard to the Carling Export Brewery Company, the report stated:

> In order to insure the success of these operations, it was necessary to procure customs seals, both of the United States and of Canada, and the necessary customs and shipping documents. According to the evidence, Low stated that he could procure these. . . . These cars had affixed United States and Canadian customs seals which had been stolen or otherwise unlawfully procured and affixed to the cars, and customs and shipping documents that were forged or otherwise unlawfully procured.

With regard to Gooderham and Worts:

> It was disclosed by an examination of the books of the company that large unvouchered payments were made, which were charged as part of the cost of operation, under various headings which did not show the real nature of the expenditures. Most of these payments were deducted from the profits before arriving at the amount upon which income tax was payable by the company to be government. The evidence disclosed that these payments were principally for political and propaganda purposes. In so far as contributed for federal political purposes, they were illegal and contrary to the provisions of section 10, chapter 46 of the Dominion Elections Act. . . .

With regard to Hiram Walker and Sons Limited:

> The evidence also indicates that this company made large payments for which there were no proper vouchers and for purposes not recognized by the department as properly deductible for income tax purposes, and that the same were deducted from the profits of the company on the income tax returns made from year to year. The evidence suggests that the income tax returns of this company and the settlements made of the income tax should be reviewed.

With regard to Wiser's Distillery Company similar statements are made. Reporting the sittings of the royal commission at Montreal, The Toronto Telegram of June 14, 1927, stated:

> James G. Lawrence, secretary-treasurer of the Consolidated Distillers, admitted that the sum of $380,608.59 was paid to both political parties between July, 1923, and the end of 1926.

I do not accuse the right hon. the Prime Minister of receiving campaign funds directly from these great breweries and distilleries; I do not intend to imply that the members sitting on the opposite side of the house are in direct receipt of these amounts, but I do say that when it is a well-established fact that large sums of money have been used for political propaganda and for election purposes, it does at least leave some ground for the suspicion that in some way or another, in the underground workings of the party system, there are influences at work which are inimical to the public welfare. I have been informed upon very good authority that when one of the old parties starts a federal campaign it requires a minimum of $1,000,000; I think I have that on fair authority.

Mr. JACOBS: Shame, shame.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) may make light of that, but we have all been long enough in politics to know that these practices do exist.

Mr. BOURASSA: The hon. member is shamed with the small figure.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I said a minimum of $1,000,000. It may be for the legitimate purposes of the party, but what I am getting at is this; large corporations are making enormous fortunes in this way and we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that by underground methods these corporations have tremendous power and may influence public sentiment through the party organization, through the newspapers and in other ways. The right hon. the Prime Minister and the government should very definitely clear themselves of all suspicion of participating in any way or of being influenced in any way by organizations of this character.

Further the present practice encourages bootlegging. We have been told by government officials that bootlegging has been decreased to almost the vanishing point. Well, tell that to the marines, or perhaps I had better say "tell it in the maritimes; tell it on the Pacific coast." Personally I do not know much about the border between Ontario and the United States but I do not think that anyone who knows of the conditions there will say that smuggling has decreased to the vanishing point. I will frankly admit that the government has introduced some great reforms in the regulations and I want to give every credit to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) for the way in which he has carried out those reforms. There has been a reduction in the number of docks and an elimination of the abuse of the B-13 forms, and liquor is now being loaded in the presence of a customs officer. I have no doubt that these reforms have done much good, but they have not been sufficient. In the report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario dated October 31, 1928, Sir Henry Drayton, the chief commissioner, states:

> It is hoped that substantial relief will be obtained through these reforms and that the short-circuiting which has so undoubtedly taken place, substantially reduced.

Sir Henry continues:

> Bootlegging and short-circuiting will never really be stopped until proceedings are effectively taken against those supplying liquor in the first instance.

According to the Toronto Globe on November 22, these regulations are not satisfactory to the Attorney General of Ontario. If we are committed to the government sale of liquor in this country we should supplement that by government manufacture and make the handling of liquors purely a government monopoly.

Miss MACPHAIL: We would save the taxes too.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think that is a reasonable and constructive proposal which might be considered by the government. Let me repeat: If we are committed to government sale in most of the provinces of this country, I think the only logical thing for us to do is to go in for government manufacture; manufacture practically at cost because that would eliminate the bootlegger as he would have no particular reason to go into the business if the liquors were manufactured by the government and sold at as nearly cost as possible.

Mr. GEARY: Sold abroad at cost?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not considering the sale abroad; I think that we will have enough to do at the present time to consider our policy with regard to Canada itself. In considering our foreign policy we might very well determine it on a somewhat different basis from that which now prevails under private manufacture.

An hon. MEMBER: Why manufacture at all?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not intend to go into the question of why manufacture at all; I simply say that as we seem to be committed at the present time to government sale we should go right through with a public control policy and adopt government manufacture.

I charge that the present practice encourages lawlessness here in Canada. I should like to

read a few brief paragraphs from our daily papers. The first is from the Toronto Globe of December 3, 1928, and is as follows:

There can be no mistaking the nature of the business itself or the men engaged in it. Official figures show that in the past trade year the Canadian customs cleared for United States points liquor valued at more than $25,000,000. This is not all. It is an open secret that most of the liquors ostensibly cleared for any of the four corners of the outside world are actually destined for consumption in the United States. This is big business—and it can be transacted only by those who daily risk their lives in evading our neighbour's police. It was inevitable, therefore, that the rum-running ranks should have been largely recruited from the gangs of gunmen and thugs who formerly inhabited the underworld of Chicago, Detroit and New York.

Is there any one so simple as to imagine that these gangsters are criminal only on their native side of the border and become good citizens the moment they cross or recross the invisible boundary? Such a hope is an impossibility. There are several hundreds of pages of evidence in the investigation of our customs scandal. A great many of them witness to the fact that these criminals are always criminals; that they are not in business for the fun of it; that they are not particular whence their profits come; that they just as readily smuggle narcotics, tobaccos or silks north as they smuggle liquor south; that their contempt for their own American government does not magically become admiration for the Canadian authority simply because it shelters them and abets them.

A particular case is mentioned in the London Free Press of December 3, 1928, as follows:

Last year J. D. Hanson, a native-born Canadian, was slain by a liquor enforcement officer for no discoverable reason. Hanson was not a bootlegger and did not even have any liquor in his possesion when shot down in cold blood. Children living in Sandwich had narrow escapes from death as long range bullets from guns of enforcement officers sped over the Detroit river. Motorists traversing the border cities along the water front were in danger of their lives. A state of siege every once in a while occurs on lake Erie off the Port Dover district, when it is not safe for law-abiding citizens to venture out on the lake in their launches. They risk instant death or injury at the hands of the quick-trigger American liquor enforcement officials.

I need only mention the sensational articles which appeared in MacLean's Magazine of December 1, December 15, 1928, and January 1, 1929. But I should like to quote a paragraph from a statement by Sir George Foster. I read it in the Winnipeg Tribune of February 23 of this year. This is what he is reported as saying:

An organized band of rum-runners and smugglers who by the corruption of Canadian and United States officials, by outwitting the United States guardians of the law, and by the employment, if necessary, of gunmen and hired bandits, forced the forbidden borders of a friendly state and delivered therein to other organized bands of law-breakers, the goods banned by the laws of that country. By these methods and with such associates, Canadian brewers and distillers disposed of $27,000,000 worth of their wares in 1928, and pocketed their proportion of the illegal profits made by the venture.

Again:

The organization exists—it is skilled and experienced and absolutely unscrupulous; it is well armed with corruption funds and sawed-off shotguns, and shrinks not at the sight of blood. Why should the Canadian government give support and sustenance to so efficient and soulless an organization?

That question is being asked right across this country from coast to coast: Why should the Canadian government give support to such an organization as that? Let me quote this statement by Sir George Foster which, for me, is unanswerable:

The citizen of one nation who does not respect the law of another nation of equal civilization will not be likely to respect the law of his own, if it conflicts with his own personal self-interest.

I do not know that I can do better than reiterate that statement. It is all I want to say in the way of argument. The citizen of one nation who does not respect the law of another nation of equal civilization with his own will not be likely to respect the law of his own, if it conflicts with his own personal self-interest.

I want to suggest that the practice that now exists, encourages political corruption. The old brewing and distilling firms were well known. They had certain standards of public and private morality. They may have contributed and they did contribute to the campaign funds of at least one of the older parties and, I think, to both of them; some to one, some to the other, but the same corporation did not contribute to both. It was known to which party they contributed and they did so as any other corporation would. These new firms which have had such a mushroom growth and which have made such enormous profits, have the morality of bandits and pirates. They cheat even the government which protects them. I need not go into details but no later than May 16 I read this in the Toronto Star. I happened to be in Toronto on that date, but similar statements can be found in almost any newspaper. The article reads:

The Attorney General of Canada brought action against Hiram Walker and Son, distillers, to recover the amount of bonds totalling $107,000 and given by them on the export of 4,000 cases of whiskey to W. O. Watson, Guatemala, by way of Victoria.

Again:

Captain Nicholles swore that he sailed from Victoria, B.C., with sealed orders, which he

opened after leaving port. These orders instructed him to be off a port on the west coast of Vancouver island and there to discharge 2,400 cases of whiskey. He swore he did so discharge the cargo to a steamer called the Pascawa, of Canadian register, and that 100 cases of Hiram Walker's was included in this discharge.

Continuing, witness swore that afterwards his orders were to proceed south to a point off the Faralon islands, off San Francisco, and that there he discharged the balance of the cargo, part to another steamer of Canadian register, the Chief Skujuid, and the balance to small boats, that arrived from the American shore.

Captain Nicholles swore he never went to Guatemala nor to Bonaventura, Colombia, that he did not know how landing certificates had been procured.

He swore that for the return voyage he required an outward bound report from the authorities at Bonaventura and a clean bill of health to present to the Canadian quarantine officials on return. These papers, he swore, were handed to him as his ship lay off San Francisco.

This sounds very much like the information that was given us some years ago by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). Instead of this having been cleaned up as we had a right to expect, we find that under the present practice these rotten conditions are being continued.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give me time for a question. I am sure he does not want to misrepresent anything. Can he give the date when this offence was committed?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No.

Mr. EULER: He will find that is one of the old cases which is now being prosecuted.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad of the correction. I did not look into the question of the date of the offence. The paper I am quoting from is of recent date. I quite admit that this case does not have any bearing upon or back up my argument at this point.

But to proceed, it seems to me that the refusal of our government to take action along this line constitutes an unfriendly act towards the United States. On June 6, 1924, Canada signed a treaty with the United States "for the suppression of smuggling operations along the international boundary between the Dominion of Canada and the United States and assisting in the arrest and prosecution of persons violating the narcotic laws of either government and for kindred purposes." Article 1 provides for the exchange of information concerning clearances of vessels, and article 2 provides for the elimination of the practice of granting fake clearances. Almost before the treaty was signed it was found that in practice it was altogether inadequate. So, as early at least as October 6, 1925, we find the United States officials opening up negotiations with Canada—I have not the earliest letters, but a letter of that date refers to still earlier negotiations—to see whether Canada would not consent to legislation which would make the treaty effective. Under date of October 6, 1925, I find a communication from the United States authorities:

> Suggesting, first, that—clearance be refused by the Dominion authorities to vessels carrying cargoes of liquor destined for the United States; second that a convention be concluded for the extradition between the United States and Canada of persons guilty of offences under the customs laws of either government, and, third, that a convention supplementary to that signed on June 6, 1924, be negotiated for the transportation of liquor to Telegraph Creek, British Columbia, via Stikine river through Alaska.

Negotiations dragged on month after month. At last, on October 6, 1926, the Canadian government asked for a still further delay until after the royal commission had reported. It was pointed out by the Canadian government that:

> The order in council instructs the commissioners "to continue and complete the said investigation into the Department of Customs and Excise and also to inquire into and report on the operations of the treaty made between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America dated June 6, 1924, for the suppression of smuggling along the international boundary between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America and as to whether the said treaty is being carried out according to the declared intent thereof and as to whether any amendment to the said treaty is necessary or desirable to ensure the suppression of smuggling."
>
> In view of the fact that the above inquiry has been initiated and that the reports and recommendations of the royal commission will be of great value in the discussion of the interpretation and possible amendment of the existing convention and collateral questions, the Canadian government is of opinion that it would be desirable to await its findings before setting a date for the proposed conference between representatives of Canada and the United States.

It is quite apparent from that letter and from the subsequent correspondence that the American people expected, and the Canadian government more or less conceded, that some revision of the treaty would be made. A preliminary conference was asked for by the United States and at last on January 8th, 9th and 10th of this year a conference on commercial smuggling was held. I should like to summarize a few of the important presentations made at that conference, following the Canadian summary.

First of all the Canadian representatives made it clear that that conference had no real

authority. It consisted of officials rather than of members of the government, and they had no authority to determine matters of policy and were called upon simply to bring out in discussion the implications of any proposals made.

The United States representatives showed that there was a growing importation of liquor from Canada. I quote from the summary:

According to Canadian official statistics the export of liquor to the United States for the year ended 31st March, 1928, amounted in duty-paid value to over $18,000,000. It was estimated that the importations from Canada formed the largest proportion of the supplies from outside.

I would urge that the amount of duty-paid liquor does not anything like cover the whole amount of liquor that was taken into the United States. Some of my official friends may be inclined to trust merely to the documents in this respect but some years ago I had some experience in waterfront work, and from inside knowledge I can testify that there is a good deal that goes on that is not found in the official documents.

Again, the American representatives stated:

Contrary to statements appearing in the press the United States officials were seriously attempting to solve the liquor smuggling problem. They had substantially succeeded in cutting off the smuggling of liquor from the high seas but had not been able to stop the flow across the Canadian border, particularly in the Detroit area.

Further:

The fact remained, however, that since the treaty went into effect between 1926 and 1928 the shipment of liquors to the United States, according to Canadian statistics, had increased.

With regard to the vessels that were operating they pointed out that the information as to clearances was frequently not sufficient to permit of identification. Then followed their proposal:

The proposal merely meant that each country should refuse to allow its instrumentalities to be used by persons engaged in breaking the laws of the other country. This remedy could be afforded by treaty amendment to the following effect, or by corresponding legislative or administrative action:

"The high contracting parties agree that clearances of shipments of merchandise by water, air or land from any of the ports of either country to a port of entrance of the other country shall be denied, if such shipments comprise articles the introduction of which is prohibited or restricted for whatever cause in the country to which such shipment is destined, provided, however, that such clearance shall not be denied on shipments of restricted merchandise when there has been complete compliance with the conditions or laws of both countries."

Quoting further from the summary:

It was made clear, however, in subsequent discussion that in addition to the renewal of clearances the United States representatives considered it would be necessary, in order to check the flow, for the Canadian authorities to take steps to prevent the release from distilleries of duty-paid spirits for export to the United States.

Years ago the Liberal party negotiated a treaty for reciprocity between the United States and Canada. I am one of those who believe that that proposal should have been adopted. The failure to carry it into effect has been, I think, a tragedy for Canada from which we have not yet recovered. Here is another reciprocal treaty which has been proposed, a reasonable treaty, which the Liberal government so far has refused to consider. The Americans pointed out that other countries had done what Canada was refusing to do. Mexico and Cuba had taken action along these lines, and I understand, though I do not find this in the memorandum, that Japan has also done so. Norway refused to clear shipments of liquor to the United States, and not only that, but it penalized Norwegian vessels engaged in smuggling liquor into other countries. It was stated that Great Britain had taken action, but I believe that that was later questioned. In any case, Great Britain had gone so far as at least under certain circumstances to extend the three-mile limit to twelve miles. Quoting from the summary:

The United States delegation stated that it was their well considered opinion that nothing short of discontinuance of the existing practice of issuing clearances or other official documents permitting the legal exportation from Canada to the United States of goods which cannot be legally imported into the United States, would be of material assistance in dealing with the problem.

So they stated, very clearly indeed.

Mr. IRVINE: What report is that?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am reading from the memorandum compiled by our own Canadian authorities as to what took place at the conference held in Ottawa between the United States and Canadian representatives in January of this year. I should like, however, to go just a little outside of that official memorandum to quote a couple of paragraphs direct from what was said by the American authorities. I read from the papers laid on the table:

Admiral Billard concluded his statement with a parable, based on the operation of Article II of the present treaty, of a man who asked for a clearance for his vessel with a cargo of liquor to a port in Cuba. The clearance was refused on the ground that the vessel would not be able to make the port specified, and there was, consequently, a suspicion that the liquor might be smuggled into the United States. The man thereupon asked for a clearance to Detroit with the same cargo, which was promptly granted, since all suspicion had been cleared away.

Further, Admiral Billard said:

The treaty with Canada already concluded between the United States and Canada is entitled a Convention "To Suppress Smuggling" between the two countries. It seems to us, then, that Canada has already subscribed to the general policy, not only of reducing smuggling between the two countries, but of suppressing it. In other words, that we are not asking the Canadian government to adopt a new policy on this matter; we are asking them to take the policy they have already officially sanctioned, to suppress smuggling between the United States and Canada, and to supplement the existing treaty into which they so willingly entered and which they have so thoroughly upheld—to supplement it by accomplishing that suppression of smuggling, to the suppression of which they have already indicated their official willingness.

The Canadian government since the conference has made a suggestion that it might be possible to meet the wishes of the Americans and to effect the desired reforms by permitting the American officials to be stationed at the docks on this side of the line. This, however, is the reply of the American authorities to the proposal. It is dated April 20, 1929. I read simply the essential parts:

In the above communication you were good enough to state that in order to cooperate with and further assist my government in the effective enforcement of its laws, the Canadian government was prepared to permit United States officers to be stationed on the Canadian side of the border, at ports of clearance to be determined, in order to enable the United States officials themselves to transmit immediately to the appropriate authorities in their country information concerning clearances of all vessels carrying liquor cargoes to the United States.

I now have the honour, under instructions of my government, to inform you that it is the view of its competent authorities that the proposed arrangement would not be a solution of the problem.

That letter is signed by William Phillips. Se here we arrive at the same point at which we started back in 1924—a deadlock, the United States asking that we would legislate in such a way as to enable them to carry out their laws, that we would not connive at the breaking of their laws, and we refusing to do what I think the world would consider to be a very neighbourly sort of act.

What will be the next move of the United States? Well, I cannot tell, but I found this in a recent despatch from Washington:

Someone here put it this way—"Canada has been asked to stop the rum-runners from her side before they start. Failing that, by far the biggest effort yet will be made to prevent them from finishing. If the Canadian government does not make shipment of liquor to the United States illegal, then the United States will talk to the Canadian distillers and their rum-runnning agents in a language that they will understand."

If in this effort it becomes necessary to stop and examine everybody and everything that crosses the border by auto, by boat, in railway cars; to stop and examine all express and freight shipments, there will be delay, discomfort, inconvenience and friction. It is to be hoped that this will not be necessary, but if the present temper on the United States side of the line persists, however reluctant the authorities may be to adopt such drastic measures, there is a feeling that whatever it is necessary to do will be done, but that rum-running must and will be stopped.

An hon. MEMBER: What paper is that in?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is an article published in the Toronto Star of April 10 from a special correspondent at Washington.

An hon. MEMBER: Why don't they stop them?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Surely it is not necessary to say that to-day, when the American representatives themselves have shown so clearly that under existing conditions it is next to impossible for them to do so. They ask our help, at least to a degree that we will not actively connive at this traffic, that we will pass legislation that will prevent clearances to rum-running vessels. But further than that, I find this statement, which was published, I think, in nearly all our papers. I read this in the Toronto Star of April 12:

"Only when it is apparent that a boat trying to escape search is faster than ours is gun fire to be used," an official said to-day. "Even then, under no circumstances, are boats to be followed into Canadian waters. We have warned the officers, in case the zeal of some of the younger men should run away with them in their desire to make a capture."

When the United States prohibition navy—

Mark the words.

—in this sector—

Mark also those words.

—is assembled within a few weeks there are to be twenty-nine "36 footers" capable of a speed of 45 miles an hour, and five "75 footers" capable of making 25 miles in heavier seas. The first twenty-nine will carry machine guns, and the larger submarine chaser type, will mount one pound guns in the bows.

In the whole history of prohibition enforcement along the Niagara river boundary, no fleet to equal this has ever been assembled by the United States to blockade Bridgeburg, Port Colborne, Port Maitland and Dunnville. This flotilla has to cover the shore line from the straits of Mackinaw to Sacketts harbour, opposite Kingston. In places of twenty-five "36 footers" last year, Commander Rasmussen has twenty-nine this season. Last year he had only 250 men, this year he has 300.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that that is rather a serious situation to develop on our great lakes and boundary rivers. I was reading, with a great deal of interest, a speech made by the Prime Minister a few weeks

ago before the League of Nations Society in this city. Let me quote simply one paragraph:

> We are able to point to our unprotected frontier of over 3,000 miles, a frontier stretching from ocean to ocean across an entire continent, along the whole of which not a shot has been fired for over a hundred years.

That simply is not true, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that certain types of United States boats are not found on the lakes, but other boats of smaller tonnage are there; and although guns of a certain calibre are not used, smaller guns are. Let me say there is every danger of friction and conflict when that situation exists. Three hundred men in these boats at the present time. I urge that here is a dangerous situation that may easily lead to some most unfortunate incident. In fact we had only last night brought to our attention the I'm Alone incident, and it was declared on the floor of this house that that was a case either of war or piracy. Now, I am not going to discuss that case, but I submit that when words of that character can be used in the Canadian House of Commons with regard to an incident that involved this country and the great republic to the south, it is a serious situation. And even although the orders to the United States officers may be that there is to be no passing into Canadian waters in pursuit of rum-running vessels, is it not inevitable that there will be exciting chases in the course of which there will be a rush to our side of the line? So narrow are these waters in some places that gun fire may endanger the lives of Canadian citizens, and should it unfortunately happen that any of our people are killed or wounded, it can readily be understand there will be passions aroused—well, it is hard to know whether those passions could be held in check. It may well be that the United States coastguards in the I'm Alone case were in the wrong—I think they were—but are we justified in provoking such acts? That is another question and one we have to answer. Some of us have had to discipline children, either our own or somebody else's in school. Jack is told that he must not hit Mary. We say to him "Now, Jack, it is not nice for a boy to hit a little girl. You must not do it." Then one of these days there is a squabble, and poor Mary comes home crying and says "Jack hit me." I suppose we should then inflict condign punishment on Jack for having done it. Well, I confess that at times, in the case of such domestic troubles, I sympathize with Jack. Mary has been perhaps as tantalizing as girls know how to be—I am glad that the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) is not here. Undoubtedly they grow better as they grow up, but girls can be very tantalizing. Probably Mary sticks out her tongue at Jack and says smart things—and girls can always say smarter things than boys. Jack of course becomes exasperated and he strikes her. That little incident may, I think, be taken as suggesting the relation between ourselves and the United States in this matter. It may be true that the coastguard exceeded his authority, but at the same time this was a vessel of Canadian registry; and whether or not the clearance papers had been granted by Canada the fact is that she was smuggling goods, and therefore we are more or less involved. And there are other cases.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member knows that she did not clear from a Canadian port.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I say, whether or not clearance papers had been granted. I am glad the hon. member has made that clear. She did not clear from a Canadian port, but I urge that irrespective of that fact she was a vessel of Canadian registry. As a matter of fact only to-day a gentleman who has come from the west coast tells me of incidents of this kind which are taking place out on the Pacific.

I have carefully read the statements of Canada's representatives at the conference, and really it does seem to me that after all we are simply offering excuses. That is all I can say. I have tried to find a reasonable ground for our refusal to accede to the request of the United States but I have not succeeded. If the shoe were on the other foot I know that we should be indignant had the United States taken the position that we are taking.

We are maintaining, at enormous cost, an embassy in the United States to promote friendly relations. Are we going to maintain that embassy simply to try to protect international rum-runners, as in the I'm Alone case? I ask this question: Why should we shield a gang of outlaws, many of them American outlaws, whose business means gain to a small group of Canadian distillers and their parasites, but is not in the interests of the great mass of the people of Canada? I say this is not decent treatment of a friendly nation. All Canada is asked to do is to refuse to facilitate the operations of law-breakers. I have said earlier—and I do not intend to develop this point—that this trade as now carried on threatens the morality and peace of Canada itself; and that perhaps is even more important than the question of our international attitude. Perhaps I should not say that; I do not know whether it can be

more important but at least it is of equal importance. And to recall the earlier part of my argument, since the government had such a clear mandate from this house, and since it had the report of the royal commission which the government itself appointed, it does seem that inaction on the part of the government constitutes a threat to the principle of responsible government itself.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): It has become habitual in this house, so habitual in fact as to be almost a commonplace, for any member who rises to address the house on any subject to refer to that subject as being of such transcendent importance as to constrain him to take part in the debate. While however this may have become habitual, I submit that the question before us is intrinsically and from the point of view of the Canadian public one of importance. It is, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) has said, a subject of importance inasmuch as it involves our international relationships as well as the morality of our own people. As the hon. member was speaking, my mind went back a few days, and I thought of that treaty which was brought before the house having for its purpose the renunciation of war. That treaty was epoch-making in its importance; it was tremendous in its possibilities. It was based, not upon law but upon the crystallized and articulate conscience of a people, and the measures for its enforcement lay not in legal action nor in legal penalties but in the indignation of an aroused people. And so with this. Many questions of importance in constitutional law are here involved, and there are many problems, staggering in their difficulty, in the way of administration. But these, notwithstanding their importance, fade to my mind into comparative insignificance in the light of two other factors which arise—factors overshadowing the question of law or the question of administrative detail, as the oak would overshadow—I was going to say the violet, but that comparison is not so apt—the shrubs and bushes at its roots. These questions may be divided into two; they are two great questions. First is the degree to which our action will affect international peace and international harmony as between two great nations, nations which for decades have prided themselves, and rightly so, on their cool-headed common sense and kindly consideration when dealing with their mutual problems. This matter before us is, I think, one which threatens the very purpose for which the treaty for the renunciation of war was brought forward.

I am not going to speak of connivance on the part of the government, for as I interpret the word "connivance" it implies a certain degree of approval; and I cannot believe that this government would or could view with any approval the actions of certain criminals —I speak of them as criminals, but perhaps I had better say certain men—in their own country. Moreover, I cannot imagine the present minister of the department (Mr. Euler) viewing the situation with approval. I have known that minister as a private member and as the head of the department for eight years, and during those eight years my respect for him has grown as a man of courage, sincerity and character. I shall not therefore speak of connivance in that sense. But to the degree to which connivance may be interpreted as a knowledge of what is going on, without any effective steps being taken to curb the situation, I might possibly use the word. We have watched the effects of this trade, which is carried on legally in this country although it is illegal in the country to the south of us; and we have seen that trade leading to conditions which we all deplore. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, it is leading to the arming of people, a very small percentage of people it is true, in order to defend the laws of the United States against what they believe to be aggressive acts on the part of some of our nationals. You will note that I say aggressive acts on the part of some of our nationals, and I am not in the least confusing individual citizens of Canada with the government of Canada. That is a very different thing, but it has led to the arming of a people and to the I'm Alone and other similar incidents. I believe that from the point of view of every right thinking man—and I believe every member of this chamber is a right thinking man—it may lead and has led to deplorable incidents.

I intend to speak very briefly on this matter; I wish simply to express my opinions and those of thousands of other citizens of this country, many of whom have communicated with me, and therefore I shall pass to the second phase of this issue, which was also touched upon by the hon. member who opened this discussion; I refer to the morale of our young people. When you go to the frontiers of our country where this trade is principally carried on you will find men who have grown wealthy from this traffic; I am not sure that you will find women, but at all events you will find such men. The young people of Canada, who see these men and are associated with what is going on day after

day and who see so little effective action being taken to curb it, to my mind are subject to the great danger of setting up false ideas of right and wrong and of the heroic and the base. When they see men enriching themselves in this way; when they see these same men retain their standing as respectable and responsible citizens of the community; when they see that the actions of these men and the trade in which they are engaged apparently do not lower them in the eyes of the adult community, what kind of ideals will these boys and girls have? What will they think; what heroes will they set up? Then, to go into it further, right along our frontiers we find boys and girls and men and women becoming associated with the idea of violence and bloodshed, and I am afraid that we are coming to the point where familiarity does not necessarily breed contempt but where familiarity dulls the keen edge of their perception, wipes out the sense of right and wrong and takes away the right balance of mind.

Let me repeat that I am considering this as a moral rather than a legal issue. I am not qualified by either experience or knowledge to speak of the law; neither am I qualified to speak of the administrative difficulties, but I think I am capable of voicing here the opinions and the best common sense of some people at least whom I know in this country. It is their opinion that we are in danger of interjecting into our international relationship, into the international harmony and goodwill which is of such great importance, an element which will threaten if not destroy it, and that we are still more in danger of destroying all that is best in some of our people. I believe we are tearing down the bars which have protected what is best in mind and in conscience of these people who are now becoming accustomed to this traffic, and we are setting up in the place of statesmanship, of self sacrifice and of morality and goodwill an ideal of financial success without regard to how that wealth may be brought about. So it does seem to me, without being able to state definitely just what steps should be taken, that this parliament and this government should approach the subject seriously and with sincerity, and from the moral point of view as much as from the legal point of view. We should do what lies within our power to stop this practice.

I have heard it advanced as an argument against action being taken by our government that the United States is not very sincere or very desirous of seeing these laws enforced; we are told that they would rather throw upon us the onus of that problem than assume it themselves. I can hardly accept that statement without having very definite knowledge, but I do know that no matter how lax the officials in that country may be or how insincere in their attitude towards their own laws, it does not remove from Canadians the responsibility which rests upon us and for which we alone must account. So once more this parliament and this government have set the stamp of approval upon such repressive or preventive methods or measures as may be brought into force, they represent a people who are moral and peace loving; they are, I believe, individually and as a whole anxious to do the right thing both here and abroad, and in all earnestness and sincerity I appeal to the government and to the house to treat the subject on its merits and to see that at least Canada shall place herself beyond reproach.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): Mr. Speaker, those of us who were here in 1925-26 will clearly recall that charges were made with regard to the administration of the Department of Customs and that a special committee was appointed to make a very careful study of the whole subject. In one regard at least that committee made a unanimous report to the House of Commons in June of that year, and on June 18 the house approved of the report. Among other things that report urged that:

> . . . . regulations be made to prohibit clearances being granted to vessels carrying liquor as cargo, sailing from a Canadian port to a United States port. . . . . .

That is a very simple recommendation which anyone can understand. Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, now the Prime Minister of Canada, gave earnest and hearty support to the investigation and to the report of the committee; he pledged himself and his party "to continue relentlessly the investigation of the customs service and to carry out without fear or favour the needed requirements." That pledge was given during the election campaign which followed the investigation by this committee.

Mr. King was returned to power and has done much to make the Customs department efficient. I for one wholly approve of the Prime Minister's selection of a minister for that department; I honestly believe I could not have done better had I picked him myself. During the first session of the next parliament a royal commission was appointed, which spent eleven months in finding out all the facts which were gathered from a very wide field, and that commission aproved of section 10 of

the report of the special committee. I read part of this section a few moments ago, but now I would like to read the entire last paragraph:

> Doubts have been cast upon the sufficiency of existing legislation to prohibit or authorize regulations prohibting the illegal export of intoxicating liquors to the United States. To the extent to which such legislation may be insufficient the committee recommend that it be amended. The committee further recommend that, as soon as possible, regulations be made to prohibit clearances being granted to vessels carrying liquor as cargo, sailing from a Canadian port to a United States port, such regulations to make an exception in favour of liquor being imported into the United States in accordance with the laws of that country.

Two bodies, a special parliamentary committee and a royal commission, studied this subject much more carefully than any individual could. They made a recommendation and parliament approved of that recommendation but has not carried it out. The next question which occurs to one's mind is: Why has not parliament carried out the recommendation which a committee of this house and a royal commission made to it?

I am concerned with how this matter affects the United States, but I am not going to discuss that phase just now. The speech made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) expresses exactly how I feel about it. There is no use in our talking about the peace of the world and in unanimously approving such things as the pact of Paris until we can deal effectively with an irritating and troublesome question which affects the peace of the world. It is nonsense to think that because the problem is irritating and troublesome to us we can escape the duty of putting a stop to the bootlegging of liquor into the United States of America. From my point of view the liquor business is a dirty business. I have never seen anything good come out of liquor and I have seen a great deal of evil arise from its use. It corrupts all those who touch it, whether they are individuals or groups of individuals. I have no use for the whole dirty business and the fact that we are allowing liquor to pour out of southern Ontario into the United States and are doing nothing effective to stop it is giving to the Canadian people the mentality and the ethics of bootleggers.

Very eminent gentlemen—I think one would call them eminent—are hunting for defences for our attitude. It is quite true that we are making money through the sale of liquor to the United States but what is the use of gaining even the whole world if we lose our national soul? How can we expect the young men and women, the boys and girls of this country to respect the laws of the land if we do not respect the laws of another country? Our example will mean more to them than our teaching; our acts will loom so large that they will not hear our words. From the standpoint of morality in this country we should do something about it, whether it be to stop the clearance of vessels or whatever it may be, and we should set about getting it done as rapidly as possible. Supposing we had a bad child in a community—we have been apt to say "bad boy" but I do not want to say that because there are bad girls as well as bad boys—and suppose that only one parent of that child was anxious that it should be reformed and was doing everything to help the child to a better way of life. But some other neighbour in the community, knowing the will of the one parent, deliberately put evil in the path of the child. What would we think of that neighbour; what would we think of him as a community builder? We would have nothing but contempt for him, and that is almost the place we are in as a nation as between ourselves and the United States.

Mr. HEPBURN: Does the hon. member not think it advisable that we should dry up our own country before we try to dry up the United States?

Miss MACPHAIL: Yes, I think it advisable that we dry up our own country and if I had the doing of it there would not be any liquor. I do not want any and if everyone were like me there would not be any. If the Canadian people have no more sense than to want to drink stuff which is poison to them and which does them no good, there is a country south of us which officially does not want it, and has said so, and we are not doing everything which we could do to help them carry out that law, called the Volstead Act.

Since the session opened I have been in Buffalo twice and in Detroit once. I was amazed at the strength of public opinion expressed by former Canadian residents in those two cities. These people were not particularly prohibitionists but they felt that something which they had held very high had fallen. They had thought of Canada with a great deal of love and admiration; they had thought of us as being people with very high moral standards; they had thought of us, and it was expressed quite freely to me, as maintaining ideals superior to those of the country in which they were residing. They told me that in this regard we had not lived up to our former high standard of morality; they felt that we had let them down rather badly. As one man said to me, "For the first time in my life I am apologetic for my country." I

think that expresses the opinion of the people who are close to this problem and see it in operation on the other side.

Some may think that the resolutions which have come from rural communities, and which have flooded this house, are of no consequence. I am well enough acquainted with the people of the country to know that when they sign their names to a paper and put it into an envelope and mail it, they know what they are doing, because it is one of the hardest tasks in the world to get rural people to write letters. When they do write them you know that they are interested in the thing they are doing or they would not bother posting the letter. The fact that they have sent hundreds of these resolutions to the house convinces me that there is a very strong public opinion in the country, particularly in the townships of Canada, concerning this question.

If anyone has taken the trouble to look up the press, either recently or back in 1927, he will have seen that many papers strongly condemn the position which we are taking. I have an editorial from the Country Guide, the new name for the Grain Growers Guide, which I would like to read. I have not the date of this issue, but I believe it is recent. The editorial, in part, is as follows:

> There is a lawless element in the United States engaged in smuggling Canadian liquor across the border. Huge fortunes have been acquired in this rum-running business. The American bootleggers are assisted by an equally lawless element in Canada. The two have terrorized a considerable section of the territory along the great lakes and crime has become a commonplace. This situation is a disgrace to both nations—but more so to Canada.

The article then reviews the fact that a parliamentary committee and a royal commission had been set up and had made recommendations which were not carried out. The editorial continues:

> Why is the government doing nothing? Why is the Liberal and Conservative press practically silent? What is the mysterious influence which prevents the government from setting the machinery in motion to exterminate this nefarious business? Perhaps another royal commission could find out. All other civilized nations are cooperating with the United States to curb rum-running. Canada, the nearest neighbour is also the most unneighbourly. If the situation were reversed we would be incensed. This is an opportunity to apply the golden rule.

I would like to quote briefly from an editorial in the Toronto Globe of March 1, 1927, which contained the following:

> The royal commission on customs is collecting considerable evidence showing how this country is helping the rum-runners and bootleggers to defeat the aims of the Volstead Act in the United States. Added to the evidence taken by the special parliamentary committee, it would form rather a voluminous indictment of Canada, as a partner in the international liquor business.

I do not believe that anyone can derive satisfaction from an editorial like that in a leading daily of the province of Ontario. The Port Hope Guide of April 8, 1927, contains an editorial which, in part, reads:

> It is a criminal offence to systematically smuggle goods into this country. It is equally so to likewise smuggle into the United States. Why should this country encourage or allow any class, no matter how wealthy, to carry on, systematically and publicly, smuggling operations to the United States in intoxicating liquors with any greater immunity than we would tolerate such action by the Chinaman with his opium or the white-slaver with his victim?

And they add something which struck me as being so true that I feel I should place it on Hansard. It continues:

> The law gloats over the capture of a poor wretch in the back townships, found in possession of illicit still. . . . But the other man who is violating international laws is encouraged in his nefarious traffic. The former is probably trying to keep the wolf from the door. His place is prison. The latter wins the King's Plate at the Woodbine, and is presented to, and dines with, the Governor General.

I do not think that is overstated. I have often thought that, when I have seen the place of honour that is given to our big distillers and brewers in this country. I do not think their business is an honourable one, and to me they can never be honourable people while they are engaged in it. The editorial continues, but I think I have already said what is repeated in it.

I do not care to say any more except this, that if the government wants to hold up a high moral standard to young boys and girls in Canada, it will have to do something to prevent huge fortunes being made by Canadians who are breaking the laws of another country. If this is not done, they cannot expect the laws of this country to be respected, nor can they expect the moral fibre of the Canadian people to be maintained.

Hon. W. D. EULER (Minister of National Revenue): The question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), so ably seconded by the eloquent member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), and supported by the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail), who has just spoken, is apparently one of considerable public interest, perhaps more so in recent years. But upon that question I think all members of the house will admit there is a very sharp division of opinion as to what the

policy of the government should be. Undoubtedly there is a very strong body of public opinion which is opposed to the export of liquor from Canada to the United States. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre stated that that feeling is not confined to those of prohibition sentiments. I was rather inclined to think that such is the case, and that is not in any sense to be regarded as a criticism. It is equally true that there is just as strong and possibly a stronger body of public opinion which is entirely opposed to the suggestion that we should, in their words, assist in carrying out the laws of another country. For these reasons the government welcomes a very frank discussion of the whole question in all its bearings. Personally I am glad to have an opportunity of correcting some of the misconceptions that are apparently in the public mind to-day and to review as briefly as I can the situation as we find it. Essentially—and I think most members will agree with me—the situation is one that must almost inevitably arise where two adjacent countries deal with the liquor problem in two radically different ways. The one country, Canada, is "wet"—I think I may use that term—under a system of government control in seven out of the nine provinces: the other, the United States, has a drastic prohibitory law.

Something has been said with regard to liquor and its evil effects. With some of the remarks I agree, but so far as the average individual is concerned, liquor is apparently a commodity in a class by itself. In my experience, laws with regard to liquor have never been regarded with the same respect as laws with regard to any other matter whatever. People who are otherwise quite respectable —and perhaps I should not use the word "otherwise"—people who are quite respectable, in this country in the past, and no doubt to-day in the United States, seem to have so little respect for prohibition laws that they will violate them apparently with no offence at all to their consciences. Liquor laws, dry or wet, always have had a strong minority, or possibly, even a majority opposed to them. I believe it is literally impossible for a wet country to lie adjacent to a so-called or ostensibly dry country without a flow of liquor proceeding from the wet to the dry. That, of course, is the basic reason to-day for the situation which we are now debating.

During the war Canada had a prohibitory law. The United States continued wet. They were not yet in the war. Liquor flowed freely at that time from the United States to Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: Very little.

Mr. EULER: It is perhaps fair to say that I have no recollection, and I think no one has any, that the United States, at a time when conditions were reversed, made any effort whatever to stop the exportation of liquor from one friendly nation to another friendly nation which was engaged in a great war. I am not sure that that is an argument, but in any disposition we may make of the question I believe we ought to consider the attitude of the United States itself in regard to this matter. To-day with Canada wet, and the United States ostensibly dry, the flow is from us to them.

I want to congratulate the members in that corner who have discussed the question from a very high moral plane and to assure them that I desire to discuss it solely on its merits. When I say that, I wish for a moment to take exception to an inference apparently drawn by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre when he says that it is at least suspicious that no action is taken in the direction which he desires and that perhaps we may be influenced by money which would flow out of the coffers of the distillers and brewers into party funds. I am not sure whether it is worth while denying that, but if it is, so far as I am concerned I wish to issue an absolute denial. No better proof of the sincerity of that denial can be offered than the fact that in every case where action was recommended against brewers and distillers who had not paid their taxes, that action was proceeded with without any exception whatsoever. We have collected from those brewers and distillers a good many million dollars, and expect to get some more.

Perhaps I might deal briefly with the subject in chronological order. As has been said, in 1924, a treaty was concluded with the United States for the suppression of smuggling. The chief obligation into which Canada entered was that we should report to the United States authorities whenever a clearance was granted by Canadian customs officials to liquor-laden boats bound for the United States. A good many other things were discussed, but those who are familiar with the treaty will agree that that was the outstanding obligation in it. May I say in passing that the United States government on several occasions has stated officially that the Canadian government, through the Department of National Revenue, has faithfully carried out the obligations embodied in that treaty. But the United States has not been satisfied with the provisions of the treaty. With that I have no particular fault to find. Indeed, before the treaty was

made, the United States requested that there should be inserted in it a provision that no clearances be granted to vessels of the kind mentioned, namely, vessels carrying liquor to United States shores. It was not so included in the treaty. We merely agreed to give notice of clearances that had been granted.

As has already been stated, in 1926 a request came from the United States government for a further conference with the Canadian authorities, their purpose being to persuade the Canadian government, if possible, to grant the very thing which they are again now asking. That conference, held last January, was attended by certain officials of the United States government and the Canadian government. Suffice it to say that the outcome of the conference was merely this, that the Canadian officials expressed doubt as to the efficacy of the remedy proposed by the United States officials, and that the United States officials re-asserted their conviction that the only way in which the difficulty could be met was by Canada passing such regulations or such laws as would prevent the export of liquor to the United States. I might say here, although I shall come to that point later, that merely to prohibit the granting of clearances will not remedy the situation at all. To make such a measure effective you would also have to forbid the release of liquor or beer from the distilleries and breweries.

I have spoken of the net result of the conference of last January. Following the conference, the officials made their reports to their respective governments. The report of the Canadian officials was received by the government some months ago. After some consideration by the government a communication was sent to the United States suggesting a proposal, which has already been described by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that it was thought would be of assistance to the United States, namely to permit them to station their agents on Canadian docks from which liquor was being exported, so that they could observe and report to their own government and thereby stop the export to the United States, The United States authorities, in further correspondence, reverted to their former request and stated that the only thing that would serve their purpose would be for this government to stop the issue of clearances. There the matter stands to-day.

I should like, because I think it is of interest and will remove misapprehension in the minds of some hon. members and certainly of some people in this country, to describe what takes place in the exporting of liquor. In the first place it should be understood that liquor manufactured and sold in Canada pays an excise tax of $9 a gallon. Liquor imported into Canada pays a duty of $10 a gallon—a little bit of protection, as some of my Conservative friends would say.

Mr. BENNETT: As the minister would say.

Mr. EULER: I will say it myself.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Both of them say it.

Mr. EULER: It should also be understood that when liquor is bona fide exported to another country and it can be proven that the liquor has been landed in that foreign country, there is no excise tax to be paid.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: When was that excise tax on liquor manufactured in Canada for export imposed?

Mr. EULER: It all depends upon the country to which it is being exported. If the liquor is actually exported to the West Indies, if it actually goes there, the method is this: The liquor does not pay an excise tax as it leaves the distillery, but the shipper gives a bond issued by a reliable guarantee company for twice the amount of the excise tax. That bond is released and cancelled by the Department of National Revenue when the shipper brings back from the country to which the goods were shipped a bona fide landing certificate, showing that the goods were actually landed in that foreign country.

Some reference has been made to the fact that in the past a good many bogus landing certificates have been obtained and the bond released when the liquor was not actually landed in the foreign country to which it was destined. I want to assure the house that that practice has absolutely discontinued; that the bonds which are given are bona fide bonds, and that the landing certificates which we receive and upon the receipt of which we cancel the bonds are absolutely genuine; there is no doubt about that.

Liquor exported to the United States is in a different class in this way: It is apparent, of course, to every member that it is impossible for a vessel to obtain a landing certificate for liquor shipped to the United States, that country being under a prohibitory law. Therefore, in order to avoid any difficulty, the practice is for the distillers to pay the excise tax before the goods leave the distillery.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): When did that practice start?

Mr. EULER: Mr. Speaker, I have only forty minutes, and although I should be glad to answer any questions if my time were extended, there are certain things that I should like to say. In any case I cannot answer my hon. friend's question; that was before I took charge of the department.

When liquor is destined for the United States, the excise is paid and it is then just as legal to export that liquor as any other commodity—boots and shoes, furniture, iron and steel, or anything else that can legally be exported. So far as the Department of National Revenue is concerned, when the excise tax is paid, all its demands are satisfied and the liquor becomes exactly similar to any other commodity that might be manufactured in Canada. When these liquors are exported to the United States, however, it is necessary that the boat or conveyance carrying them to the United States obtain a clearance from the Canadian customs and fill out the necessary export papers. That is the whole procedure.

Most of the liquor that goes from Canada to the United States is shipped from what we may call the Windsor-Detroit front and the Lake Erie front. Some goes over the border from lake Ontario, and some from western Canada and from Quebec, but not so very much. Most of it goes out from the area I have mentioned in the province of Ontario, and some from the province of Quebec. In every case clearances and export entries are necessary under our law.

I should like to correct a few misconceptions that are current throughout the country. It has been stated that the government loses revenue by reason of the export of liquor to the United States. That is not the fact. Every bottle of liquor that leaves a distillery in Canada, no matter where it goes, pays the excise tax before it leaves the distillery unless it is bona fide destined for some foreign country where bona fide landing certificates can be obtained, and in that case the shipment is made under bond. It is no longer true, as some people believe, that clearances to small boats are issued from our lake ports to countries like Cuba or Mexico. That practice was discontinued even before I took charge of the department. No boat which it is quite evident cannot proceed to the destination designated in its papers can receive a clearance.

Reference was made to a clearance being refused to a boat at Bridgeburg going to Mexico because it was quite apparent that it could not proceed there, and a clearance being given when it was stated that the boat would go to Detroit. I do not see anything very peculiar in that, because in the one case the master of that boat gave a false declaration, and in the other he did not. In the one case he was violating our customs law, in the other he was not. I think it will surprise the members of the house when I say that when these boats clear from Windsor, we will say, for Detroit, or from Bridgeburg for Buffalo, they go to Detroit and go to Buffalo. They clear for a definite destination. If we know that they are clearing for some destination to which they are not actually going, they are violating our law and a penalty is applied.

Mr. STEVENS: Do they present their clearances to the port to which they go?

Mr. EULER: I do not suppose so. I am glad my hon. friend mentioned that point; I might as well deal with it now. The boats which are smuggling liquor are not violating our law, because it is not smuggling while they are in Canada. But when they deliver liquor in the United States they are violating American law, and the boats that are carrying this liquor to the United States are almost 100 per cent United States boats; they are not Canadian boats at all. Not only that, the men who are carrying the goods across are Americans practically 100 per cent, not Canadians. Here is a peculiarity in the respective laws of the two countries. In Canada every boat, no matter how small it is—and most of these goods are carried in small boats—must obtain clearance from a Canadian customs officer. In the United States—and these boats are owned in the United States, I should like the house to remember—boats under 5 tons need not obtain clearance, and need not report when they come back. In Canada they must obtain clearance when they leave and report when they come back. While the United States are asking that we discontinue clearances to these boats—their own boats manned by their own people—they do not demand clearances themselves from those very boats.

Mr. MANION: Are these boats not treated in exactly the same way as a boat carrying, we will say, a shipload of potatoes? Suppose an American boat came across here for a cargo of potatoes, she would get clearance and would be treated in exactly the same way as these rum boats?

Mr. EULER: Yes, exactly the same. The difference is in the tonnage. In the United States they demand clearance of boats of five tons and over. But the anomaly is in this

They now ask us to discontinue giving clearances to their own boats, which in most cases are less than five tons. They themselves do not require clearances of those boats. I would respectfully suggest that they would have considerably more control over their own boats, manned by their own people, if they would enact a law that those boats, no matter how small, should be obliged to obtain clearances when they leave their shore and report when they come back, the same as we require in Canada. That would give them some control.

The chief export points are the Windsor district and the Bridgeburg district. I have said something which may appear a criticism of the United States. I have no desire to be offensive, but I think there are some facts I should place before the house in view of the statements made that we are not dealing in a friendly way with our neighbour to the south. It has been stated that these boats go across at night. That is not entirely true. I took the trouble last fall to go down to Windsor. I was offered safe conduct by a liquor exporter and went out on a launch on the Detroit River. I could see the United States customs office on the other shore, and I could also see that it was not difficult to detect any boats that left the Canadian shore to go to the American side. While in Windsor I got into conversation with a man engaged in the business of exporting liquor. I asked him, "Do you cross in the day-time?" He answered, "Yes, quite often." I said, "How is it they do not get you?" He replied with a smile, "It just happens that they are not there when we go across."

Our inspector went to Windsor not so very long ago. He did not select any special day. While there, on January 14, he observed the following vessels cross the river to Detroit in daylight with cargoes of liquors:

"Ben", J. King, master,
10 quarter barrels beer
11 cases whiskey
"Rat", J. Sales, master,
24 cases whiskey
5 cases wine
1 case brandy
"Bat", A. Jacks, master,
19 cases whiskey
1 case wine
"Rabbi",—

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose he was a spiritual leader.

Mr. EULER: Most of the cargo seems to have been beer, and I am afraid you would hardly call that "spiritual."

"Rabbi", I. Straight, master,
5 half barrels beer
8 cases whiskey
"Bird", J. Bloom, master,
18 cases whiskey
8 cases bourbon
1 case Scotch whiskey
"Bar", J. Peters, master,
13 cases whiskey
4 cases bourbon
3 cases brandy

That was in one day. Those boats went over in broad daylight. I leave members to draw their own inferences from that state of affairs. From the Bridgeburg district I have a report, in reply to an inquiry, by the collector at Bridgeburg, Ontario, written on April 11 of last year, and directed to the commissioner of customs.

Dear Mr. Breadner:

I wish to give you a short account of the rum-running at this port, and our procedure in the matter.

There are about twelve boats plying between here and Buffalo, N.Y., the river at this point being about half a mile wide. Some days we only have two or three boats out—

I do not think he should say "we" have.

—they have only two or three boats out, and on other days the whole fleet will make a trip.

The liquor and ale are brought from the distillery and brewery by truck, arriving here about two o'clock in the afternoon. The boats are all loaded and clearance granted about 5 p.m. and they are compelled to leave by 6 p.m. Some of these boats carry from 800 to 1,000 cases, and on their arrival on the American side it takes from two to three hours to unload them. No effort as far as we can see is made by the United States authorities to seize any of these boats, as the United States customs are always notified by us an hour or two before the boats leave, and occasionally we notify them as the boats are leaving, giving them the names of the boats and the quantity of liquor or ale on board. We have had high customs officials from Buffalo, special agents, and officers connected with the coast guard come over to the Canadian side, watch these boats load and pull out. It is a well known fact that some of these boats land within a few hundred yards of the United States customs office at the foot of Ferry street and unload without being disturbed.

Some few weeks ago, no doubt you saw in the press where it was stated that a truck had drawn out on the Peace bridge, and unloaded the ale down on the bank on the American side by tying a rope around the cases and lowering them to the river bank. As a matter of fact this ale was unloaded from one of the rum boats plying between here and Buffalo, right under the Peace bridge within a few hundred yards of the customs house.

Our officers who check these boats out were informed by one of the rum-runners that they had no trouble in landing their cargo as they were assisted by the officers of the dry squad on the American side, and it would appear that such must be the case when seven or eight boats will leave here, and land their cargoes, sometimes taking them three hours to unload without any casualties.

These boats are loaded directly opposite from the United States customs office at Black Rock. You can stand by the window in that office and look across, and see every case that is loaded on the Canadian side. I know if con-

ditions were reversed that we would have all these boats tied up in less than a week, and if the officers on the American side wish to put a stop to this business they could do it in about the same length of time.

An hon. MEMBER: Whose report is that?

Mr. EULER: That is signed by F. T. Pattison, collector of national revenue at Bridgeburg, Ontario. I am reading this, Mr. Speaker, not for the purpose of making a criticism against the United States' officials—I do not question the good faith of the men at the top—but I think it is at least a fair reason for considering whether the Canadian Government would be justified in going to what, I think I can show, would be a heavy expense if this law were enacted that is being asked for, in face of the fact that the United States authorities are making no very earnest effort to do it themselves.

Miss MACPHAIL: I should like to ask the minister a question which it will not take him a moment to answer. Were not these facts known at the time the special committee and the royal commission made their report? Did they not then know that some, at least, of the United States officials were not trying to enforce their own laws?

Mr. EULER: My answer would be, I do not know. But I could hardly understand why they would fail to have knowledge of these facts.

An hon. MEMBER: Why did we endorse it?

Mr. EULER: That endorsation was given in 1926, as I understand it, and if the house desires I will deal with that later, if I have time, but I would prefer for the moment to go on with another phase of the matter.

It has been said, I think by the member for Winnipeg North Centre, that we have done absolutely nothing to assist the United States. I desire to cite some of the things we have done.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I thought I gave the government credit for having done something.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps I am accusing the hon. member wrongfully, but I understood him to say that we had not done anything to assist the United States. The first thing we did was to agree to a treaty establishing the twelve-mile limit, which has at times involved considerable difficulty to Canadian boats. That helped tremendously in stopping the importation of liquor from the Atlantic seaboard. We agreed to give information as to clearances and have faithfully carried out that agreement, as the United States has testified on more than one occasion. We insist on bonds of the kind I described some time ago, where boats laden with liquor come from across the ocean, or from St. Pierre Miquelon, which is the centre of the trade, and enter Halifax harbour; at least they used to enter that harbour in stress or storm or from any other cause. They now must give a bond in the same way as the others that export to foreign countries. The result is that that business has stopped altogether, and the depots that were formed in Nova Scotia, from which liquor was smuggled into the United States, are no longer in existence. In addition to that we closed the export houses to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred. There were in Canada so-called export houses—houses which imported liquor, stored it in these places in bond, and then exported it. I think it is true to say that perhaps 95 per cent of the liquor in these export bond houses went to the United States. We have closed these and shut out that source of supply to the United States, because this department agreed with the royal commission that these customs bonds served no useful purpose; and although it is quite true that the Dominion government obtained considerable revenue from that source, it was not taken into consideration at all. We passed last session the Intoxicating Liquors Act; the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) piloted that bill through the house. The result is that now, with a few exceptions, no other than the local control authorities in any province may import liquor into that province. That also has prevented the accumulation of liquor which later found its way into the United States. We have limited in Ontario, where most of the export business is done, the number of docks from which liquor may be exported.

Mr. STEVENS: How many are there now?

Mr. EULER: Windsor district was the most notorious, if I may use that word. I do not know the exact number, but there were about fifty places from which liquor went out. There are now ten.

Mr. MANION: Are ten enough to supply the demand?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 86, for the relief of Frederick Rutherfoord Zoppi.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 119, for the relief of Bessie Ruth Glass.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 125, for the relief of Edith Marie McFarlane.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 128, for the relief of Cleoniki Paleologou Drakoulas.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 140, for the relief of Nanette Coffey.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 141, for the relief of James Graham McCreadie.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 142, for the relief of Stephen Dymon.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 153, for the relief of Marion Isabel Kemp.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 157, for the relief of Elizabeth Crawford Copping.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 158, for the relief of Arthur Alderton.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 159, for the relief of Elias Abraham, otherwise known as Elie Abraham Allen.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 177, for the relief of Claude Frederick Burgin.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

Bill No. 181, for the relief of Mary Addie Linton.—Mr. Geary (for Mr. Lennox).

Bill No. 184, for the relief of Edna Maud James.—Mr. Spence (Parkdale).

Bill No. 185, for the relief of Helen Jane Sim Pittendreich.—Mr. Spence (Parkdale).

Bill No. 187, for the relief of Alfred Roy Edwards.—Mr. Spence (Parkdale).

Bill No. 189, for the relief of Molly Vaughan.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 191, for the relief of Myrtle Mary Jane McLean.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 207, for the relief of Ida Rosenberg.—Mr. Spence.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 108, for the relief of Thomas Southwood.—Mr. Howard.

Bill No. 195, for the relief of Jeanie Mathieson Howell.—Mr. Howden (for Mr. Edwards, Ottawa).

Bill No. 199, for the relief of Gordon Asher True.—Mr. Howden (for Mr. Edwards, Ottawa).

[Mr. Manion.]

PREMIER GUARANTEE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA

Mr. J. E. LAWSON (West York) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 74, respecting The Premier Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the nature of these amendments?

Mr. LAWSON: The senate merely changed the phraseology of section 1 of the bill, without, as I am instructed by counsel for the petitioner, changing the effect. I am instructed also that the amendments made are acceptable to the petitioner.

Motion agreed to, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

JOLIETTE AND NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac) (for Mr. Ferland) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendment made by the senate to Bill No. 70, respecting the Joliette and Northern Railway Company.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the nature of this amendment?

Mr. CAHILL: I am afraid I cannot give an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. GARDINER: Never mind, I have it now.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The senate has narrowed the time allowed by the House of Commons and asks that this company show activity within one year instead of within two years.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

KETCHUM PATENT

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Antigonish-Guysborough) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 78, respecting a certain patent of Zebulum Colvin Ketchum.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

CLARENCE SPURGEON WHITE

Mr. M. F. HEPBURN (West Elgin): In the absence of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Sanderson), who is ill at his home, I would like to move the second reading of this bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent, Mr. Hepburn for Mr. Sanderson moves that bill No. 275 for the relief of Clarence Spurgeon White be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY COMPANY

On the order being called for the second reading of Bill No. 282, respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Bourgeois:

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to say that this bill cannot be proceeded with because there is no petition.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 216, for the relief of Laura Grace Osborne Lea.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 227, for the relief of Pansy Jean Van Luven.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 235, for the relief of Edyth Viola Beacock.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 236, for the relief of Bertha Nichols.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 238, for the relief of Albert Victor Walter Holman Homan.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 250, respecting The Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 259, for the relief of Grace Viola Byers.—Mr. Hay.

Bill No. 260, for the relief of Mildred Soden.—Mr. Hay.

Bill No. 261, for the relief of Mabel Graham.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 262, for the relief of Velma Stella Seadon.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 263, for the relief of Emma O'Grady.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 265, for the relief of Gordon Hanna.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park) (for Mr. Rowe).

Bill No. 270, for the relief of Thomas Horace Sillery.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 272, for the relief of Gladys Elizabeth Boyd.—Mr. Stinson.

Bill No. 274, for the relief of Annie Fraser Rice.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 284, respecting a certain patent of Cobb Connector Company.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 288, for the relief of George Stanley Warner.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 289, for the relief of Vincenzina Gramigna.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 292, for the relief of Kenneth Evan Thompson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 293, for the relief of Thomas Matthews Moland.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 294, for the relief of Andrew Townsley Hirsch.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

RIGHT OF MARRIED WOMEN TO ESTABLISH DOMICILE

The house resumed from May 7, consideration in committee of Bill No. 75, respecting the domicile of married women in proceedings for divorce—Mr. Ward—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 2—Married woman separate from husband.

Mr. BOTHWELL: When this bill was before the house the other evening objections were voiced to it as it stands, and at that time a proposed motion was placed before the house but was not put as there was no seconder. The proposal contained in that amendment was also objected to when it came before the house. The discussion brought out very clearly that there is a real need in Canada for some such legislation as is proposed in this bill. The hon. leader of the opposition, when the bill was up before, explained some of the difficulties that the courts in Canada have to face in connection with our divorce legislation, and the references that he made to various cases which have been decided showed clearly that there is a real need for some such legislation as is here proposed. In order to meet some of the difficulties that were mentioned in the discussion, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk, that sections 2 and 3 of the bill be struck out and that the following be substituted therefor:

> 2. A married woman who either before or after the passing of this act has been deserted by and has lived separate and apart from her husband for a period of two years and upwards and is still living separate and apart from her husband may acquire in any one of the provinces of Canada in which there is a court having jurisdiction to grant a divorce a vinculo matrimonii a domicile of her own choice as though she were a feme sole for the purpose of commencing in the province in which she has acquired such domicile an action for divorce a vinculo matrimonii praying that her marriage may be dissolved on any grounds that may entitle her to such divorce in the court of such province having jurisdiction to grant such divorce whatever the domicile of the husband may be, provided that for the purpose aforesaid such married woman shall be deemed to retain the domicile of her husband at the time she was so deserted until she has acquired a domicile of her own choice as aforesaid.

The amendment meets the objection that was raised the other evening that the bill as it stands goes too far and might encroach

upon other situations than that of divorce, because it clearly and definitely limits the domicile to the purpose of divorce. As the bill is changed by this amendment I can see no objection to it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, I objected to the bill on the two occasions when it came before the committee, first, as originally drafted, and afterwards as amended. I must admit that as far as the constitutional side is concerned, the new amendment is not subject to criticism as were the two first drafts. But speaking for myself I am sorry to say that I still object to the bill, and I would regret if it should become the law of this country. I wish to repeat what I have stated as to the various effects of this bill if it passes parliament. For instance, a wife will be able to take proceedings for divorce in Manitoba or in Saskatchewan, while her husband may apply to this parliament for divorce if he still lives either in Ontario or in Quebec. There may be two applications for divorce in two different places. There may be even two divorce trials before two different courts if the wife goes to another province where there is a divorce court. There may be two actions for divorce, and there will be a race for the better position. I still believe in the soundness of the British doctrine in this respect, that there is only one, and that there should be and can be but one, domicile as long as the matrimonial tie continues, and that only when it is dissolved can there be two domiciles.

My regret more particularly is that this bill if enacted would provide greater facilities for divorce. Public men in other countries have regretted the increased facilities for divorce, but once the door has been opened it is very difficult to close it. We in this country have always boasted that our record is clean in this respect. I admit that I do not share the viewpoint of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that it is better that we should have the facilities which this bill will provide to avoid the scandal of some of our people going to the country to the south of us and there building up a fictitious domicile to obtain a divorce which has more or less legal effect in Canada. I repeat I do not agree with my hon. friend in that regard. I think it is better for us to keep our record clean in this respect, and that the remedy will be worse than the disease.

Our conditions are very similar in so many respects with those that prevail in the United States that I am afraid the troubles that are regretted over there will become ours if we adopt their system and make our laws concerning marriage and divorce more like those of that country than those of Great Britain.

[Mr. Bothwell.]

The strength of our Canadian life has been based to a large extent on our marriage laws, and I do not think there is anywhere in Canada much public opinion in favour of changing those laws. Among all classes of our people marriage is respected. Our people everywhere have always believed that once a man and a woman are united in marriage, the union is for better or for worse, and that it is a lifelong contract. This has always been the Canadian conviction, and we have been proud of it. I still think that by the adoption of this measure we should be entering on a new policy fraught with danger to our national life, and for that reason I cannot agree with the amendment and shall register my vote against it.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I regret my inability to agree with the Minister of Justice in respect to this matter. I think he has overlooked one or two essential factors that should be considered. First of all, this bill does not extend the causes for which divorce may be obtained. The only ground upon which divorce may be obtained is unfaithfulness. Secondly, it must be remembered that the wife in order to obtain a separate domicile must be deserted by the husband. If she has lived in the domicile where the husband has deserted her, by this bill she merely will be able to maintain her action there on the assumption that he having gone away, she knows not where, has for the purposes of the action left her with the domicile where she was deserted. There can be no scandal in that. If by reason of her desertion she finds it necessary to leave the community where she lives and go to some other province, she can acquire domicile only by satisfying the court of two facts, because domicile is a question of fact: (a) residence and (b) intention to remain in that jurisdiction. When these two factors are present and the court finds as a matter of fact that the wife is thus domiciled, this legislation will confer upon that court the necessary jurisdiction to enable that action to be maintained. How can it be successfully said in this age, when a woman may hold property and, under the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857, shall, if judicially separated from her husband, be regarded as a feme sole and, as such, may for every purpose in the world be deemed an unmarried woman, that she shall nevertheless, for the purpose of separating herself from her spouse, who has been unfaithful, be unable to acquire that necessary ingredient to enable the court to exercise its jurisdiction, namely, domicile? How can we take the view in this day and generation that she shall not be considered to have a separate domicile in a matter

of this kind, because by a fiction of law "they two are one"? It must not be forgotten that the principle of British law, to which my hon. friend has referred, is a principle based upon that old saying—"They two shall be one, and the husband is that one." In France, in Germany and in other continental countries where the question has been considered it has been conceded that the adandoned wife may acquire a domicile inasmuch as she is in the eyes of the law a separate entity, her existence being no longer merged in that of her husband. And since there is no longer any merging of her identity or personality in that of her husband, and she may exercise the power of a feme sole, as we have evidence of in legislatures and parliament and other institutions of the country, I do not think we are going to the extent indicated by the minister when we merely confer upon the appropriate court the power to exercise its jurisdiction upon its being satisfied that a woman who has been deserted and abandoned by her husband—he having been guilty of unfaithfulness—has acquired, by virtue of residence and intention, that domicile which will enable her to prosecute and maintain her action for the termination of the marriage tie by reason of such infidelity.

Mr. POULIOT: Before the bill is carried I want to state my views on this matter. I wish to say first of all that what astounds me is that every particular case will be decided under this act. Now every case is entirely different from every other. In the province of Quebec, when a wife asks for separation from bed and board, she presents a petition to the judge seeking the right to have a separate domicile temporarily until judgment is given. The judge listens to the arguments in support of the petition, and if he deems it advisable to grant the wife a domicile separate from that of her husband he granted the petition. On the other hand, if, according to the evidence, it does not seem to him proper to grant the petition, he refuses it. The matter is left to the good judgment and experience of the judge. But more than that, judges of the superior court of the province of Quebec very often in these cases try to bring the two parties together; in his chambers the judge places the situation before them and hears what they have to say. Sometimes the separation is asked for merely because the parties for some reason or other cannot agree, but the cause of difference is not so serious as they imagine and the judge tries to conciliate them. Consequently the suit is very often abandoned by reason of the very sensible course followed by the judge, who exercises his office for the benefit of both parties concerned.

Some arguments brought forward in this discussion are rather strange. Someone has said that in such a case the wife should have the same rights as the husband. Well, undoubtedly the wife has as many rights as the husband, but they are not of the same kind; it makes all the difference in the world. For guidance, are we going to go back four centuries ago when the Indians had camps here, and on this very spot where now stands this beautiful parliament of Canada? At that time the squaws had many powers and rights; they used to go out hunting while the husband kept the home fires burning.

Mr. IRVINE: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to inform the house whether he is speaking for the bill or against it? It is nearly nine o'clock and we should like to know.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, you may call this an exordium; I am giving you the general lines of my speech. Afterwards I shall come to what we call the confirmation of the speech, and I shall then submit stronger arguments to support my view. Someone has said in this debate that the wife should have the same rights as the husband. That may be all right; but that matter is not in question at all. I cannot agree with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) when he dismisses as fictitious the idea of unity as between man and wife. It is not merely saying that husband and wife shall be one; it is more than that. It is a question of the very existence of the family.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Time.

Mr. POULIOT: No. I have listened politely to my hon. friends, and I have the floor now and will hold it. On Tuesday next I will give the house what I call the confirmation of my argument.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

EXPORT OF LIQUOR TO THE UNITED STATES

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) for the house to go into committee of supply.

Mr. EULER: When the house rose at six o'clock I was discussing the measures which had already been taken by the Department of National Revenue to limit the carrying of liquor to the United States. I

stated that we had agreed to the right of search within the twelve-mile limit by United States vessels of ships supposed to be carrying liquor to that country. I stated also that we had agreed under the treaty to give information to the United States of all clearances of vessels leaving Canadian ports and carrying liquor to the United States. As I said this afternoon, that agreement has been faithfully carried out, and statements to that effect have been made by the United States government.

I might have made reference to a rather remarkable condition existing at Windsor in connection with the giving of notices to United States customs authorities. As I said this afternoon, Windsor is one of the chief ports of liquor export to the United States. Under the treaty the collector at the port of Windsor did give notice by telephone to the United States customs authorities at Detroit of clearances that had been given. I am not going to suggest any reason, but peculiarly enough we were requested by the United States government to discontinue the giving of telephone notices to the collector at Detroit, and in accordance with that request such notices were no longer given at that port. They asked us then to give weekly reports rather than daily reports by telephone, and we have acceded to their request.

Mr. McGIBBON: Was that the United States federal government?

Mr. EULER: Yes. I further said that we are now demanding bonds for all liquor-laden vessels coming from abroad and entering Canadian ports, no matter what the reason may be. In the past that was made an excuse for landing some of these liquors in Canada, thus providing a convenient means of later transporting it to the United States. The result of our action in demanding these bonds has been to stop that method entirely.

In addition, we have taken steps to close all the export bond liquor houses in Canada; while I mentioned that fact this afternoon I forgot to mention one other point. These houses imported liquor from abroad and stored it in bond for the purpose of later exporting it to the United States. We decided that these houses should be closed, that they served no useful purpose but promoted the exportation of liquor to the United States. We took action to close them, but under the law any liquor in bond could remain there for two years. No further liquor has been allowed to come into these houses for many months, and the liquor remaining there must be exported in about a year from now, I believe some time in June, 1930. Then this system, which was a very fertile source of exportation of liquor to the United States, will be done away with entirely.

Mr. BENNETT: How many of these houses remain in that position?

Mr. EULER: I think there are one or two in British Columbia and one in Halifax, but in June of 1930 these places will be out of business and in the meantime they cannot import further stocks. I said this afternoon that we also passed the Intoxicating Liquors Act, which gave to the provincial authorities the sole right to import liquor. That again circumscribes the power of export to the United States.

At six o'clock I was referring to the fact that in certain parts of Ontario we had limited the number of docks from which liquor could be exported, and perhaps it would be interesting to the house if I reviewed what led up to that action. At the interprovincial conference held in the fall of 1927 I agreed to cooperate in every reasonable way with the provincial authorities in the enforcement of the provincial liquor laws. One of the results of that agreement was the passage of the Intoxicating Liquors Act, although that act had been introduced the year previously. We further agreed that no additional licenses for distilleries or breweries should be issued anywhere in Canada by the Department of National Revenue without first consulting with the provincial authorities, and I may say that unless some arrangement had been made prior to the agreement with the provinces, in no case has a license been issued except with the consent of such provincial authority.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does that "consultation" necessarily mean "consent"?

Mr. EULER: We are not bound by it, but I may say that the minister has so far followed the wishes of the provinces. I do not think, however, he should bind himself entirely; circumstances might arise which would lead him to believe that such licenses should be granted, but the fact is that no such license has been issued since that arrangement with the provincial authorities was arrived at, and I propose to continue that policy.

Mr. MANION: What date was that?

Mr. EULER: The promise of cooperation was made at the interprovincial conference, and the actual agreement with the provinces was arrived at some months later. I think it has been in existence about a year, or perhaps a little longer.

Something was said this afternoon with regard to short-circuiting; it was suggested that the export of liquor to the United States made it possible to short-circuit liquor into the different provinces without any great trouble. I believe that statement has been made by the chairman of the Ontario Liquor Control Board, Sir Henry Drayton. I am not altogether prepared to contradict him, but I do not think there is very much short-circuiting of liquor in the province of Ontario, because any man who desires liquor can purchase it without trouble at the stores of the Liquor Control Board. There may be a little short-circuiting which comes about in this way: Occasionally a boat which sails from the Ontario side, perhaps from the port of Windsor, finds it impossible to land the cargo on the other side and is forced to turn back and land that cargo of liquor somewhere in Ontario.

Mr. STEVENS: That seems to be a rare occurrence.

Mr. EULER: I think it is quite rare. We have further instituted a system of checking all shipments of liquor from the docks into the boats; our officers carry on that work. We are also abolishing what was termed the nuisance and abuse of the B-13 forms connected with the shipment of beer; we are now inaugurating a new system of permits which I think will remove most of the complaints of the provincial authorities. As a matter of fact, as I said this afternoon, the number of docks at the border in the Windsor district has been reduced from fifty to ten. That was done absolutely with the cooperation of the provincial authorities; the selection of these docks was made by the collector at Windsor in conjunction with the inspector working under Sir Henry Drayton. Perhaps I should not take any undue credit for trying to assist the United States in regard to the limitation of docks; I will admit that it was done for the sole purpose of assisting in the enforcement of the Ontario Liquor Control Act. It was felt that if the number of docks were limited the Ontario authorities could more closely watch the operations of the exporters and take precautions in order to see that there would be no short-circuiting. However, the result has been that the United States authorities have been given, if they choose to avail themselves of it, a similar opportunity to watch the operation of these exporters and protect their own shores.

Mr. CAHAN: I understand that we receive no landing certificates for these cargoes of liquor, but what certificate is received from the American authorities showing that the vessel which cleared from Windsor has arrived at Detroit?

Mr. EULER: We receive none; we are not entitled to any under the law. We cannot even demand a certificate showing that a landing has been made in another country, when the boat returns to Canadian shores. That question has been brought up before; we have consulted with the Department of Justice and that is the law.

Mr. MANION: Is it not true that a number of those docks which were closed were merely little unimportant docks or jetties?

Mr. EULER: Yes, that is quite true; some of them were very unimposing places, but still they were shipping liquor. It had been thought, and corresponding criticism had been made in the press until about a year ago, that the Minister of National Revenue had authority to discontinue the issuance of clearances to boats exporting liquor to the United States. Probably my hon. friend, (Mr. Stevens) who was minister for a short time before I took over the department, had the same thought; I may be wrong but I think he found, as I did upon making inquiry, that there was no power under the act for the minister to refuse clearances in that way. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that the department and the government have done practically everything which could be done under the law as it now stands to help our neighbours, short of the actual prohibition of exports. It should be remembered that after all Canada is not a prohibitionist country. That fact may be regretted by a great many estimable people, and many of them may be in this house. I have no fault to find with that, but the fact remains that under our law liquor may be manufactured and sold in Canada under certain conditions. We have a system of public control for the making and the sale of liquors and we have been quite consistent in the matter of limiting the number of docks, which implies control but does not imply prohibition.

It is quite apparent that in order to bring about the result which is desired by the United States, and by our friends who have spoken prior to myself, it is necessary that the law be changed before the issuance of clearances can be stopped.

I would like to sum up very briefly what seem to me to be the reasons both for and against a policy of that kind. It has been said that we are violating the spirit of the treaty

which was made in 1924 by not absolutely prohibiting the exportation of liquors. I cannot agree with that and I do not think it is a fair charge. As I stated this afternoon, before the treaty was actually made the United States asked that the export of liquor should be made illegal, that no clearances should be granted; that is what it wanted but the Canadian government did not grant that. It seems to me that if it was the intention of the Canadian government to stop the export of liquors it would have been specifically stated in the treaty which was made; that seems to me to be absolutely logical, and it is just as reasonable to suppose that what was specifically stated in the treaty was as far as we cared to go at that time. I refer to the obligation which we are carrying out, to give notice of clearance whenever a boat leaves the Canadian shore.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on, go on.

Mr. BENNETT: He is a minister replying.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the unanimous consent of the house.

Mr. EULER: I thank the members for their very courteous indulgence and I promise not to impose unduly upon their patience.

This question has been discussed very freely and I think it is only fair to give at this time some of the facts which I think have not been brought out. One argument which impresses me most strongly in favour of the prohibition of exports is the moral argument. It has been stated that the business of the exportation of liquor has resulted in the demoralization of people and has increased the disregard for law generally. I believe that, to some extent, that is the fact, a fact very much to be deplored, and one which I do not think any member of this house will condone. It will be agreed that wherever a country is under a prohibitory law to which a very large minority is opposed, the condition which has been described is inescapable.

It has been stated that other countries prohibit the issuance of clearances, and Great Britain was cited by the United States authorities in that connection. As a matter of fact we have made inquiry, and there is no such practice in Great Britain. That country does not refuse clearances for the exportation of liquor to any other country in the world, so far as I know.

Petitions by the hundreds have been presented to this house asking that clearances be no longer issued. I believe that the petitioners have so petitioned because they are opposed absolutely to the traffic in liquor. I do not believe that they were moved primarily by their regard for the feelings of a friendly nation; I believe that the prime motive was as I have stated, but I must say that I have no fault to find with that motive. I might say in passing—perhaps I should not say this, but I will—that to me it does not seem quite consistent that we as a country, or as separate provinces, should permit the legal manufacture and sale of liquor and then place undue restrictions upon the sale of liquor anywhere else.

One of the arguments offered against our prohibiting the issuance of clearances is that the problem which the United States is now experiencing is one of their own making and that we are not primarily responsible. Another is—using the words of the man on the street—"Let the United States enforce their own law." In the light of the statements which I made this afternoon, in connection with the lack of effort on the part of the United States to enforce their own law, I think that attitude is a very human and fairly reasonable one and that we might at least go slowly until we have some assurance and some evidence that they are trying to do for themselves what they are now asking us to do for them.

I mentioned this afternoon the peculiar fact that whereas we in Canada compel all boats, no matter how small, to take clearances when they leave our shores and to report when they return, that practice does not obtain in the United States. All boats under five tons sailing from United States ports are not required to take clearances and do not report when they return, yet practically all the boats engaged in this traffic are of United States registry and the great majority of them are of a tonnage less than five. Perhaps I should not offer advice to the United States as to what they should do, but it seems to me it would not be unreasonable for us to say, when they ask us not to give clearances to small boats, that they should amend their own law and demand clearances from their boats when they leave a port and ask them to report when they return, thus obtaining control over their own boats.

The statement has been made frequently that it is Canadian liquor which is flooding the United States. There is no reasonable doubt that a large amount of liquor does go from Canada into the United States, but relatively speaking the amount is very small

based upon the evidence of United States authorities connected with the enforcement of their law that it is only from two to five per cent of their total consumption which is imported from Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer the most important argument as I see it. Suppose for the moment that it is thought desirable to accede to the request of the United States and to the requests of the many petitioners who have come to this parliament, and that we pas a law prohibiting the issuance of clearances. In my opinion, if that remedy were adopted it would not solve the difficulty. Liquor can be obtained throughout Canada quite freely. In the province of Ontario liquor may be purchased in fairly large quantities from the government stores. In the province of Quebec they have the right under their law, although it is not exercised, to sell any quantity for export by the Quebec Liquor Commission. Liquor may be bought in fairly large quantities in almost every province of the Dominion. If clearances were not issued perhaps the quantity exported would not be so large, but there is no doubt in my mind that a great deal of liquor would be purchased throughout the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of exportation to the United States. If clearances would no longer be granted; the result would be that shipments of liquor to the United States would not go from recognized customs ports on the Canadian border, and the traffic would be forced underground to the corruption of Canadian people where perhaps it has not extended to Canada as it has to the United States. That would be a very undesirable situation. Moveover, probably the liquor that now goes across the border might successfully be shipped down to ocean ports and perhaps exported to St. Pierre and Miquelon, which also takes no particular precautions as to where the liquor is going, and from whose exports we in Canada suffer very considerably. One of the worst troubles we have in connection with preventive measures in the maritimes is that the St. Pierre and Miquelon islands lie at our doors and it is impossible to prevent the smuggling of liquor from those islands into our own country. It seems to me that in that case, if the liquor cannot go out through a recognized customs port in Canada, it will go out through perhaps every little landing place that may exist along our boundaries lined with lakes and rivers.

Mr. MANION: And worse liquor.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps worse liquor, and the difficulty from our point of view will be that it will then be illegally exported. As the matter stands now, the export of liquor from Canada is absolutely legal. The illegality arises where the liquor enters the United States, because the importation of liquor into that country is against their law. Exportation of liquor from Canada is entirely legal. If we pass a law prohibiting clearance, the liquor will then go out in any case, but it will go out illegally and secretly instead of openly, aboveboard and subject to a certain amount of observation, because we have limited the number of places from which exportation can be made.

I mentioned this afternoon that when the excise was paid on liquor manufactured in Canada, the liquor became free goods and could be exported the same as any other commodity. I repeat that because I want to add this further observation: that being the case, we cannot stop the exportation of that liquor from any customs port in the Dominion. We have limited the number of docks. but that has not resulted in stopping the exportation of liquor through those ports. We can limit the number of docks within any one port, as we did, for example, at Windsor; but we cannot, under the present law, stop the export through any open port in the Dominion. There are those who say—and I have in mind now particularly a prominent Toronto newspaper—that if we passed a law prohibiting the granting of clearances, we would at least have washed our national hands of an offence against a friendly neighbour, and that, having done that, we would be under no obligation to spend money or time to uphold the laws of the United States. I cannot agree with that view. I cannot escape the conclusion that we then assume a responsibility which now rests upon the United States. As the matter stands, if there is any violation of law it is a violation of United States law. As it would be under the new law, it would be a violation of Canadian customs law. The law is the law, and we cannot shirk responsibility as readily as that suggestion would make it appear. If a Canadian customs law is violated, surely it becomes the duty of Canadian customs officers to see that that violation is punished. I am not trying to exaggerate; I do not think I am drawing a fanciful picture at all, but I say that if we are under an obligation in the Department of National Revenue to see that violations of the law are punished, surely we shall need to establish a preventive force a good deal larger than the one we have now, which, I may say, is giving me enough trouble as it is. I am sure the most ardent prohibitionist will not say that this country should be under

any obligation to spend large sums of money in employing many men to see that that law prohibiting the exportation of liquor is not violated. Nations have not yet become quite so altruistic as that. Besides that, we would not succeed; we could not stop the exportation of liquor, although it might be lessened to some extent. After we had passed a law of that kind and liquor still continued to flow into the United States, I feel sure that our neighbours would yet be much inclined to criticize and we would continue to get the blame.

So far as I am concerned—and I think I can speak for the government in this matter—we are honestly anxious to do all that we reasonably can to assist our neighbours. But I will also say very frankly that I am more concerned with stopping smuggling into Canada than stopping smuggling into the United States. The first is our own particular business and the other is primarily theirs. The Department of National Revenue, as it is now with its many branches and ramifications, provides plenty of work for those connected with that department. It is a fairly big job and I will admit I have no inclination at the present moment to add more duties to that department which has already so many. I am not deliberately looking for more trouble. I admit the problem is a difficult one and it gives the government some concern.

Personally—and I think I may again speak for the government in this—I have received with considerable sympathy and every consideration the protests of those who are opposed to the exportation of liquor, but I sincerely believe that under all the circumstances as related by myself this afternoon and evening, and with all the measures already taken, the government has done fairly well, and has perhaps gone far enough. But the door is not closed; the government is always prepared to give further consideration as developments may justify it. I feel, however, that before we take any further action there should be more convincing proof that our neighbours are sincerely doing all they can to help themselves. In the meantime the government desires and welcomes a frank discussion by members of all parties of a difficult and vexing problem, in order to enable it to arrive at new conclusions or to be confirmed in the position that so far has been taken.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house as a whole will agree with me when I say that the minister has given a very frank and carefully studied statement of a most difficult problem. Personally I congratulate him upon the clarity of his utterances; and with the greater part of what he has said little fault can be found. I should like briefly to bring to the attention of the house one or two points arising out of what he has said.

There are perhaps two main suggestions arising out of his remarks: first, it must be granted by every hon. member that the problem is an exceedingly complicated and difficult one. Second, by the official statements of the Minister of National Revenue in charge of the administration of the customs and excise of the Dominion of Canada made in the house to-day regarding the manner in which the officers administering the law on the other side of the line have reciprocated, shall I say, the courtesies and the efforts that the minister declares his officers have made, there is presented to the house an appalling situation. The minister told us most frankly, and in clear and unmistakable language, that under a solemn treaty entered into between the two countries Canada had agreed to render to a friendly neighbouring state the service of notifying them when vessels laden with liquor cleared from Canada for points in the United States; that these vessels have been cleared from Canada in a perfectly legal manner for the last few years; that Canadian officers had promptly, and in some cases twice for the same vessel, notified the official at the United States point to which the vessel was going of the name of the vessel, the name of the officer in charge, and the nature of the cargo; that these vessels left Canadian ports, Bridgeburg, Windsor and other points in broad daylight; that they proceeded across the river, and that the actual unloading of the cases of liquor themselves could be seen from the Canadian side, and yet in the work of unloading they were unmolested and not interfered with by the American officers, although in every case the American officers had been advised of the departure or prospective departure of the vessels, in some cases only two hours prior to sailing. Further, it has been declared that with very few exceptions these boats are American-owned boats, the names of which are well known to the officials on the American side, and that finally, little or no notice is taken of this courtesy on the part of Canada in the discharge of her duties under the treaty. The minister further tells us that the American government had requested that the notification in regard to the Windsor-Detroit traffic should be discontinued.

Mr. EULER: They requested that the notification sent daily by telephone should be sent weekly, and not by telephone.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, that the practice of notifying them by telephone, as was the understanding, should be discontinued and that notification should be sent weekly instead of every day. These statements, coming as they do from a minister of the crown in the House of Commons, and from a minister of the crown noted for the coolness and deliberateness of his utterances, present to this parliament a situation which I think warrants our attention. I make this suggestion to the Prime Minister—I have not had time to consult either with my leader or with those around me, and I am therefore discussing this matter on my own responsibility, simply as a member of the house—I suggest to the Prime Minister that a treaty such as that which we have made genuine efforts to observe, the United States authorities apparently taking no notice of these efforts on our part, might very well be dispensed with and abrogated. It seems to me that the treaty is a farce. I must say that the picture drawn by the minister presents a situation which if I can judge of the temper of the people south of the line will cause them a good deal of anxiety and will perturb the mind at least of the government there for some time to come.

There are two or three things that I should like very greatly to discuss. On one of them the minister touched lightly, but I think he will not disagree with me when I say that it is clear that the practice of certain persons, largely American citizens, from what the minister tells us, in continually violating the American laws is building up a spirit of lawlessness which is reflected not only in the smuggling of liquor but in much more violent ways. I think it is known the world over, it is certainly known all over this continent, that in Detroit and Chicago and other American cities the violent crimes directly attributable to this traffic are nothing short of appalling. I recall reading only a few weeks ago an address by the president of the United States to the press association of the United States, pointing to the number of murders committed in one of the great American cities, the number of convictions, and the number of apprehensions due largely, but not wholly, of course, to this traffic. I have not the statement with me, but it seemed to me unbelievable. That feature, I think, warrants the attention of the government of this country as well as that of the United States. We cannot lightly brush it aside on the ground that some of us may be in favour of a prohibitory measure and some of us opposed to it. That is not the ground from which that class of criminality can be viewed, and anything that contributes to such a situation merits the closest scrutiny of parliament itself.

What is lying at the bottom of all this? At the bottom of it all is the profit that is in it. There is one aspect of the matter which I should like to present to the house and to the government. Last year, according to returns which I have received, the Dominion of Canada collected from the distillers in this country, by way of excise duty the sum of $12,400,000. Of that amount, $7,800,000 was duty paid on spirits exported to the United States, and $4,600,000 on domestic spirits, or spirits consumed in Canada. I pause to impress upon the attention of the house the significance of those figures. Under the Excise Act as I read it there are only two ways in which the release of spirits may be treated; one is for domestic consumption, where an excise duty of $9 a gallon is imposed, and the other is for export, where this $9 excise duty is refunded. But in recent years, owing to the development of this illicit traffic to the United States—illicit only so far as entry to the United States is concerned—we have introduced a third class of duty, namely, the collection of the regular home consumption excise duty of $9 a gallon on such liquor as is exported to the United States. I submit that in my opinion that excise duty ought not to be collected. I put it upon this basis: After all, the minister was perfectly correct in his statement that this is a legal business in Canada. I made the statement three years ago, and again last year, that just so long as the manufacture and sale of liquor is legalized in Canada, just so long are those in the business entitled to fair and equitable treatment by the administrative authorities of this country, dominion and provincial. I conceive that neither this nor any other government has the right to single out this particular business and say: We will impose a tax upon you in respect of all the liquor exported to the United States, but we shall not impose it upon liquor exported to Cuba, Porto Rico, China, Japan, England, and so forth. A very considerable quantity of liquor is exported to other countries. I have not the figures before me, but speaking from memory, last year the total export was some 1,800,000 gallons, whereas the export to the United States was 1,100,000 gallons—in round figures showing about one third was exported to other countries.

That trade paid no excise tax—it was fully refunded; but the 1,000,000 gallons going to the United States were taxed. To the extent that we collect that revenue and allow the fact of the $7,000,000 from that source to influence the mind of parliament, we are partners in this export business to the United States. I think we might as well frankly face that situation. I know there is a school of thought in Canada which argues that if we can make a dollar out of the export of liquor to the United States—well, let the Yankee pay it. I remember that one of the witnesses who appeared before the customs committee, a man by the name of Cooper, made an immense fortune out of this business. By the way, it was recommended that he should be sued for some $900,000, but I do not know whether the case was proceeded with or not. He made the statement that it was a splendid thing for Canada to get "the good American dollar," as he put it. I submit it is not in the interests of Canada's self respect that for the sake of a revenue of $7,000,000 we should actually become partners in the business of export of liquor to the United States.

Mr. EULER: I do not like to interrupt, but may I ask a question?

Mr. STEVENS: My forty minutes are just as short as the minister's.

Mr. EULER: I merely wish to ask this question. The hon. member suggests that we should not collect excise tax on liquors exported to the United States. Does he mean that the liquor should be allowed to be exported without paying the tax?

Mr. STEVENS: I did not put it quite that way.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: I submit that this is not a laughing matter.

Mr. EULER: My question is quite serious.

Mr. STEVENS: I will try to express myself clearly to the minister. I do not think this is a matter that should be treated lightly. I want to say to the Prime Minister and his government that I am not approaching the question in any captious spirit, nor do I intend to do so during these remarks. I repeat, under the statutes as I read them, the practice—leaving out of the question for the moment the export to the United States—in years gone by was to treat the taxing of liquor on two bases, one, that Canadian-made liquor exported was not taxed, that is, the excise tax was not imposed; two, that on liquor manufactured in Canada for consumption in Canada an excise tax was imposed of $9 a gallon. But there has now grown up a third basis, namely the imposition of an excise duty of $9 a gallon on liquor exported to the United States. To put it a little differently, the exact form of that tax is this: the excise duty of $9 a gallon is paid on all this liquor, and it is refunded where the liquor is exported to foreign countries, except to the United States. I submit that that in a sense makes us a partner in this business of trafficking in intoxicating liquor to the United States—indirectly, not directly. I submit further that that is not conducive to the dignity of this country.

When I was interrupted I was proceeding to say that at the bottom of this business is the money that is in it. Let me give to the house the profit which accrues to those engaged in it. The minister will correct me if I am wrong in my figures; I think I am not. Whiskey constitutes the great bulk of the liquor traffic. Each case of whiskey contains 12 bottles or 2 gallons. The excise tax is $9 a gallon or $18 a case. That is, the Dominion of Canada takes $18 a case in the form of excise tax. If the goods are sold in Canada by some province there is a wide margin of profit. I will give the figures for my own province as they used to be; I think they still apply. They have a profit of $20 a case. That makes the cost $38 a case. According to the returns of the Department of Trade and Commerce, whiskey costs to produce $2.65 a gallon, or about $5.50 a case. On an article worth about $5 or $6 the Dominion tax and the profit of the province represent about $38. In the case of imported liquor it is $40. If the bootlegger or smuggler bringing in liquor from outside can sell without the province knowing it he has a margin of $20 a case upon which to work; if he can evade the excise duties or customs duties, he has another $20, that is, a margin of $40 a case. The point I make is that the monetary inducement to violate the law is simply terrific. Last year I suggested, and I suggest again now, that it would be good business on the part of the parliament of Canada if we made a very drastic revision in the import duties and the excise duties and so take away a substantial portion of this attractive profit offered to the illicit dealer in liquor. Secondly—and perhaps this is not my business, but I will mention it—if the provinces under the government sales system would merely add a profit that would take care of the cost of the distribution of the liquor

with a margin of safety, it would largely do away with the inducement to deal illicitly in liquor in this country.

Now I come to the suggestion of the minister that there would be no advantage in refusing clearances. In one sense I agree with the minister that perhaps there would be no advantage. But I should like to submit this to him. If we lowered our excise and also our customs duty we would of course lose a certain amount of revenue, but I am again pointing out that if you are going into this business for the revenue that is in it, then you must take the consequences of the persistent evasion of the law, whether in Canada or outside of Canada. But I assume that we are not in the business for the purpose of making money. It is a legal business and we want those in it to make reasonable profits and to act legally. Assuming that is the basis upon which we are to deal with it, then I say the minister can very well refuse clearances and not experience the result that he suggests, namely, that an underground system would be worked out. The only reason for an underground method being developed would be the excessive profits in the business. No men will go into this business and risk their lives, as they do daily and hourly—many of them, I think far more than we have any idea of, losing their lives—they will not go into the business except for the exorbitant profits in it. I am not going to take the minister to task on his suggestion that to refuse clearance would simply develop an underground and illicit trade, but I do wish to suggest to him that at the present time we are actually facilitating the business. Let me put it to the minister this way. Had we not charged the distillers of Canada $9 a gallon and then given them in return for that $9 of revenue a free right of way to the export docks, and every possible official facility to get their liquor out of the country —had we not done that, or, to state the case differently, if we surrendered the $9 a gallon, we should not have to give that service. What we are actually doing is giving them that facility, that protection, and collecting $9 for it. In the first place I contend that the minister ought not to collect the $9 a gallon; they ought to be given the right to export, as they export to Cuba or China, or any other country. That is my first point. My second point is that it is not the business of the government to facilitate the moving of liquor to the boundary line for export. That is the business of the dealer in liquor.

Mr. EULER: We don't do that.

Mr. STEVENS: You do in this way: I understand that under the provincial law they would not be permitted to do it—under this very law which the minister passed last year giving the provinces control. The minister issues a form of permit—X-13 or whatever it is—which accompanies the liquor out. I submit that there is a facility in the movement in liquor resulting from the collection of the $9 a gallon, which I contend is illegally collected; and I venture this statement, that if the distilleries took their case to the courts, and the government gave them a fiat, they could recover the money they have paid in under that practice, provided they could show that the liquor was exported. And the minister knows that it is exported because he would not give them the permit otherwise.

In a return I have here it is shown that we collect $7,800,000 on liquor exported to the United States, which I take it is at the rate of $9 a gallon. It is indicated as from the licensed distilleries of Canada and as Canadian export. We get $7,800,000. But in the trade and commerce returns I find that up to the end of February, for the same year, we exported to the United States 1,103,000 gallons which, at $9 a gallon, would be roughly $9,930,000. And that does not include miscellaneous liquors; that is whiskey alone. Now if we exported that quantity, according to these returns, how is it that we collected only $7,800,000?

Mr. EULER: I might have explained that but I was told not to interrupt the hon. member.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not tell my hon. friend not to interrupt me; I merely suggested what he himself suggested to me, namely, that forty minutes was rather short.

Mr. EULER: This is a possible explanation—that the $7,800,000 which we collected for liquor exported was for liquor that went directly from the distilleries. But there is no doubt that a good deal exported is sold by the commissions and does not pay the excise duty.

Mr. STEVENS: It would not account for the difference—

Mr. EULER: It might.

Mr. STEVENS: —because the total amount collected was only $12,000,000, for domestic consumption and export; and if we collected on the 1,103,000 gallons which, according to this return, we exported to the United States, we should have collected $9,930,000.

Mr. EULER: Is there any reason for assuming that the Department of National Revenue's figures are incorrect rather than those of the Department of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. STEVENS: No, but I am suggesting to the minister the responsibility of explaining this discrepancy amounting to some $2,100,000. Let the minister understand me; I am not making any statement charging him or his officials with anything wrong. But there is an obvious and a serious discrepancy that should be explained. Another point that struck me as extraordinary was this: There was produced in Canada last year some 9,000,000 gallons of whiskey. It is known that we are releasing this liquor, not under the old law of the two-year period, but within the two-year period. Under certain new processes it is sometimes released after nine months and sometimes after a year and a half. So that there seems to be a discrepancy between home consumption, export and production. I think these figures should be carefully checked up. I am not particularly asking for an explanation, but I submit the problem to the minister as one that merits very careful checking up.

There is another point I wish to bring to the attention of the house, and in this respect I must say I find myself at sharp cleavage with the minister. In 1926 there were fifteen distilleries in Canada, and in 1929, according to this return, there are twenty-five. I take the ground—I have taken it before and I still hold it—that we ought to keep down the number of distilleries in this country.

Mr. EULER: We are doing so now.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, there is an increase from fifteen to twenty-five in less than three years.

Mr. EULER: But the sale of liquor has been made legal in Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not criticizing that. But I think that the increase in the number of distilleries and, furthermore, in the distribution of the stock, which is a private matter throughout the country, is tending to increase the country's national interest in the business. Now I have no brief for anyone in any attempt to combat the use of intoxicating liquors on the part of those people who so choose; that is not my purpose at the moment. I am not challenging anyone's right in this matter. But I do say that it is not desirable for the people of Canada to increase the facilities for the handling of liquor and for the production of it. And we are doing both of these things, largely from the inducement of revenue.

Mr. EULER: I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend, but I might answer him in this way. In the first place the minister did not think that any monopoly should be created in the business; and secondly—I do not think my hon. friend was present when I made the statement—I pointed out that for a year at least no licenses have been issued except with the consent of the provincial authorities.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think the minister should advance that as a reason. After all the responsibility for granting licenses rests with the Minister of National Revenue, and with him alone. Let me give the minister a case parallel to all this. In years gone by—about 1922-23-24—there were a large number of licenses or permits issued for export houses, which the minister himself now tells us he is bending every effort to exterminate. And when we challenged that in the house we were told that every license was granted on the advice and with the consent of the attorney general of the province where the export warehouse was to be established. Now it will not do for parliament to hide behind the gown of the attorney general of a province; that excuse is without any validity or value. The point I make is that there is a substantial increase in the number of distilleries in Canada. The minister says he does not want to create a monopoly, but I would infinitely rather have seen the distilling business remain where it was ten years ago, in the hands of a few outstanding and reputable firms, than distributed over this long list of some twenty-five distilleries in Canada. I see that in my own city there are four where there used to be one—that is, in the neighbourhood of my city. I am very serious on that; I think it is bad policy for Canada to increase the number of distilleries throughout the country. Then there are the breweries; I have not the list under my hand but I know there has been a large increase in the number of breweries as well. The minister says he does not want to create a monopoly, but we have virtually a monopoly in this case, with the provinces controlling the sale of liquor as a provincial right and the federal government controlling it by the heavy excise duty. As I said before, we are partners in the business to the extent of the revenue we are receiving, so there is virtually a monopoly. However, there is a tendency to let others into this very choice monopoly; it is a very valuable concession to anyone, and it is against that I am now raising my voice.

It is not my intention to prolong the discussion; I repeat that in his excellent address the minister has given the house a picture in regard to the liquor treaty betwen Canada and the United tSates which is nothing short of appalling. I repeat to the Prime Minister

and the government now that a treaty which is held so lightly by one party and which, according to the minister, we have bent every effort to observe, is scarcely worth keeping. So I would suggest that the time has come when we might properly advise the United States that the treaty should be abrogated.

Mr. J. F. POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words to add to this discussion. First let me sincerely congratulate the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) on his very interesting speech, which was delivered, as always, with great clearness. He has his own views, on the matter, with which we may all agree to some extent, but there are also other important features to be considered.

Listening to the remarks which were made this afternoon one might think that all the crimes perpetuated in Chicago are due to the importation of Canadian liquor into the United States, but I think this is a great exaggeration. At the root of the liquor trade is not only the profit but also the pleasure which some people derive from drinking liquor. This has been elementary since the days of Noah; it is quite an old principle, and it is well known that even in the United States liquor is sold on doctor's prescription. However, they take such great care to prevent the smuggling of liquor into that country that even diplomats must drive their own cars when they contain embassy liquor, and I do not mean Embassy Scotch. I have in my hand an article which appeared in the New York Times and which is as follows:

Diplomat Drives Car With Embassy Liquor. By This Means Load Is Enabled To Pass Safely In Streets Of Washington.

Washington, March 13: The truck was accompanied by a member of the diplomatic corps, who personally took over the steering wheel and drove the truck into the city. In one case an attache of an embassy was following a truck in his private automobile, but this was not thought sufficient to give the truck immunity from seizure for carrying liquors. These warnings were given by the police before the passage of the Jones law, imposing more severe penalties for dry law violators.

This is very severe. I also remember having read in the papers that Lady Heath, I think, came from Great Britain with a bottle of champagne to christen a ship in the United States, and the bottle was seized. I have another clipping from the New York Times which contains the picture of an aviator and his wife, with these words underneath:

The Volstead Act Lays a Hand Upon Science: Captain William Lancaster, a British aviator, holding the compass which was brought from England by Mrs. Lancaster and held up at the customs because it contained four ounces of pure alcohol. It was later passed.

Then I have an article which appeared in the Ottawa Journal of March 20:

Until Death Do Us Part

Years ago Macaulay spoke of the United States as being "all sail and no anchor." Reading the American press these days, with their tales of machine guns in the streets of Chicago, of 10,000 stills discovered in "dry" Pennsylvania, of thousands of undetected murderers, of bandits and crooked bosses, of bootleggers and hi-jackers, of domestic scandals and civic graft, one thinks of Macaulay's phrase.

Further in this article I find this paragraph:

Dudley G. Newcomb had a "love for liquor," said his wife. The judge thought he detected an odour at the hearing. Wherefore the court ruled $75 a month alimony to Mrs. Newcomb, Mr. Newcomb going to jail for contempt because of his aromatic breath.

This happened under American law; and I am not through with it yet. There is not only the comical side of it, which lies in the exaggeration of these people who think that when they have uttered the word "law" they have done everything; there is more. I have another clipping from the Ottawa Journal referring to a despatch under date of December 31. It is a very sad case and will show how stupidly the law is enforced in the United States:

A Legal Monstrosity

A court clothed with the power, and representing the authority and majesty, of a great state of the neighbouring republic closed its record for the year 1928 with an act which for its revelation of the state of mind and folly that bigotry upon a public question can produce, should not go unheeded. What happened is told as follows in a despatch that appears in the New York Times:

"Lansing, Michigan, December 31: Mrs. Etta Miller, mother of ten children and grandmother of two, and the first woman convicted as a fourth offender under the new criminal code, was sentenced to life imprisonment in the Detroit House of Correction this afternoon, immediately after a jury, which had deliberated twenty minutes, returned a verdict of guilty. Her fourth offence was the sale of two pints of liquor."

When one thinks of the thousands of murderers scot free in the United States, of the gunmen and "racketeers" who ply their trade in Chicago and New York, of the clemency that has been extended to capital offenders and the light sentences imposed upon others, one wonders what is becoming of some of the people who are in authority across the line. To their strange mentality apparently the sale of a pint of whiskey is a more terrible offence than the murderous use of a gun.

The saddest case of all happened in Illinois last March, and in that connection I have a

clipping from the Washington Times under date of March 27. This article refers to a woman who had a gallon of wine, not spirits, in her house. She was killed by the dry officers and the case aroused intense indignation throughout our neighbouring country It only shows the stupidity of these so-called dry officers, and I do not think I am exaggerating when I use that word; I should like to find a stronger one to qualify it as it deserves. This issue of the Washington Herald contains the following headline:

Dry Slayer Blames Law

Mr. GOTT: Put it on Hansard.

Mr. POULIOT: This appears upon the first page of the Washington Herald.

Mr. GOTT: What year?

Mr. POULIOT: This year. The headline and article continue:

Aimed Shot At Woman In Defense, Agent Says. Prohibition Makes More Trouble Than Good, Is Lament of Illinois Rum Raider.

Aurora, Ill., March 27 (I.N.S.)—"I wish there was never such a thing as prohibition. It has made a thousand times more trouble than it has done good." This was the first declaration made in a hospital here to-day by Deputy Sheriff Roy Smith, who killed Mrs. Lillian De King in a dry raid here and assisted in clubbing her husband into insensibility.

This act was committed by a man who had absolutely no judgment but who was authorized to enforce a stupid law. Upon this same page appears the picture of a dry congressman, and beside the picture appears the following:

Dry Legislator Brings In Rum. Representative Morgan Lands In New York From Panama With Four Bottles.

This was afterwards denied, but as the hon. gentleman in question is not a member of this house we are not bound to take his word.

In relation to a question of this kind there are many views. Some believe in moderation, others in abstention—

An hon. MEMBER: Which is the worst?

Mr. POULIOT: I do not say it is the worst, because I believe that sometimes the people are sincere. Some people abstain because they cannot drink any more; others abstain because they have never tasted alcoholic beverages, and still others abstain because they dislike them. I respect the opinions of others, but it is very difficult for one who is not a doctor or who has not had any experience with the good or bad qualities of liquor to say, "This is bad for everyone." It might be good for the man next door, and it is not right to say that it is bad for every man or every woman.

An hon. MEMBER: Was that a lady doctor?

Mr. POULIOT: A lady doctor, yes. One should show a little tolerance in these matters. I find as I grow older that tolerance is not a bad thing. We must accept the other man's point of view. Liquor will not be abolished because a man or a woman is a teetotaller; that would be Utopia. There will be liquor so long as grapes are grown, and when people are careless enough to lose themselves in the lord's vineyard, so much the worse for them. But when that does happen it is not to be expected that they will be followed by everyone, because the majority of the people are in favour of moderation.

They have plenty of liquor in the United States. A friend of mine, born in Canada but living with his mother in New York or some other big city to the south of the line, told me last Sunday that on one occasion his mother had wanted a little whiskey and he said he would be able to obtain some for her without having to go more than a block away. She did not believe that one could obtain liquor in that city, but he told me that he knew of four or five "blind pigs" within the block, and he was able to get it without any trouble.

Mr. GOTT: Did he get a chaser?

Mr. POULIOT: He went to one of those "blind pigs" and obtained a bottle of liquor, to his mother's great surprise.

Mr. GOTT: Or joy?

Mr. POULIOT: Who can say that that liquor came from the country of my hon. friend? No one can say that.

Mr. GOTT: It might have come from Temiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT: We do not carry on that business there. It was probably moonshine whiskey manufactured in the United States. Anyone who reads the American papers knows that there is plenty of moonshine whiskey manufactured in that country. They even work during the sunshine—

Mr. GOTT: Make moonshine by sunshine.

Mr. POULIOT: As the hon. member appears to know so much about this matter I will take his word for it. It is a mistake

to say that all the liquor consumed in the United States comes from Canada. It is a gross exaggeration, and only creates a bad opinion of our country. It would be better for our tourist trade to have the American people who are fond of our liquor feel that they had better come here to drink it on the spot.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre suggested a reduction of the excise and import duties on alcoholic liquor. If a reduction is to be made, it should be made in the excise duty. As I have already said in the house, I think it would be proper to give our own people a chance to produce liquor in this country instead of importing it from other countries. Just in conclusion I will take the liberty of asking those who are discussing these matters, although they are free to say what they like, to be very moderate in giving an expression of opinion as to whether the whiskey and other liquor supplies of the United States come from Canada.

Mr. B. W. FANSHER (East Lambton): Mr. Speaker, one would think from the discussion that has taken place thus far that the request that clearances should not be granted to liquor cargoes going to the United States was made in the first instance by the delegation which visited Ottawa in January of this year. It is well, perhaps, that the United States delegation brought to our attention some of the recommendations that were made in the session of 1926 when the customs scandals were under investigation. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) this evening reminded us that the Ontario Liquor Control Board had requested one or two years ago that restrictions be tightened up at Windsor. The fact was that conditions became so intolerable in that district that the Border Cities Star, a very influential paper of Windsor, through a series of editorials complained of the conditions existing there. The Ontario government was forced to take action and it reminded the federal government of the recommendation of the royal commission and also of the committee that sat in this house in 1926 in connection with the smuggling situation. The recommendation was that the number of export docks should be reduced, and it was favourably considered by the Ontario Liquor Control Board and by the federal government. We are informed to-night that the number was reduced from about fifty to ten.

I wish to approach this question not from the viewpoint of the request of the United States delegation but entirely from our own viewpoint and our own concern. In the session of 1926, when it was suggested that clearances should not be granted to cargoes of liquor bound for the United States, there was no thought that we were assisting the United States in enforcing their laws. The idea was that it was for our own good, for the benefit of this country and for that alone, that such a reform should be undertaken. It seems to me rather a superficial view to take of the situation to say that we should go rather slowly in assisting another nation to enforce their prohibtion laws when it is remembered that this question was under consideration for nearly a whole session in this parliament. A committee of this house brought in a report recommending that clearances be refused, and that report was adopted by the parliament of the day with all parties assenting thereto and not a dissenting voice in the whole house. The Prime Minister and the government of the day agreed that such should be done. The opposition, under a different leader from the hon. member occupying that position to-day, agreed that clearances should not be granted. The Progressive group in this part of the house were very anxious and insistent that all reforms along this line should be undertaken. As I say, the report of the committee was approved unanimously. Shortly after that the whole question was thrown into the arena of a Dominion election. Definite assurances were given that the necessary measures would be taken to clear up the situation. The Prime Minister gave a pledge to that effect and a royal commission was appointed which spent many months in investigating the whole liquor business and smuggling in general, although I may say that most of the smuggling was found to be in connection with liquor. The report of the commission revealed an appalling situation. The liquor trade seemed to recognize no law whatsoever: they would not, in many instances, pay excise tax or make income tax or sales tax returns. I believe that more than $4,000,000 have since been collected in back taxes from liquor firms.

The report of that royal commission was tabled only a short time ago, after a general election, before a new parliament, before a house whose personnel had largely changed, with many new members, and with a new leader of the opposition. That report recommended that the export of liquor be prohibited; that clearances be not granted. That report again was endorsed by every member of the house, by the government, by the opposition and by the party in this corner. There was not a dissenting voice. Why then should we hie away to the United States for an excuse to evade what at that time we

deemed to be our responsibility in connection with this matter? I want to say at this juncture that a large section of the people of this Dominion has not lost sight of the promises made at that time, of the reports given to the house, and of the way in which they were received. Many of those people are very sincere when they petition the house at this session to have that recommendation enacted into law. The house has received petitions not only from temperance organizations but from women's institutes, township councils and various other organizations of a secular nature urging that the government carry out what both the committee and the royal commission recommended and what two parliaments adopted and agreed should be done. It is difficult for me to understand why this question should not now be considered from that viewpoint rather than from the viewpoint of assisting the United States in the enforcement of their law. The justice of the end sought I think demands that we should enact legislation which would refuse clearance to liquor cargoes going to the United States. Surely we are not interested in the trade to the extent that we are going to assist it by giving clearance to vessels landing contraband stuff in the country adjoining, but we should be interested, and I think we are interested as Canadian citizens in maintaining law and order in this country, and in maintaining the virility of our citizens.

I was astounded when I heard the Minister of National Revenue say that he was more interested in stopping smuggling into Canada than in prohibiting smuggling from Canada into the United States. I wondered by what process of reasoning he could figure out that he could curtail smuggling into this country when he says to the liquor exporters, citizens of this country perhaps only temporarily, but many of them citizens of this country for a good while: Pay me your $9 a gallon excise tax and you will get your clearance papers allowing you to land your cargoes in the United States. When he facilitates the entry of that liquor into United States, gives the smuggler clearance papers and facilitates him in his work, how can he expect the smuggler to respect his request not to smuggle goods back from the United States into Canada? It seems to me that he cannot expect our citizens to respect the laws of this country so long as our government does not respect the laws of the adjoining country.

It has often been brought to my mind very forcibly that the export liquor traffic, especially in the southwestern peninsula of Ontario, which the trade calls the bottle-neck of the trade—and the bottle-neck it really is, because most of the liquor gravitates into that peninsula and crosses over the border at Detroit—has a demoralizing effect upon the citizens of that district, so much so that, as I said before, the Border Cities Star thought it its duty to take a hand in the situation and represent the facts as they were with a view to having the border cities cleaned up. That in a measure was accomplished, but to my personal knowledge, from observation of the trucks that ply our highways day by day in large numbers laden with liquor for export across the Detroit river, and the certain knowledges of all our citizens that that trade is aided and abetted by the government in giving clearances to liquor laden vessels, it is not at all surprising that there has developed in the minds of the citizens in that district a somewhat lax idea of respect for law in general. It has been my observation that there have been more hold-ups on the highways, more bank robberies, more hold-ups of gas stations and the like in that territory within the last few years than there have ever been in the history of Ontario before. Only the other day we had a very unfortunate incident upon No. 2 highway down in that district, when an American citizen shot dead a Canadian citizen who attempted to hold up his car. Knowing, as I say, the state of affairs that exists there, the Detroit citizen was not going to take a chance on what might happen. Surely we owe it to ourselves and to our country to see that the morale of our people is kept at a high standard. Instead of condoning the export of liquor to the United States, the trade which is largely concentrated in that area close to the Detroit river having such a detrimental effect upon our citizens, I say that we owe it to ourselves to use every means in our power to try to stop that traffic.

I was somewhat concerned when the Minister of National Revenue gave us the information that when liquor is exported to any country which does not prohibit its importation the exporter is required to furnish a bond of twice the amount of the excise tax, but anyone who desires to export liquor to the United States is required to pay the excise tax in cash because it was not recognized by the department that he could land a cargo within that country. Then the minister made the observation that the excise tax having been paid and clearance granted it was no more of the department's concern or the concern of the government, but that the liquor was then in the same position as free goods, and could go anywhere. The minister, in other words, virtually gave us to understand that having received the money and issued clearance papers, he washes his hands of the

transaction and says: It is nothing to me; do what you will with this stuff. But is that really the case? I do not think it is. There is a situation developing between this country and the United States that will some day alarm us and we shall be forced to sit up and take notice; and it is developing in that southwestern peninsula of Ontario. We cannot go on indefinitely forcing our goods which are contraband within the United States upon that country without engendering their ill-will, and some morning we shall perhaps read in the newspapers that some act has been committed which we shall greatly deplore.

This government has considered the question. It has before it the report of the royal commission and the endorsation of two parliaments. Then why should there be any excuse offered at this time not to carry out the recommendations made by that royal commission and by the committee of the House of Commons? I say the least we can expect is that the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition should make a pronouncement upon this question. It seems this debate is going to end without the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition being concerned enough about the situation to make a pronouncement to the house. To my mind this is one of the most important questions that has come before the house this session, not only because of the investigation made in 1926 and the recommendation which followed it, but because it involves our honour in connection with a neighbouring nation.

Yesterday I listened very attentively to the remarks of the Prime Minister when he introduced the resolution dealing with the Geneva protocol. He stressed the fact that we had to rely on the good faith of the contracting parties. That was the fundamental bond of the whole treaty. Surely in connection with the request of the United States in this regard, good faith means a lot in cementing the international good will that has endured for so many years and that I hope will endure in the years to come. I urge upon the government not to let this matter pass without taking action, but to present to the house a solution for the problem by amending our law in the manner recommended by the royal commission which investigated the situation in 1926.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to minimize the importance of this subject. Indeed, in my judgment the control of the liquor traffic is one of the most important subjects that could engage our attention. Neither do I propose to minimize the difficulties that confront us in dealing with this particular phase of the liquor traffic. It may very well be that those difficulties peculiar to this phase of the traffic are not sufficiently appreciated in all quarters of the country. Indeed, we shall always have difficulties in dealing with the sale of intoxicating liquor so long as we permit its manufacture. It certainly would be an anomaly if, having granted the distilleries the right to manufacture, we began to interfere with the sale of their product. My own personal inclination would be to stop the whole business, and I hope the time may come when the country will see that that is the only way in which the liquor traffic can be handled.

An hon. MEMBER: It will be a long time.

Mr. BROWN: The millennium may be a long time in coming. But I am hopeful the time will come when the general sense of the people of Canada will be in favour of going about the eradication of the liquor traffic in a logical way, in such a way that we will not be confronted with these anomalies that arise from time to time.

We approach this particular question from two different standpoints. We have to approach it from the standpoint of our obligations to our friendly neighbours across the line. It has been urged upon us from some quarters that they have done all they can to control this traffic. and that if we would only do the little bit more necessary to complete their work, their problem would be solved. If that were demonstrated to be true, I should have no hesitation, nor do I think this parliament would have any hesitation, in undertaking to do that little bit more. Unfortunately, as I think has been shown this afternoon by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler), there is good reason to believe they have not taken all the steps that they might have taken, and when we are considering the question from the standpoint of our obligations to our neighbours we cannot altogether ignore that feature of the case. If they come to us with the assertion that they have done everything they can to stop this traffic, and demonstrate to us that that is the case, certainly we should not rest satisfied until we had done everything that lies in our power to help them to enforce their own law. Not that the obligation should be thrown upon us to enforce their law, but that we should lend them friendly assistance in that particular. The treaty was entered into with that object in view, and so far as its

terms are concerned, I do not think it can be shown that Canada has not faithfully lived up to them.

Personally I should be very happy to see us go further and enter into a new treaty, if we could help them and ourselves to eliminate this evil. It is true that we might pass a law forbidding the export of liquor, not dealing with it from the standpoint of simply refusing clearance papers, a procedure which might not be as effective as many people seem to think. But I say it is true we might deal with the matter by passing a law absolutely forbidding the export of liquor to the United States. Towards such a law I would be entirely sympathetic, but I would be compelled to concede that tremendous difficulties would confront us when we were called upon to enforce it, especially when we have distilleries situated within a gunshot of the American border.

Let me add what I intended to say at the outset. When I knew that the government had offered the United States every opportunity for their officers to come over to the Canadian side and get full information as to shipments of liquor destined for that country, I was hopeful that the Americans would accept that offer. It seemed to me, whether it would satisfy those who wished for the refusal of clearance papers or not, that such action might be taken as would have all the effect expected from the refusal of clearance papers without any of the consequent difficulties that might result. It is true the Americans have refused that offer. I cannot understand why. It rather confirms me in the thought that perhaps they have not been dealing with the matter entirely in good faith. I repeat, personally I should be willing and anxious to see Canada take all possible steps to cooperate with the United States in enforcing that law. But looking at the matter from our own standpoint, I must say that even if the Americans were negligent in the enforcement of their law, from the point of view of a great many people in Canada who feel that total prohibition is the only final solution of the liquor problem, we are anxious to see the law a success in the United States, and we should put no difficulties in the way of their enforcing it. Then, from our own standpoint, wishing to see their great social experiment a success, I should be still more anxious that we should do everything within our power to curtail the traffic in liquor across the line. On the other hand, it cannot be disputed that apart altogether from the question of short-circuiting liquor, which is after all only incidental, the whole wretched business must of necessity have a demoralizing effect upon our own people; and if through any action on the part of this government in dealing with this particular phase of the situation we could bring about better conditions, certainly I should be only too happy to support any efforts in that direction.

One feature of the situation has been referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) as a third method of dealing with the duties imposed upon this traffic. Undoubtedly it is a new practice that seems to have been necessitated by the peculiar circumstances of the case. The liquor is not intended to go into consumption in Canada, nor can it come under the export laws or regulations that apply to the export of liquor to countries where it may be legally imported. When the minister was speaking I was compelled to do some thinking on that phase of the situation and I may say frankly that, with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, I do not look with any degree of satisfaction on the fact that Canada is reaping a revenue from that particular branch of the traffic. I may say that in regard to the methods of handling liquor in so many provinces of Canada to-day, I look with a good deal of alarm on the fact that the revenue that is being received from the traffic is making the people just a little less antagonistic to it than they were before. I know we are confronted with this situation as we were in Manitoba—that we are to consider whether it would be better to take such revenue as comes from the traffic when it is sold at a high price, or to increase the sale by selling at a lower price. Therefore I cannot altogether agree with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre when he urges that we should not collect the excise on this liquor in this particular form inasmuch as it tends to increase the profits of the bootlegger. I cannot see it in that light. It seems to me that if the government refused to collect the revenue from the sale of the liquor it would enable the distiller to pass the liquor over to the other people that much cheaper; they would make just as much money selling it a little cheaper as they are doing to-day, and the possibility is that the consumption of that liquor would be vastly increased. I cannot look favorably on any resolution that would tend to increase the consumption of liquor. So that for my part at the present time I find myself on the horns of a dilemma, as to whether I should accept the situation, much as I dislike it, of receiving revenue from the sale of liquor, or in the alternative increase the sale of that liquor.. I can however agree with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre when he takes exception to the policy of increasing the number of distilleries.

Mr. EULER: But we are not doing that.

Mr. BROWN: I was merely taking the hon. gentleman's statement that the distilleries have increased in number in the last few years. However, if the statement is not correct—

Mr. STEVENS: It was correct.

Mr. EULER: It might have been correct a year ago, but that is not the case now.

Mr. BROWN: We may take it, then, that it is not the policy of the government to increase the number of distilleries. That attitude on the part of the government will certainly secure my endorsation, which will be given all the more heartily if in some measure they can manage to decrease the number.

The unfortunate thing to-day in the liquor situation in Canada is the fact which is also evident in the old country: So many people are acquiring a vested interest in the traffic that it is consolidating itself more than ever before. The financial interest in the traffic is becoming so widespread that the time seems more and more remote when we shall secure from the people of Canada a vote which will abolish the traffic from our midst. That is one feature of the present situation which I dislike—the fact that more and more citizens are securing a financial interest in the traffic. When that is the case we are not likely to take such steps towards its abolition as many people in this country would like to see taken.

Personally I have this to say in regard to the whole question. I know it is true of many people in this country that they want to see Canada do whatever can be done to help a friendly nation to carry out its laws. I do not altogether agree with what the minister said, that the people were not really concerned about our attitude towards a friendly nation, but were only expressing the views they held as prohibitionists. That is not altogether true, although there may be a measure of truth in it, because I feel that a great many of the honest and right-thinking people of Canada do consider it a reproach to the citizens of this country that we should be engaged in a traffic which is abhorrent to the wishes of our friendly neighbours.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, May 22, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 267, for the relief of William Edward King.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 283, respecting Central Finance Corporation.—Mr. Lang.

Bill No. 297, to amend the Penny Bank Act.—Mr. Robb.

Bill No. 299, for the relief of Edith Laura Hewitt.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 303, for the relief of Roland Emory Anderson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 304, for the relief of Olive Marion Gerrard.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 305, for the relief of John Beck.—Mr. Kaiser.

Bill No. 306, for the relief of Ruth Leonard Wiser.—Mr. Rowe.

Bill No. 307, for the relief of George King.—Mr. Bowen.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

MANITOBA NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BISSETT:

1. Is it the intention of the government to establish a national park in the province of Manitoba, as requested in a memorandum submitted to the Minister of the Interior on March 9, 1928, bearing the signatures of all the Manitoba members of the House of Commons?

2. What methods are adopted in determining the suitability of any given areas for national park purposes? Is there a set standard as regards physical characteristics of the area so chosen? If so, what is it?

3. Who made the examination of the proposed eastern Manitoba park site, and the proposed Riding mountain park site?

4. What portion of the whole area in the proposed eastern Manitoba park site was covered by Mr. R. W. Cautley of the Department of the Interior, on which his report dated February 11, 1929, is based, and on what evidence does he report: (a) that there is no uninterrupted waterway through this area; (b) that there are no trout or bass in this region; (c) that it is impossible to construct motor roads except at uneconomical and impractical costs in this area?

5. Has the government expressed its willingness to the government of Manitoba to establish a national park within the province of Manitoba? If so, when and what answer was received?

6. Has the government of Manitoba been asked to submit or approve of any given area for national park purposes? If so, what answer was received?

7. What mining claims have been staked and what other lands have been alienated in whole or in part in the proposed eastern Manitoba park site since the passing of an order in council on April 19, 1928, setting aside this area as a provisional reservation for park purposes?

8. What amount of money has been spent: (a) in connection with the Riding mountain forest reserve during the last three years; (b) in connection with the recreation ground established within that reserve and on whose recommendation were those expenditures made?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Under consideration.

2. When it appears that there is a responsible body of public opinion urging the establishment of an area as a national park, the department considers, first, whether the area is available for the purpose; secondly, whether the area is of national parks standard, i.e., that it is the best example available, typical of any region which is nationally interesting and valuable from a scenic, ecological, educational and recreational point of view. This is determined by inspection.

3. R. W. Cautley.

4. The portion north of the Canadian National railway. (a) The Whiteshell river is the only continuous waterway through this area and there are thirteen unavoidable portages in the 48 miles from its mouth to where it flows under the Canadian National railway embankment in a culvert; (b) On the evidence of his Indian guides, and local squatters; (c) Because of the generally rocky and difficult character of the country for highway construction from an engineering point of view.

5 and 6. The subject has been discussed tentatively with the province, but not finally.

7. None.

8. (a)

Fiscal Years	Total expenditure
1926-27	$ 23,807 31
1927-28	33,905 88
1928-29	47,086 33
	$104,799 52

(b) Project—Fiscal Year—Amount—Total Expenditure.

Clark Beach summer resort:

1926-27	$ 45 00
1927-28	169 95
1928-29	12 15
	$ 227 10

Clark Beach summer resort—cabin:

1923-24	$ 939 46
1924-25	79 31
1925-26	20 79
1926-27	12 30
1927-28	66 25
1928-29	121 23
	$1,239 34

Clark Beach summer resort—kitchen:

1928-29	$ 110 04

Clark Beach summer resort—toilets:

1923-24	75 00
1926-27	17 50
1927-28	38 43
1928-29	10 00
	$ 140 93

Clark Beach summer resort—grounds:

1926-27	$ 22 50
1927-28	13 75
1928-29	107 95
	$ 144 20

Clark Beach summer resort—fire places:

1926-27	$ 5 00

Clark Beach summer resort—auto road:

1917-18	$ 60 00
1922-23	334 95
1923-24	488 79
1924-25	188 47
1925-26	473 72
1926-27	47 89
1927-28	188 50
1928-29	876 18
	$2,658 50

Clark Beach summer resort—pier:

1928-29	$ 466 62

Clark Beach summer resort—wells:

1926-27	$ 58 13
1927-28	15 30
1928-29	38 40
	$ 111 83

North Shore summer resort—clearing streets:

1928-29	$ 500 00

Clark Beach summer resort—telephone:

1923-24	$ 163 57
Total	$5,767 13

These expenditures were made on the recommendation of departmental officers.

NATIONAL GALLERY

Mr. EDWARDS (South Waterloo):

1. By whom are the employees in the National Gallery appointed?
2. Is it necessary for applicants for vacant positions on the staff of the National Gallery to pass an examination set by the Civil Service Commission?
3. If so, is preference given to Canadians?
4. Have any appointments been made to the National Gallery staff within the past two years?
5. If so, what are the names of appointees, and if not Canadian born, how long were they resident in Canada before appointment was made?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Civil Service Commission.

2. Yes.

3. The Civil Service Act makes provision that "no person shall without the authority of the governor in council, be permitted to enter an examination unless he is a natural born or naturalized British subject and also has been a resident of Canada for at least three years."

4. One permanent appointment has been made during the past two years. Two temporary appointments for special service have been made. All appointments were on certificates issued by the Civil Service Commission.

5. Permanent: Miss E. P. Mountain, Canadian born.

Temporary: David H. Baker, Canadian born; Miss Kathleen M. Fenwick, not Canadian born.

Miss Fenwick came to Canada in January, 1928, at the request of the board of trustees of the National Gallery to perform work of a highly specialized and technical nature; opportunities for obtaining the requisite experience in which are not as great in Canada as in England or France.

FOX CREEK POST OFFICE

Mr. PRICE:

What amount of revenue has been received from the Fox Creek post office, county of Westmoreland, N.B., from the sale of stamps, money orders and other receipts for the year ending March 31, 1929?

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Veniot): Sale of:

Postage stamps, $142.28;
Money orders, nil (not a money order office);
Postal notes, $252.77.

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

Mr. FAFARD:

1. How many square miles have been photographed each year in the Dominion by means of aerial photography?
2. How many square miles have been photographed in each province?
3. How many square miles have been mapped out for each province?
4. What are the titles of these maps?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1.

1,965 square miles in 1923.
40,570 square miles in 1924.
49,170 square miles in 1925.
59,890 square miles in 1926.
45,850 square miles in 1927.
65,200 square miles in 1928.

2. The number of square miles photographed in each province since 1923 is as follows:

7,570 square miles in Nova Scotia.
1,345 square miles in New Brunswick.
24,245 square miles in Quebec.
71,445 square miles in Ontario.
82,485 square miles in Manitoba.
36,805 square miles in Saskatchewan.
33,735 square miles in Alberta.
5,015 square miles in British Columbia.

1,775 square miles were covered in 1921 and 1922 by experimental photography.

3.

	Areas for which maps are published.	Approximate areas being compiled.
Nova Scotia	320	1,700
New Brunswick ..	—	350
Quebec..	3,200	10,800
Ontario	42,500	6,000
Manitoba	44,000	16,000
Saskatchewan	3,500	16,400
Alberta	8,000	15,700
British Columbia .	—	1,600

4. The titles of these maps are as follows:

New Glasgow, map sheet No. 11 E/10, N.S.
Wolfville, map sheet No. 21 H/1, N.S.
Comeau Hill, map sheet No. 20 O/9, N.S.
Yarmouth, map sheet No. 20 O/16, N.S.
Shawinigan, map sheet No. 31 I/9, Que.
Sorel, map sheet No. 31 I/3, Que.
Rouyn lake, map sheet No. 32 D/S.E., Que.
Rouyn-Larder lake, map sheet No. 32 D/S.W., Ont.-Que.
Lac Seul, map sheet No. 52 K, Ont.
Trout lake, map sheet No. 52 N, Ont.
Lake St. Joseph, map sheet No. 52 O, Ont.
Armstrong, map sheet No. 52 I, Ont.

Sioux Lookout, map sheet No. 52 J, Ont.
Kenora, map sheet No. 52 E, Man.-Ont.
Pointe du Bois, map sheet No. 52 L, Man-Ont.
Carroll lake, map sheet No. 52 M, Man-Ont.
Island lake, map sheet No. 53 E, Man.
Oxford House, map sheet No. 53 L, Man.
The Pas, map sheet No. 63 F, Man.
Grand Rapids, map sheet No. 63 G, Man.
Cormorant lake, map sheet No. 63 K, Man.
Wekusko, map sheet No. 63 J, Man.
Kississing, map sheet No. 63 N, Man.
Berens River, map sheet No. 63 A, Man.
Norway House, map sheet No. 63 H, Man.
Battleford, sectional sheet No. 267, Sask.
Reindeer lake, special area, Sask.
Edmonton, sectional sheet No. 312, Alta.
Vermilion, sectional sheet No. 316, Alta.

Maps being compiled

Shelburne, map sheet No. 20 P/N.W., N.S.
Port Mouton, map sheet No. 20 P/N.E., N.S.
Loch Lomond, map sheet No. 21 H/5, N.B.
Beaupre, map sheet No. 21 M/S.E., Que.
Gatineau Forks, map sheet No. 31 O/S.W., Que.
Kempt lake, map sheet No. 31 O/S.E., Que.
Parent, map sheet No. 31 O/N.E., Que.
Buckingham, map sheet No. 31 G/N.W., Que.
La Tuque, map sheet No. 31 P/S.E., Que.
Lachute, map sheet No. 31 G/N.E., Que.
Grondines, map sheet No. 31 I/9, Que.
Dubuisson, map sheet No. 32 C/4, Que.
Abitibi, map sheet No. 32 D/N.W., Que.-Ont.
Muskoka, map sheet No. 31, E/S.W., Ont.
Parry Sound, map sheet No. 41 H/S.E., Ont.
Hudson, map sheet No. 52 K/S.E., Ont.
Sudbury, special area, Ont.
Dryden, map sheet No. 52 F, Ont.
Deer lake, map sheet No. 53 D, Ont.-Man.
Hecla, map sheet No. 62 P, Man.
Waterhen, map sheet No. 63 B, Man.
Cross lake, map sheet No. 63 I, Man.
Selkirk, map sheet No. 62 I, Man.
Pelican Narrows, map sheet No. 63 M, Sask.
Lac La Ronge, map sheet No. 73 P, Sask.
South end Reindeer lake, map sheet No. 64 D, Sask.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Prince Albert national park, special area, Sask.
Fort Assiniboine, sectional sheet No. 364, Alta.
Chipewyan, map sheet No. 74 L, Alta.
Peace Point, map sheet No. 84 P, Alta.
Claire lake, map sheet No. 84 I, Alta.
Sicamous, map sheet No. 82 L/N.W., B.C.
Fitzgerald, map sheet No. 74 M, Alta.

T. L. CORY—TRAVELLING EXPENSES

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton):

What travelling expenses have been drawn during the period from January 1, 1929, to date, by Mr. T. L. Cory, of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

$1,272.26 January 1 to March 31, 1929; $900 advanced in April and May, 1929.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

HALIFAX, N.S.—INSPECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Mr. POWER:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence and other documents referring to the promotion of Mr. Arthur Lovett to the position of inspector of customs at Halifax, in August, 1925.

PENITENTIARIES—RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. SPENCER (for Miss Macphail):

For a copy of the rules and regulations governing officers of the penitentiaries.

BRANTFORD PUBLIC BUILDINGS—EMPLOYEES

Mr. RYERSON:

For a copy of all letters, reports, rating sheets, decisions, memoranda and any other documents on the files of the Civil Service Commission, Department of Public Works, or any other department of the government, relating to the appointment of a heating engineer, grade 2, advertised March 20, 1928, and the appointment of an engineer caretaker in May, 1929, for public buildings, Brantford, Ontario.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE ACT

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RECEIVING APPLICATIONS

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved that the time for receiving applications for insurance under the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act be extended for one year from the 31st August, 1929.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE PROSECUTIONS —MR. HARRY BRONFMAN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I desire to answer a question which was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine). The Department of National Revenue transmitted to the Depart of Justice the findings of the Customs commission in a number of cases, and upon consideration of the same, proceedings were instituted by the Department of Justice, but in the case of Harry Bronfman the department reached the conclusion that while, as found by the commission, there might be a prima facie case on the facts, the crown was not in a position to make out a good case in law, and that opinion was expressed to the Department of National Revenue by the Deputy Minister of Justice.

NOVA SCOTIA COAT OF ARMS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I should like to reply to a question put to me yesterday by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Black) with reference to the return of correspondence laid before the House of Commons respecting the arms of Nova Scotia. The interpretation of the arms referred to in the Hon. Mr. Rhodes' letter of the 3rd instant, a copy of which was included in the return, was merely a coloured representation of the arms asked for by the province and a copy of such could not be supplied.

No correspondence has been exchanged with the premier or other officials of the province relative to this matter since the departmental despatch of the 15 instant.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): I should like to state, in the absence of the hon. senior member for Halifax, that in his request of yesterday he asked that a certain letter, which was mentioned in the correspondence brought down but which was omitted from the return, should be furnished to the house.

Mr. RINFRET: The reply I just made bears on that very point. Premier Rhodes uses the word "interpretation" of the gentleman named in his letter, but the word "interpretation" refers not to a letter but to a coloured drawing of the arms, and a copy of this cannot be supplied. If the hon. member wishes to see the drawing, of course he will be welcomed in the department.

Mr. CAHAN: I beg your pardon. I just remembered the request.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Kaiser) was desirous of knowing when the report would be forthcoming that he asked for some time during the latter part of last month regarding certain live stock diseases. This entails a great deal of work on the part of my staff and they have been busy on it ever since. I am afraid it will be still another eight or ten days before the information is fully compiled.

PENSION PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston City): Some time ago I asked the government if they would lay on the table order in council P.C. 8481, dated January 16, 1928, as referred to on page 223, volume 1, of the Auditor General's report. I have not yet received the order in council and I would like to know whether it will be brought down before the militia estimates are before us.

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): I will look into the matter and see if I can expedite the return.

INTEREST ON REFUNDS OF TAXES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. R. GEARY (South Toronto): Has the government under consideration the question of the payment of interest on refunds, such as excise tax, made by the government?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): A considerable lobby has been carried on for that purpose, but we have not yet seriously considered the matter.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill No. 278 to amend the Special War Revenue Act.

Mr. I. D. MACDOUGALL (Inverness): I wish to move in amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton (Mr. Macdonald):

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

"In the opinion of this house the application of the sales tax in respect of personal clothing and boots and shoes places a heavy and unnecessary burden upon the people of Canada and should be discontinued forthwith."

No extended argument is required to establish the merit and justice of the amendment which I have just submitted to the house. The sales tax was distinctly a war measure. When first adopted in 1919, it could be justified. At that time Canada was just emerging from the world war. For four years this country had given unstintingly of its man power and financial resources in that great struggle. The obligations arising out of the war were colossal in their nature. Under the circumstances, ordinary methods of raising revenue were not sufficient; extraordinary means had to be resorted to, and the sales tax was one such extraordinary method. But to-day the scene has changed; the circumstances are entirely different. The fiscal year under review records abounding revenues and the Minister of Finance was able to tell the house of a surplus of $69,000,000 in national bookkeeping. Eleven years have elapsed since the consummation of peace. To-day our land, and I use that word in its broad economic sense, our labour, our capital, the creative genius of our people, are all alike devoted to the pursuits of peace, and under these entirely different circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the sales tax, which was distinctly a war measure, now lingers superfluous on the stage of national finance and in my judgment should be completely abolished.

But in this amendment I do not ask for its complete abolition, and for this reason: When the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) presented his budget to parliament he told us that out of the $69,000,000 of surplus, some $40,000,000 would have to be earmarked to retire maturing obligations. The revenue derived from the sales tax during the last fiscal year totalled $71,000,000, and were I to move at this time for its complete abolition the Minister of Finance might well reply that complete abolition would interfere with plans that he had for the retirement of maturing obligations. I have consequently in my amendment limited the abolition of the sales tax to boots and shoes and clothing, a source from which only about $7,000,000 of revenue is derived, and derived from commodities which enter directly into the family budget of the poor people of this country. Whatever argument my hon. friend the Minister of Finance might make against complete abolition of the sales tax at this time, there is no semblance nor shadow of an excuse for not abolishing it in respect to the commodities which I have mentioned in my amendment—commodities which as I have said enter directly into the family budget of the poor people of this country.

In the matter of levying taxes and of remitting taxes every government must be guided by some canon of taxation, and what better canon could this or any other government adopt than the canon of human welfare? What more just than where taxes are levied the strongest backs should bear the heaviest burdens and those who are best able to pay should pay the most? In the matter of remitting taxation and giving relief to the taxpayers, what more equitable than that relief should be given first to those people in our country who most urgently need relief. Under the amendment which I have proposed the beneficiaries will be our farmers, our fishermen, our miners, our lumbermen, the artisans and common labourers of Canada. All I ask this house to do is to relieve those classes of our population of a burden of taxation amounting to some $7,000,000. All I ask this house to do is to join with me in attempting to reduce the cost of living of the masses and correspondingly increase their standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has presented to parliament a rich man's budget. It is my privilege to-day to move a poor man's amendment to a rich man's budget, and I move that amendment with the confident expectation that it will be given the sympathetic support of every hon. member of this house, irrespective of party, who wishes to bring a little more of comfort and happiness into the homes and a little more of cheer and encouragement into the hearts of the great masses of the people.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): The resolution before you, Mr. Speaker, is that the bill be now read a third time. That bill provides for a reduction of taxation amounting to over $20,000,000, and my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Macdougall) moves an amendment which I have not before me, but happily we have two years' notice of it because it is exactly the same amendment as moved by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in 1927, namely, that all the words after the word "that" be struck out and other words substituted.

Now if that means anything it means that the house will reject the reduction of taxation as presented in the budget of $22,000,000 and will not be declaring for a policy such as was presented in the amendment which was moved to the budget by my hon. friend from South Wellington, speaking for the opposition—a

policy of protection and the safeguarding of industry. When the budget was under discussion the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite all indicated, not a desire to help the poor man, not a desire to reduce taxation, but a desire to impose indirect taxation because every hon. gentleman opposite will admit that protection is in a measure indirect taxation. To-day we have the issue put straight before us. We have before us to-day an amendment which proposes to reduce direct taxation. The amendment goes still further. It proposes to wipe out altogether the reduction of $22,000,000 in taxation as provided for in the budget and declares for a policy which, after all, is a policy of direct taxation. It is interesting to consider just how the various elements in this house will regard the amendment. I can quite understand that my hon. friends opposite who seek to impose indirect taxation would support a policy of reducing direct taxation, but I cannot see how some parts of the country that favour a policy of direct taxation could support the amendment.

I admit at once that the sales tax is a direct tax. In that regard it is similar to the income tax, which everyone will admit is a direct tax. If anybody has any doubt as to who pays the sales tax as collected by the retail merchants, because in the last analysis it is the retail merchant who collects the sales tax, and if anybody has any doubt as to who pays the income tax, all they have to do is to consult the circulars that are being sent out at this time by the electric power and light companies in the province of Quebec, who say to their customers: If the government would only reduce the income tax, we should be able to reduce to you the cost of light and power. Now if the electric power and light companies in the province of Quebec are right in that contention—I am not going to discuss that for the moment—then I ask this house who pays the income tax which the government imposes upon corporations, great transportation companies, the big life and fire insurance companies and the banks of this country? And, remember, the larger portion of the income tax, which is a direct tax, comes from the corporations. So I submit that the policy of my hon. friends opposite is a policy of increasing indirect taxation, while making a gesture that they are in favour of reducing direct taxation. I said a moment ago that after all it is the consumer who pays this tax.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBB: I notice my hon. friend in the corner applauds that remark. Now, if we accept this amendment, what do we do? At once we declare that we are not in favour of the reductions in taxation, amounting to over $22,000,000, provided for in the budget.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh no.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, that is what it means.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It will take something more.

Mr. ROBB: But we go further. If hon. gentlemen are right in saying this would not be the effect of the amendment, then we impose upon the treasury the same obligation that was imposed upon it in 1920 when the luxury tax was wiped out. On that occasion certain automobile dealers throughout Canada contended that they had paid the tax and therefore it should be refunded to them. This parliament recognized the reasonableness of their contention and provided in the estimates for a refund, which totalled $1,699,464.

Mr. BENNETT: Does that include interest?

Mr. ROBB: Yes. My hon. friend who has moved this amendment claims that the amount involved will be $7,000,000. Now, I have before me a statement from the Retail Merchants' Association—I will quote it in a moment—claiming that a considerable part of the tax in the year referred to was paid in advance, I think about one third. It is reasonable to suppose that if they were right then they are right to-day, and that one third of the tax has already been paid. It has been assessed by the manufacturer on the wholesaler, and by him passed on to the retailer who has the goods on his shelves. He has paid this tax. If the amendment is carried, not only do we wipe out the budget provision for the reduction of $22,000,000 in taxation, but we also invite a further raid on the treasury for one third of the $7,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister permit me? If that argument is sound, does it not apply to the reduction in the sales tax that he has made this year and last year?

Mr. ROBB: No. I am glad my hon. friend has raised that issue, because it gives me the opportunity of bringing to the attention of the house what the people who collect this tax directly from the consumer think of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite and the policy of the government. In December of

1926 my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), speaking of the sales tax, used these words:

How are we going to get relief from this oppressive taxation? The method I propose is boldly to strike out and do away with the sales tax.

Apparently that speech was brought to the attention of the Retail Merchants Association of Canada. The secretary of the association directed to the Prime Minister this letter, dated December 15, 1926:

To the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Prime Minister and President of the Council.

Dear Sir,—We would call to your attention the following statement made by the Hon. Mr. Guthrie, leader of the opposition, in his reply to the address from the throne, delivered on Monday, December 13, 1926, and reported on page 25 of Hansard of that date as follows:

Then they quote the passage that I have just cited.

We cannot find any reply in your address to this statement, and as this is a matter which very vitally concerns every retail merchant in Canada, and more particularly the merchant than the manufacturer, we would like to refer to this statement.

The retail merchants ultimately pay the sales tax and not the manufacturer as the manufacturer simply hands the sales tax on to the merchants who are carrying the stock. The manufacturer does not pay the sales tax until the goods have been sold or invoiced to the purchaser.

If there was approximately $90,000,000 collected in sales tax last year, and the average turnover of the class of merchandise by the merchants on which the sales tax has been paid is four times a year, which we believe is very much higher than the average turnover would be found to be, as while groceries are turned from ten to twelve and even a greater number of times per year, clothing and wearing apparel, in most instances, are not turned in excess of three times and some of the other lines of merchandise even less, but even taking the turnover at a maximum of four times, the merchants must have merchandise in stock to-day on which they have paid a sales tax in advance to the government in excess of $22,500,000.

We do not believe that the government could do away with this amount of revenue in one year, and we are certain that the merchants in Canada could not afford to take this loss, most of the merchants still holding that the gradual reduction of the tax, as set out in the resolution, would be preferable to its total removal at one time.

The Retail Merchants Association of Canada.
Per N. B. Douglas, Secretary-Manager.

That is the point of view of the men in the trade who collect this tax for the government. I submit to my hon. friends that in presenting this amendment they are doing no kindness to the many retail merchants throughout the country who have already paid this sales tax in part on the goods on their shelves. Just as sure as we are in this chamber, if this amendment is adopted we will again have before us claims similar to those made by the automobile dealers.

I submit to hon. gentlemen that the policy of the government in gradually reducing both debt and taxation is a sound and sane policy. My hon. friends opposite have frequently referred to the position of the finances of the country. We are glad to have it acknowledged from all sides that Canada to-day is in a good financial condition. The mover of this amendment has said that the sales tax was a war measure. True, the war is over, but the war debt has not yet been paid; the country still has obligations to meet in this respect. We are gradually reducing those obligations. We say to parliament frankly, we are budgeting to take care of maturities as they come along. We propose to take care of those maturities from now until 1933. We are budgeting for that purpose, and I submit to hon. gentlemen, and especially to my hon. friends who are in favour of direct taxation, that the country will prefer the policy of the government in gradually reducing taxes to the resolution as presented by my hon. friend, which I am sure he does not expect to carry. All he wants to do is to be able to say that a hard hearted Minister of Finance refused to accept this proposed reduction of taxation. I submit to him that the orderly method of the government in reducing our debts and taxation is more acceptable to the country than the abrupt wiping out of a tax that will create embarrassment to the retail merchants throughout the country.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Macdougall), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),	Embury,
Arthurs,	Esling,
Barber,	Fraser,
Bell (Hamilton West),	Geary,
Bennett,	Guthrie,
Black (Yukon),	Harris,
Black (Halifax),	Kaiser,
Bowen,	MacDonald (Cape Breton South),
Boys,	Macdonald (Richmond-West Cape Breton),
Brady,	Macdougall,
Cahan,	MacLaren,
Cantley,	MacNutt,
Casselman,	McGibbon,
Chaplin,	McRae,
Charters,	Manion,
Cotnam,	Matthews,
Cowan,	Maybee,
Dickie,	Peck,
Edwards (Waterloo South),	Price,

Quinn,
Rennie,
Ross (Kingston City),
Rowe,
Ryerson,
Short,
Sinclair (Wellington North),
Smith (Cumberland),
Smoke,
Spence,
Spotton,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stinson,
Tummon,
Wilson.—54.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Allan,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Benoit,
Bettez,
Bird,
Bissett,
Blanchard,
Bock,
Bothwell,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Boulanger,
Bourassa,
Bourgeois,
Bradette,
Brown,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Cayley,
Chevrier,
Coote,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Dubuc,
Duff,
Dunning,
Dussault,
Elliott,
Euler,
Evans,
Fansher (Lambton East),
Ferland,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),
Forke,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Gervais,
Girouard,
Glen,
Goulet,
Hall,
Heaps,
Heenan,
Hepburn,
Howard,
Howden,
Ilsley,
Irvine,
Jacobs,
Jelliff,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Kay,
King (Kootenay East),
King, Mackenzie (Prince Albert),
Lacombe,
Lacroix,
Laflamme,
Langlois,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Letellier de St. Just,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
Macdonald (Glengarry),
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
McDiarmid,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMillan,
Malcolm,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Mercier (St. Henri),
Millar,
Milne,
Morin (Bagot),
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Neill,
Parent,
Perras,
Power,
Prévost,
Ralston,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robitaille,
St-Père,
Séguin,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Sylvestre,
Taylor,
Telford,
Tobin,
Totzke,
Verville,
Ward,
Young (Saskatoon),
Young (Weyburn).—111.

Main motion agreed to on the same division reversed, and bill read the third time.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Lanctôt,
Pouliot,
Boivin,
Rhéaume,
Jenkins,
Fontaine,
Veniot,
McPherson,
Gershaw,
Sanderson,
Hay,
Odette,
Thorson,
Bowman,
Dionne,
Lang,
Ross (Moose Jaw),
Baldwin,
Descoteaux,
Rutherford,
Morin (St. Hyacinthe),
Smith (Stormont),
Vallance,
Foster,
Edwards (Ottawa),
Gray,
Fafard,
Marcil,
McPhee,
Cahill,
Sinclair (Queens),
Raymond,
Blatchford,
Guérin,
White (Mount Royal),
Lennox,
Hocken,
Church,
Grimmer,
Anderson (Halton),
Hanson,
Ladner,
White (London),
Senn,
Hubbs,
Robinson,
Stirling,
Hodgins,
McGregor,
Young (Toronto),
Plunkett,
Johnstone,
Thompson,
Gott,
Ryckman,
Pettit,
Clark,
Jones,
Garland (Carleton),
Lawson,
McQuarrie,
Perley (Sir George),
Macdonald (Kings),
Simpson,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bell (St. Antoine),
Ernst,
Maloney.

Mr. JONES: I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Foster). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Morin). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I was paired with the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Fafard). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Rutherford). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): I was paired with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Edwards). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Ann (Mr. Guerin). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CLARK: I was paired with the hon. member for South Battleford (Mr. Vallance). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Descoteaux):. Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. PETTIT: I was paired with the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Smith). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: I was paired with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. LAWSON: I was paired with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Gray). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Bell). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CAHILL: I was paired with the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Simpson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. McPHEE: I was paired with the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Macdonald). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): I was paired with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Raymond). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MARCIL: I was paired with the hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. JENKINS: I was paired with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Grimmer). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. GERSHAW: I was paired with the hon. member for London (Mr. White). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION POLICY

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 21, consideration of the motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself again into committee of supply.

[Mr. Maloney.]

Mr. A. D. McRAE (Vancouver North): Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the country what I believe to be its greatest problem. I refer to immigration and colonization. In order to do this I will move an amendment to the motion to go into supply.

The ominous silence on this subject which has prevailed on the government side of the house this session—uninterrupted but for the speech of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Forke) in March last— indicates that the government has decided to permit the hon. minister to continue to muddle along. His speech breathed an atmosphere of satisfaction, which must be discouraging to those throughout the Dominion who have been endeavouring to goad the government into action. The minister in his speech, as reported in Hansard, said:

> Everything seems to point to the fact that things seem to be going fairly well with us.

Again he says:

> Perhaps we have about reached the point where we can absorb the stream of immigration now flowing in. That means that as the country develops and capital increases, there would be an increase in population and under normal circumstances we will be able to absorb more immigrants.

This statement, Mr. Speaker, means, if it means anything, that his government is content with the situation as it stands, and that no special effort will be made to improve the present unsatisfactory immigration.

What is this movement that so satisfies the minister? He says that for the last calendar year we received 166,782 immigrants, but I prefer to deal with the fiscal year as shown in the recent report of his department. These monthly reports do not check with the official annual reports of the department; invariably they leave too favorable an impression and are apparently issued to soothe the troubled feelings of those Canadians who are becoming impatient with the government's inaction in this matter. As a a matter of fact, taking our official immigration reports for a number of years, they do not hold out; ever since the inception of the department, they have been inaccurate and misleading. If we take the returns for the last 45 years, including the natural annual increase estimated at 2¼ per cent, we find we should now have in the country about seventeen million people. We are short seven millions at least.

Let us accept the minister's return for the last fiscal year as accurate. It shows an immigration of 151,597, or an increase of 7,606 over the previous fiscal year. Is such an infinitesimal increase satisfactory to the

country, even if correct? What are the facts? We find the annual report of the department since 1924 contains a new schedule, headed "Returned Canadians", not included in the immigration figures. Evidently this schedule is inserted by the government in an effort to minimize the effect of the serious movement of Canadians to the United States. In the year 1927 it shows 56,957 Canadians, who came back to Canada to live. In 1928 the number was reduced to 39,887, which, even if accurate, equals only about one-half the Canadians who left our Dominion for the United States last year. However, taking this new schedule for the past two years, there is a decrease of 17,070 last year as compared with the previous year. Deduct from this, the reported increase for last year, already referred to as 7,606, and there remains a net loss in our immigration last year, compared with the year before, of 9,464. This is a decline of 6 per cent and not an increase as we have been led to believe, and estimates of our immigration for 1929 by those who ought to know predict a further falling off this year of 25 per cent. A British report published in March states that after allowance was made for the harvesters who returned, British migration to Canada last year fell off about 6,000, and this is the result which the minister thinks is "doing fairly well."

The minister says that the immigration we received last year constituted a better record than for some of the preceding years, when we had over 400,000 annually. What do the records of his department show? In the five years in which immigration returns have been most discussed, that is 1910 to 1914 inclusive, when we reached the enormous total of over 400,000 in a single year, 38 per cent were from Britain, in our largest year, 1913, over 37 per cent came from the British Isles. Last year, with the immigration about one-third as large, only 34 per cent came from Britain. This, I submit, Mr. Speaker, does not justify the minister's conclusion.

The report for the past year refers to the establishment of the overseas medical examination, both in Great Britain and on the continent. Notwithstanding all the trouble and expense this has occasioned, it is worthy of note that of a total of 2,205 immigrants who were either deported after having been admitted, or were rejected on arrival at ocean ports, 1,256 were British. That is, while only 34 per cent of our immigration came from Great Britain, 57 per cent of our rejections were British. Such figures furnish their own interpretation. Our immigration is back where it was in the early years of the century, over a generation ago. With all our increased business as evidenced by our trade returns, and with a largely undeveloped country, capable of supporting comfortably at least a population of fifty millions, are Canadians to be content with the present stagnation?

The minister says capital and immigration are closely allied; this may be granted, but with our capital increasing by hundreds of millions, why has the increase of our population failed to keep pace with our financial development, as apparently the minister thinks it should? In his speech this year and also last year, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization complained of the criticism of his department; in referring to the discussions which occurred throughout the country on this question of immigration, he said:

> "The difficulty that I experience, however, is that there does not seem to be any unanimity in regard to this question."

In reply to the question of the late hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) as to what was his idea, the minister said:

> "I have not yet heard from the member for Frontenac any well-defined policy of immigration."

Well, Mr. Speaker, who is the responsible Minister of Immigration and Colonization? Certainly it was not the late member for Frontenac. Has the minister any definite plan? Of course he has not; his department is as barren of ideas as the sands of the Sahara are barren of farms.

The minister has a big staff, a deputy, an assistant deputy and four commissioners in Canada, and a director and an assistant in London. If all are accurately accounted for, it is said the staff of his department will total 1,000. I am reliably informed that 86 per cent of our colonists come to us through the solicitation of the various outside agencies at work. If so, then less than 15 per cent of those we receive are in any sense the result of the direct solicitation of our Department of Immigration and Colonization. We may well ask the minister what he is doing with this huge staff for which we vote on the average $3,250,000 a year. The opinion of these agencies which are struggling to work through and under the orders of his department can be summed up in the suggestion I heard from one of them a few days ago, that we should change the name of our Department of Immigration and Colonization to the department of interference and confusion.

There is little evidence that the other members of the government are concerning themselves with the minister's dilemma; the

right hon. Prime Minister himself does not appear to be much concerned. I think I might say, Mr. Speaker, he usually talks about the things that interest him, but he is very silent on this subject.

Last year, in response to the minister's request, I made bold to submit to this house a definite colonization program, but owing to an accident I was unable to appear before the select standing committee on agriculture and colonization. To-day, I am prepared to support that program in its entirety; I believe it is practical, conservative and not beyond the ability of Canadians to put into effect. It was a program for the whole of Canada; every province would benefit, more particularly in the west where the settlement of the vacant lands adjacent to our railways is so essential. My colleagues sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, will discuss the problem with reference to the settlement of their provinces.

I wish, however, to refer to-day to the potentialities and the development of the great Peace river district; that was the part of my proposal last year most vigorously criticized by the government. Having that criticism in mind I took occasion last fall to make my third trip to the Peace river country, this time far off the beaten trail. Peace River cannot be seen on a parliamentary pass; railways and motor cars afford facilities for a very limited view of this vast country. The Minister of Colonization was there last fall, on a bit of a joy ride with the Edmonton Board of Trade. I concur in his endorsement of that section of the country. I was requested by the settlers at Fort St. John to express to him their great disappointment that although he had spent the night on the flats, 1,100 feet below their great plain above, his time did not permit him to take a personal view of their magnificent country.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member knows the reason why.

Mr. McRAE: No, I do not; it is quite a walk.

Mr. FORKE: I would have had to walk.

Mr. McRAE: I walked 100 miles.

Mr. FORKE: You are a young fellow.

Mr. McRAE: I did not see the Peace River district that way. I spent over a month there, travelling by boat, pack horses and on foot about 1,500 miles, mostly in the districts away from settlement, in an endeavour to learn through first-hand information the extent and character of the country, the fertility of its soil, and its ability to support an agricultural population. During this time I interviewed between 250 and 300 merchants, traders, trappers, natives and old-timers who were supposed to know the country. By comparing the information they gave me on the country I had not seen, with their judgment of the country I had just passed through, I have arrived at what I believe to be reasonably sound conclusions. The district is so extensive that it would take years for an individual to cover it all.

On my return, to reinforce my conclusions, I spent some weeks reading the many reports of the district which are on record. I want to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the splendid assistance I received from the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) and especially from the Natural Resources branch in charge of Mr. Lynch. They went to no end of trouble to place at my disposal all the reports on file with the government. These reports present a romance which I believe cannot be equalled in the history of any other section of the Dominion.

It begins with the discovery by Alexander Mackenzie in 1789 of the great river which bears his name—a river which drains a larger area than the St. Lawrence with all its great lakes and tributaries. This statement should give hon. members some idea of the vastness of our great empire in the north. I have not the time to note all the great explorers who followed Mackenzie, but it is worth mentioning that history records Daniel William Harmon of the Northwest Company, who in 1808—over 120 years ago—reported the country as capable of growing wheat. He says he finished cutting his barley on July 21 that year.

Then we have Sir John Franklin, 1827, expressing great enthusiasm over the fertility of the district.

Sir George Simpson, in 1828, and Sir John Richardson in 1857 both said that wheat could be grown as far north as the 58th parallel of latitude, which is approximately Fort Vermilion.

Professor Macoun in 1878, spoke of the splendid wheat grown at Chipewyan, latitude 58·70. This was grown by the Roman Catholic mission, which in 1876 won first prize at the Centennial exposition at Philadelphia.

Coming along, we find the reports of Ogilvie in 1877-78, in which he says that the country is suitable for wheat and actually reports a yield of 41 bushels per acre. And again, in 1884 he estimates the land available for

agriculture as a district 600 miles long by 40 miles wide. Not a small vision for half a century ago.

Then we have the reports of the special senate committees, the first in 1888, the second and the most valuable of all, in 1907.

Time does not permit me to dwell on the dozens of reports which make up the history of this great district. Is it any wonder that the Peace River country now attracts so much attention? It attracted more attention one hundred years ago than the now settled sections of the prairie provinces. The present enthusiasm is no accident. It has been built up on the story of the achievements of a great race of explorers and hardy pioneers, extending over the last one hundred and forty years.

It fell to the lot of my old friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) who I notice is not in his seat, to throw doubt on my proposals of last session. I was somewhat surprised at the levity with which he approached the subject. However, as regards his witticisms, I think we on this side of the house are sometimes too harsh with him. After all, perhaps he agrees with Harry Lauder who says, "If you can even laugh at 70, you're lucky." I propose to take up in detail the points disputed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture last session. The agricultural section of the Peace River country extends from the foothills in British Columbia on the west four hundred miles to the Athabaska and Slave rivers on the east. The abruptness in the change from the alluvial deposit on the west side of the Athabaska and Slave rivers to the rock formation on the east side is a phenomenon as true as it is unusual.

Beginning at the 55th parallel of latitude, this plain extends far to the north. In my opinion the northern limit of successful wheat growing at present is about the 61st parallel of latitude. This gives us a distance north and south of four hundred miles. In suggesting the 61st parallel as a northern limit for successful wheat growing to-day, hon. members should keep in mind that Mr. Elihu Stewart when before the senate committee in 1907 reported wheat as being successfully grown at Fort Providence, which is at 61.25, and further, that he had seen it there in the milk on July 15th, fifty-six days after planting.

Henry A. Conroy in his evidence before the same committee says wheat was ripe at Fort Providence on August 1st.

Fort Liard, about the same latitude in British Columbia, has a milder climate. Here the Hudson's Bay Company records, as well as Macoun's reports, show wheat to have been successfully grown many years ago.

These conditions existed over 20 years ago. The improvement which has been made in the maturity of wheat in the interval has shortened the time not less than two weeks. This leaves no doubt of the successful growing of wheat as far north as 61 north latitude.

I estimate the area suitable for agriculture in the Peace River country as 400 miles square being 160,000 square miles and containing roughly 100 million acres.

It is rather interesting to note that this estimate, which includes the northeast corner of British Columbia, is the same as that given by W. F. Breden before the special senate committee in 1907 for Alberta alone, north of the 55th parallel.

In further support of my estimate I refer hon. members to the government map of 1910 which has one of the wheat growing provinces of Russia,—Tobolsk,—superimposed in the correct latitude in the Peace River district. It shows Tobolsk, the capital, a city with 20,000 population in 1906, to be on the exact latitude of Fort Vermilion. Tobolsk province had a population in 1906 of 1,656,000 and their wheat crop in 1907 was 11,779,000 bushels. Following the same idea, I have had a map prepared showing Finland similarly superimposed. Hon. members will be surprised to know that the extreme southern boundary of Finland is latitude 60 and Finland's largest city, Helsingfors, with a population of 215,800, is in the same latitude as Fort Liard. Finland with an area of 133,000 square miles, practically all north of our Peace River district and smaller in area, had a population in 1926 of 3,558,000, an average of 26 people to the square mile. Among the exports of the republic of Finland in 1926 was one item of 106 million dollars for food obtained from animals. Finland cannot successfully grow wheat but does grow large crops of rye, oats, barley and the like.

I have also prepared a map showing in a general way the location of the agricultural land in the Peace River district. With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, for the information of the hon. members of the house, the three maps to which I have referred.

It is my opinion that, when Canada has a population of 50,000,000, as I believe it will have, parliament will still be engaged in considering the development of districts as yet not in our calculations.

I am very familiar, Mr. Speaker, with the agricultural areas of North America, and I

say to hon. members that in no other part of this continent is there such an extensive area of uniformly good land as in the Peace River district. It was originally, so geologists say, the bottom of a great lake. The soil is an alluvial deposit of great depth, free from stone. Some idea of the character of the soil may be obtained from the fact that the Peace River has worn itself down from the plain above a depth of 1,000 feet at St. John—where the minister was not able to walk up, and I do not blame him very much—and 700 feet at Peace River crossing.

As to the percentage of the 100,000,000 acres available for agriculture, probably 10 per cent should be allowed for land covered by water. In many districts there is no waste at all. A conservative estimate is 75,000,000 acres of good agricultural land. Hon. members will note that this is 50 per cent more than the acreage I assumed in my proposal of last year. Seventy-five million acres means 468,000 homesteads of 160 acres each. As the Peace River district is preeminently a grain country, short seasons make it imperative that the work for the coming year's crop be done during the summer months. This will undoubtedly result in the average farm being much larger than the original homestead. Half a section would be the ideal farm. The average farm, however, will probably be about 240 acres. This means that homes could be found in the Peace River district for at least 300,000 farmers or a rural population of 1,500,000.

The census records for 1926 show that in the province of Saskatchewan 70 per cent of the population is rural and 30 per cent urban. On this basis, 1,500,000 rural population will support an urban population of 650,000. This makes the entire population which I estimate the Peace River district alone would support, 2,150,000. The population of the three prairie provinces in 1926 was 2,067,000, so that my claim last year that the development of Peace River would double the population of the west still holds good. Hon. members should keep in mind, however, that this great development would mean an increased population in other sections of Canada as well. The cities of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver will all grow. It is difficult to arrive at a basis on which to estimate the development of these cities resulting from this rural development. I am inclined to think that the increase in population which would result outside Peace River would be as great as the Peace River development itself. If so, 2,000,000 people in Peace River would mean an addition of 2,000,000 to our population elsewhere, or 4,000,000 in all.

[Mr. McRae.]

Some such national development as I am proposing has to come about, if the boys and girls we are educating in our schools and colleges are to find opportunities in Canada. There is no other solution—we must grow in population, or we must continue to lose the best of our young Canadians. What can be done to bring about this development in our day and generation? That is the question which concerns the country.

Last year, I proposed what has been called "the wholesale clearing of land by the government." My plan contemplated clearing and breaking the easiest half of each homestead; the erection of the necessary log buildings from timber available on the ground; and the financing of this expenditure by the government, amortized over a period of 33 years, the first five years to be free from any repayment such as interest, principal or taxes.

This plan apparently did not meet with the approval of the government. I presume the Minister of Immigration and Colonization refers indirectly to this proposal in his speech this year, when he said:

> The amazing development that has taken place in western Canada did not come about by means of any great settlement scheme.

Mr. WARD: In the face of the crop we had last year, with an enormous surplus on our hands for which we have hardly any outlet, where does the hon. member hope to sell the tremendous increase in production from such a scheme as he mapped out last year and as, I presume, he has in mind at the present time?

Mr. McRAE: I presume the hon. member agrees that we must increase our population. My idea is that the only place where it can be increased is on the land. During the last forty years I have observed the development on this continent march from far south of the line up as far as it is now north of Edmonton. I have seen sections wear out as wheat growing land and come into diversified farming. I have no doubt that in the development which will come about in this country and which will take care of our ever-increasing population, the same process will follow as has followed in Kansas, Iowa, and even Minnesota where wheat is no longer the principal crop, although a little over twenty years ago it was practically the entire crop. This development will all take time; the wheat line will move gradually northward and as, after all, wheat is a world commodity, whether we grow 100,000,000 bushels more or less in Canada is not vital to the world situation. That, however, is a question which is open to discussion and

which I am not going to deal with now because I have a good deal more to say on other subjects. There will be an opportunity later for the hon. member to deal with the matter.

The Minister of Agriculture, speaking for the government regarding my Peace River proposal last session, said:

> I know of no other such scheme since settlement first began on the north American continent.

Of course not! But why should our land settlement work not progress the same way as every other line of endeavor? Why should this, the greatest of all work,—the transplanting of people,—stand still for twenty-five years, when the whole world has made such progress? Would the hon. ministers have us return to the old reapers to harvest the western wheat crop? This would be in line with their colonization efforts.

During the amazing period of development to which the Minister of Immigration and Colonization refers, the railway companies owned millions of acres of agricultural land, large tracts of which they sold en bloc to land companies who greatly assisted them in their settlement work. Land taxes in those days were practically nothing; lands investment was attractive and thousands of non-resident purchasers became active colonization agents throughout this continent and Great Britain. To-day things are different. The railway companies have disposed of a great part of their lands. Owing to high taxes unimproved farm lands are no longer considered a desirable investment, and active land agents have largely disappeared.

Besides, the best of our districts awaiting settlement to-day are more or less covered with timber of varying density, from open parklike country, light brush or scrub, to the so-called timber land, little of it giving promise of ever becoming of commercial value so far as the timber is concerned. Peace River district is very fortunate. About 50 per cent of that country is what is termed park-like land, and of this at least half is open prairie. Our problem is to make this land available for settlers with the least cost and at the earliest posible date. I quote Hansard as to my exact proposal last year:

> Using modern methods, confining the clearing to the easiest half of each homestead, avoiding heavily timbered areas, and pro-rating the expense over the whole district, I estimate the cost on the whole would not exceed at the most $12.50 per acre.

Presumably criticizing this statement, the Minister of Agriculture said, and again I quote Hansard:

> Why, twice that amount of money will not clear off the heavy scrub lands in the northern parts of the prairie provinces.

It will be apparent to hon. members that we were not talking about the same thing at all. I wonder if the hon. Minister of Agriculture, with his usual political adroitness, hoped to get away with that sort of criticism. He was talking about heavy scrub, while I was talking about park-like country, that is, open prairie and light scrub. It just happens that I am in a position to prove to the Minister of Agriculture, from government reports on file, that even the kind of country he refers to can be cleared well under my estimate.

I said last year that the grub hoe and the axe, so far as clearing land is concerned, should be relics of the past. The hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization, speaking of the settlement in the west, states it was brought about by:

> ...people beginning in a small way, humbly adding to their belongings—bit by bit— until the whole country was transformed.

That was true in the old days, but holds good no longer. It is not in the national interest that they should make such slow progress, even if new settlers would be content to do so. I believe it is just as necessary for us to conserve our man-power as our money. It certainly is much more human to put the new settler on a partially prepared homestead, than to place him on scrub land where he must spend years of effort clearing it in the old way. This is not only an unnecessary waste of many years of his life, but in most cases results in breaking his heart before he gets on his feet. The men who will tackle such a proposition to-day are few and growing less.

The individual settler cannot afford even to consider purchasing the expensive equipment necessary to open up economically and rapidly the scrub lands which are practically the only lands now available for homesteads.

I found in the north many experienced men who support my estimate of the cost of clearing this park-like land. First, there were the government's own officers who estimate the park-like country in their district at between forty and fifty per cent and the cost of clearing and breaking it on the average $11.50 per acre. At Fort Vermilion the United Farmers estimated the park-like land in their district to be 50 per cent, which they say can be cleared and broken at $10 an acre. My estimate of $12.50 per acre they think too high.

Mr. Robert Jones, superintendent of the experimental farm at Fort Vermilion, also estimates the open park-like country at 50 per cent and gives $12 per acre as the outside figure for clearing and breaking. He says the land when cleared will be worth $25 an acre. There are many others. All these figures are based on the old out-of-date axe and grub hoe methods of clearing land.

I took occasion to investigate very carefully the experience of such brush cutting machines as I could find in action. At Grande Prairie a light 25 horse-power outfit had just finished clearing 30 acres for a Mr. Curtiss. It was considered very heavy clearing, poplars up to 6 and 7 inches in diameter and heavy willow.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At page 103 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, rule 314 reads:

> It is a rule in both houses of parliament that a member must address the house orally, and not read from a written, previously prepared speech, for the reason that if the practice of reading speeches should prevail, members might read speeches that were written by other people, and the time of the house be taken up in considering the arguments of persons who were not deserving of their attention.

I quite understand that in the first session of a new parliament there is always a generous interpretation of that rule. The members coming in are new to parliament, tenderfoots, many of them, and some consideration is shown to them, but I do not think the hon. member who is now reading his speech comes in that category. I understood that he was the leader of the people's party in the province of British Columbia, a party now defunct, I believe, but as leader he must have had a great deal of experience and so I do not think he should claim the privilege of a new member. Another point is that the hon. gentlemen in this particular case does not come within the forty minute rule. If the rules of this house are to be observed by hon. members, I do not know why we should discard rule 314 more than any other. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last point, the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. McRae) is in order in speaking beyond the forty minutes because he is moving an amendment under standing order 37.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I quite admit that, Mr. Speaker. I was simply pointing out that as he was not limited to forty minutes it was more important that he should observe the other rule as to not reading speeches; but I have seen the hon. gentleman read page after page. He is doing nothing but reading his speech.

Mr. STEVENS: How about the Minister of Finance reading his budget speech?

Mr. BENNETT: And the Prime Minister?

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course the hon. gentleman is entitled under rule 37 to speak beyond the forty minutes because he is making a motion of no confidence. As regards the other point, I have followed the hon. gentleman very closely and I have seen him refer occasionally to his notes, but I can conscientiously declare to the house that he has not been reading his speech all the time. He has been reading technical notes.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BENNETT: The ruling is not debatable. An appeal is the only thing that is in order if the hon. gentleman does not like the ruling.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I would—

An hon. MEMBER: Take a dose of castor oil.

Mr. BENNETT: There should be some observance of the rules, Mr. Speaker. I certainly think it is most objectionable after the Speaker has given a ruling that the house should not be bound by it. The traditions of this house are worth something. There is the right of appeal, if the hon. gentleman so desires.

Mr. SPEAKER: No remarks should be made upon a ruling after it has been given unless there is an appeal.

Mr. McRAE: I was referring, Mr Speaker—

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): To your notes.

Mr. McRAE: I was referring to the observations I had made with respect to the brush-cutting machine. Mr. Curtiss told me he cleared this land in three days, an average of 10 acres per day,—and it cost him $66.76 actual outlay to do the job, not including depreciation or capital investment. This is exactly $2.23 per acre. The burning he said cost him practically nothing. Curtiss estimated it would cost to break the land with this power outfit $2.50 per acre. Allowing $1 per

acre for burning, the total cost for clearing and breaking would be somewhere around $6 per acre, not including depreciation.

The average cost of clearing land with the brush cutter in the Grande Prairie section was given to me as $2.77 an acre, which is 50 cents higher than the instance I have just quoted.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Was it seven inch poplar?

Mr. McRAE: There were six to seven inch poplars on the land. The whole thing including breaking would figure around $6 an acre. I decided to see the largest operators in this line of clearing in the west, so I visited Didsbury, Alberta, where I saw the Weber Brothers in action. They are no amateurs, having cleared about 6,500 acres in that district, and their experience on such a large acreage extending over several years is very interesting.

Weber Brothers keep accurate accounts. Their average cost for cutting, piling, burning and breaking somewhat over 6,000 acres is $6.50 per acre. This includes interest on the investment and depreciation, but no profit.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Were they selected lands?

Mr. McRAE: No, they were the residue of the lands in that district. When I was there in November they were on their last contract.

Weber's brush cutter cuts on an average 15 acres per day, at an outlay of $2.57 per acre, a trifle less than the experience at Grande Prairie, which is perhaps due to their using heavier equipment. They think on the average $3 per acre will include depreciation and upkeep, but not profit. His tractor also breaks 10 acres a day. By deep ploughing, ten or twelve inches, the stumps are successfully ploughed under, and as two crops are taken off before again plowing the land, the refuse largely disappears and there is little further trouble with it.

Weber says that heavier equipment would be advantageous and thinks a 100 horse-power brush cutting outfit would cut 25 acres a day, and do it for less money. Mr. Weber claimed this cleared land is much more productive than the open prairie in his district, which he accounted for by the fact that repeated prairie fires had more or less burnt off the humus. He states he is willing to take on a contract at any time to cut and burn the scrub at $6 per acre and would make good money. This would leave of my estimate of $12.50 per acre the sum of $6.50 per acre available for the breaking of the land. This I am sure the hon. Minister of Agriculture will agree is the top price for breaking, even in his old fashioned way, with horses.

I do not know if I have made this modern brush cutting operation clear to hon. members. So as to remove uncertainty and more particularly in the hopes of enlightening my hon. friends, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization and the Minister of Agriculture, as to present day methods, I have arranged for an exhibition. With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the assistance of the Motion Picture Bureau of the Department of Trade and Commerce, I have arranged to give in the railway committee room, at one o'clock next Wednesday, a moving picture of the modern brush cutter and breaking plough in action, followed by other pictures of the up-to-date farming appliances in use in the west. These explain how so few men take care of the ever increasing western crop. I hope all hon. members will attend. I have seen the picture and can guarantee that they will find it worth while.

I now direct the attention of hon. members, Mr. Speaker, to the opportunity we have to make a large number of farms immediately available for settlement in the Peace river district.

It would not require any great administrative ability to assemble and equip clearing units, which might be located at several points, in numbers sufficient to clear and make available along the lines I have indicated homes for at least 2,000 new settlers a year. The personnel of these units would in all not exceed 1,000 men. That is the equivalent of the strength of one battalion. During the war Canada maintained in France 100 battalions as a fighting force engaged in the work of destruction. Should we hesitate now, in peace, to maintain the equivalent of one battalion in the work of construction? We can increase this force as desired.

The clearing and breaking equipment required for the work would not exceed the cost of the guns for a single battery. I can seen no reason, Mr. Speaker, why we should not have the courage to tackle this proposition in a large way, particularly as it could be done under my plan without costing the treasury a dollar.

I have promised the hon. Minister of Agriculture that I would show him a way to clear the heavy scrub land, which he says will cost $25 an acre, for very much less than my

mate of $12.50, to which he has taken strong exception. I refer to clearing land by controlled spring fires.

Through the kindness of the Minister of the Interior I have been furnished with a copy of the report, with before and after photographs attached, which clearly show the result of the experiment carried on by G. J. Lonergan, under the direction of the Surveyor General in May, 1919. This report is a very illuminating one and I commend it to all hon. members who are interested in the clearing of the great Peace River district in a comparatively few years.

I suggest to the government that, instead of keeping forest rangers fire-guarding useless forest reserves in that district, they put these men at the head of crews to burn sections of the country systematically in the spring, and to occupy themselves during the rest of the year providing fire-guards for the following spring's burning operations, and in protecting the country from fall fires, which are undoubtedly injurious to the land. This could be made a very much needed opportunity to furnish work for new settlers during certain periods each year when it would not interfere with their farming operations.

The report to the Surveyor General shows that allowing his men $7.50 per day—certainly sufficient—the cost of fire-guarding and burning a very considerable tract, approximately 6,000 acres, was only 10 cents an acre. The report says this acreage was the average scrub country of the north. This statement is borne out by the photographs. It was the same kind of land that the Minister of Agriculture was talking about last year. Lonergan estimated the cost of clearing before burning at $25 per acre. After the fire he estimated the cost of clearing what remained at $5.25 per acre —a reduction of 80 per cent. So by the expenditure of 10 cents an acre a saving of nearly $20 an acre was effected in the cost of clearing this heavy scrub land. The report shows clearly that this spring burning did not damage the soil in the slightest.

This report was endorsed by the officials of the Alberta government—of which the Minister of the Interior was then premier and who, it is said, had great faith in it—as well as by every member of the crew. This included a practical farmer, a resident of the district for about 40 years. Clearing by controlled spring fires is said to have been first advocated by the Association of Dominion Land Surveyors. The report in question was submitted to their annual meeting in 1920, and, I am informed, met with general approval.

[Mr. McRae.]

The spring fires are possible in the Peace River district as the great growth of grass of the previous year easily carries a hot fire early in the spring before the frost is out of the ground. With two or three burnings at the most, open prairie country results.

I made careful inquiry into this matter during my sojourn in the Peace River country last fall. Of the many men I interviewed on the subject, I did not find one who was not enthusiastic about it. Spring burning they all agreed was not injurious to the soil. All claimed it was the only way to clear up the country. This was endorsed by the government inspector at Peace River Crossing, who added that no damage would result from spring burning. I interviewed the United Farmers of Alberta at Fort Vermilion. They said it was the only way to clear the country.

Mr. Robert Jones, superintendent of the experimental farm there, a very conservative man indeed, supported this method of clearing. The Dawson board of trade held it was the only system and that two burnings would clear the district.

Perhaps the man who was most emphatic on the subject was Mr. W. D. Albright, superintendent of the experimental farm at Beaver Lodge, who said that spring burning is the only way; that it did not hurt the soil, that at most only two or three annual fires would be required to clear an area, and that with a systematic, aggressive policy the whole country could be cleared in from five to ten years.

I am sure the hon. member for Peace River, whom I visited last fall just as he was completing the clearing of a tract of land in the old-fashioned way, will agree with my statement that the proper way to clear the Peace River country is by controlled spring fires.

The cost under this plan would be very much less than my estimate for clearing with mechanical equipment, but the results would not be so immediate. Mechanical equipment should be depended on to provide for the first few years, then systematic spring burning. Beginning to prepare for it this fall would clear the land as fast as required, thus relieving us from most of that part of our expenditure. In a few years at most, open prairie, country fire cleared, would be available to take care of all our incoming settlers.

Once the country is opened up the so-called muskegs which, with an odd exception, are merely the alluvial soil of the country in depressions, covered with moss, will soon disappear and such land will be equal to the best in the district.

An opportunity to develop an area capable of supporting two million people, thus repeating the western development early in this century, is available to the government with sufficient courage to carry it out.

I proposed last year that the government issue land bonds against their expenditure on such a development. I gave as the maximum required $300,000,000 for a ten year program, an average of $30,000,000 per year. The hon. Minister of Agriculture in referring to my program, made reference to the loss in the soldier settlement scheme. Buying improved farms at top prices bears no resemblance whatever to partly developing what is undoubtedly better land at no cost for the land to begin with. The soldiers would indeed have been fortunate if some such scheme had been adopted in their case. The history of farm land values is always the same. In good districts, as settlement intensifies, prices move upward. It is the settler who gives the value to the land. This is emphasized by the sale of school lands by the province of Alberta in the Peace river district last year.

On July 16th last 36 pieces of raw school lands were sold in the Waterhole district by auction at an average price of $20.61 per acre, the highest price being $30 per acre.

At Berwyn, north of the Peace river, 50 pieces brought an average of $20.26 with the highest price $40 per acre. The hon. member for Peace River told me last fall that in his district private lands eleven miles from the railway had been sold as high as $25 per acre.

What gives these unimproved lands such values? The answer is—settlement, neighbours. We may expect even better results in the consolidated settlements I am proposing, especially with the improvements I suggest we make on the land.

When the settlement of a district is complete, a land value of $30 an acre would be in keeping with the present Peace River values. This means that the homesteader who gets a partially improved homestead for the amount spent on it by the government (which I estimated last year not to exceed $1,500) would not be long in seeing that at $30 per acre for his 160 acre homestead he would have a prospective value of $4,800, on which he would owe the government only $1,500. Such a substantial equity in his farm, particularly if, as in the case of the ordinary homesteads, a five-year residence is required, would be a great incentive for the new settler to stick it out, and few homesteaders would abandon their claims and lose their equity by moving into town; and anyway in that event others would be anxious to immediately take their place.

Under my proposal the government would be expending on the land about one-third of its value when surrounded by settlers. Reasonably administered, it should not be possible for the government to lose money in this work. Mortgages on improved farms for about half their value have constituted for years the safest security available on this continent and the experience of the government should not be different from the record of our great mortgage companies, who have made a specialty of farm loans.

It is probable that the maximum advance I have mentioned, namely $300,000,000, will never be reached, as repayments would probably assume proportions which would take care of advances long before the end of the ten-year period. I base this assumption on the fact that our federal government in the early colonization of Manitoba advanced $100,000 to the Mennonites, which was repaid in full with 6 per cent interest within six or seven years. There is no reason why the repayments of advances under this plan should not result in a revolving credit which could be continued indefinitely.

The opening up of Peace River district is a sound national development, even without any fixed settlement scheme. In undertaking it, there need be no worry about farmers to occupy the homesteads when semi-improved. In any event, preference must be given to our own people and more particularly to Canadians. We must look after our own boys first. Making available desirable farms, such as Peace River can offer, will do much to keep our Canadian boys on the farm and will offer them a real inducement to stay in Canada. Not a few labour men in the cities through the country, as a result of my discussion last year, have written me that they would welcome such an opportunity to get back to the land on a farm of their own.

Colonization is the major task before the government. I do not believe it can be delegated to a committee or commission with any hope of success. If for no other reason, the doors of approach to government officials at home or abroad would be barred against such a committee or commission. It would have no status abroad and is certain to be abused at home and probably would not be supported even by the government that created it. No, Mr. Speaker, this is the major problem before the country—the first and greatest responsibility of the government today. It cannot be sidestepped.

I suggest to the government that they overcome their chronic indecision on colonization matters and give us an exhibition of courage and confidence in the future by tackling this Peace River development in a big way and thus prove to an anxious public that we have still in the government of this country some of the vision and daring of our forefathers. As I said last year, Peace River offers the best opportunity in the British Empire to establish an adequate British migration scheme. Like many others deeply interested in such a movement, I am greatly discouraged with the feeble efforts in this respect which have emanated from the Department of Immigration and Colonization during the past year. They even offend our sense of responsibility in this important matter. Some of the British colonization schemes suggested during the year, with the best intentions in the world, were not only inadequate but unsound, and if carried into effect would have resulted in failure.

We must get down to stern realities in this business if we are to succeed. There is no royal road for successful farmers. Failures must—so far as possible—be eliminated in Great Britain. Ne'er-do-wells in England are even worse here, for, as a class, they lack the initiative essential to success in a pioneer country. In some way we must make the farms of Great Britain the clearing house for acceptable settlers under any successful British migration scheme. It is unreasonable to expect that three months in a so-called training farm in England can educate applicants, or, for that matter, enable the unqualified to be eliminated. In my judgment the proper training school for Britishers who want to become farmers in this Dominion is on the farms in Great Britain. During the war I saw Britishers, from the cities, built into great strong men, good workers and great soldiers—none better. Would not a year of work continuously on farms in Great Britain develop men into farmers capable of meeting Canadian pioneer settlement conditions?

The problem of migration and empire settlement is one of the first magnitude. Are Great Britain and Canada so bankrupt in statesmanship that under peace conditions we cannot, acting together, find the solution? Surely our statesmen are equal to successfully meeting a situation so vitally important to this Dominion and the future of our empire. It is no more complicated that many of those great international and domestic questions which were successfully solved by Canadian and overseas statesmen during the Great war.

The latest arrangement which the government has effected with the overseas settlement committee and the Labour department of Great Britain is for 6,000 trainees, men who have had a 90 day's sojourn on one of those kindergarten farms. Of these 6,000, 75 per cent must be taken from the distressed colliery areas and the remaining 25 per cent from other districts, preferably farmers. My information is that at least one-half the so-called farm settlers will not be farmers at all. Our government undertakes to distribute and find employment for them. I leave it for some of the Labour members of this house to ascertain how this is to be done, and I leave it to hon. members who came from the same island as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) to inquire why in this movement of 6,000, the Irish are absolutely barred. I am told "no Irish need apply;" evidently the Irish have been added to the government's so-called non-preferred class of immigrants. I also understand that the government has recently allotted to the railways the task of selecting 2,000 immigrants and to the Hudson's Bay Company 200, in all 2,200 immigrants, all untrained the same as last year's harvesters, 75 per cent from the distressed areas, and again the people from the Emerald Isle must pay a higher passage rate if they are to come to Canada, raised as I am informed from £2 to £10.

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization in his speech the other day, in answer to a question, estimated that only 30 per cent of the farm labourers coming in under the railway agreement remained on the land; this is a most unsatisfactory condition. Until there is a more all-round development of our resources there is little need for immigration to the cities; there are more than enough Canadians drifting from the rural communities to the urban centres to meet present requirements. An analysis of table 6 in the last annual report of the department is illuminating; it shows that of 151,597 immigrants, including men, women and children, only 83,316 or 55 per cent were of the so-called farming class, presumably destined for the land. Of the 45 per cent of our immigration which makes no pretense whatever of being farmers, over 13 per cent are classed as labourers, mechanics and miners. Then we have those coming under the railway agreement, including some 25,000 brought in by the government direct under special permit, of whom 70 per cent drift to the cities, according to the statement of the minister. This alone would aggregate 100,000 in the last two years, so the situation is infinitely worse than the records disclose. In fact, taking the minister's statement and applying it to the returns of his department, only one conclu-

sion can be arrived at and that is that less than one-third of our immigrants stay on the land. Need we wonder that labour men generally are opposed to any immigration at all?

I do not wish to tire hon. members of this house with a further recital of the inefficiency and, may I say, hopelessness of the government in these matters. The situation is getting worse and worse as the years roll by. The sad part about all this business is the failure of the government to appreciate either its responsibilities or its opportunities, some of which I have endeavoured to place before the house.

In his speech for the government last session, the Minister of Agriculture said:

> Now, what are we ourselves doing in connection with Peace River development? Are we dong anything? To hear my good friends talk, one would imagine we are sitting comfortably here and merely wearing out our chairs from day to day.

Well, I fear the minister, who has been a swivel chair farmer for over a quarter of a century, is now becoming sensitive about it. I quite agree with this summary of his, as a true statement of their efforts. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization, in his speech last March, referring with some pride to the homestead entries for the past year, said:

> In the Grande Prairie and Peace River country, 5,216 homesteads were taken up, a gain of 450 per cent over the previous year.

The minister did not say to the house where he was placing these 5,000 new settlers; that part of the story was left for me to tell. Perhaps he does not know. I would feel derelict in my duty as a member of parliament if I did not call the attention of the house and of the country to the situation which will develop in Peace River if all these homesteaders move in this spring. The government, through its agents, encouraged these homesteaders to take up land in the Peace River district. Many of them have located so remote from settlements that there is not the slightest possibility of our government providing the necessary railway transportation to enable them to succeed, and, what is even more serious, they will be beyond the reach of the most modest requirements of rural life. The Minister of Agriculture in his speech last year, speaking of the Peace River, said:

> I admire the men who are hanging on. Possibly my admiration was inspired by the fact that I myself hung on for over 20 years, waiting for the railway.

Again he added:

> I may say the settlement that is taking place there is not settlement of the feeble-minded either but of strong, sturdy, vigorous men and women.

I can tell the minister they are not feeble-minded, unless their natural assumption and trusting faith that in this day and age a government which opens up land for homestead entry will provide the necessary transportation facilities to enable the settler to succeed can be so regarded. Because the minister waited 20 years for a railway in what is now a well-settled part of Canada is no reason why he should expect the pioneer settler in the Peace river country to waste 20 years of his time. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as colonization work is concerned, the day to which the Minister of Agriculture referred with so much pride and satisfaction is past, gone forever, let us hope. I fear that he and the Minister of Immigration and Colonization are living in the past. This is the year 1929, not 1890. Certainly we have reached the point when governments should direct their colonization work so as to bring about consolidated settlement and thus ensure, within a reasonable time, the necessary railway facilities, schools, churches and the many other requisites of a successful settlement. The Minister did not tell the house that many of these homesteaders were located far beyond the reach of any railway likely to be built in our time, and that they will not have a ghost of a chance to succeed.

Let me tell hon. members just where some of these settlers are located. Suppose we begin in the northwest corner of the district, about 30 miles north of Fort St. John; from this point on to Fort St. John, many home-seekers have selected their new homes. Go directly south as the crow flies, in all about 100 miles, that is about 30 miles southwest of Dawson creek; in the very mouth of the Pine pass settlers, hoping for transportation that will not come in our day, have located The Dawson creek farmer is to-day paying 33 cents per bushel to have his grain trucked to railhead 60 or 70 miles east. Hon. members will understand the fate in store for the new settler 20 to 30 miles further away.

Then, all along the southern boundary of this great district until we reach Sturgeon lake, 60 miles east of Grande Prairie across the Smoky river, many homestead entries have been made more than 20 miles from probable railways. The new settler has located north of Lesser Slave lake, sixty miles west of Waterhole and about the same distance east of Fort St. John I saw a lone homesteader erecting his cabin in a district without roads

or neighbours and with little prospect of enjoying either. There was evidence of entries here and there along the old Yukon trail to Fort St. John and beyond. Worst of all, however, is that splendid district beginning at Battle River, 40 miles north of the nearest railway station of Grimshaw; settlers straggle along 60 miles further north to the Keg river district and then 80 miles still further on to Fort Vermilion. Here the settlement is scattered both north and west 20 miles south at least and the settlement extends to that magnificent prairie country at the foot of the Buffalo hills 30 miles away from Fort Vermilion. On the east good surveyed townships attract the homesteader still further afield. The excellent crops I saw in this country had absolutely no market as they were 200 miles from a railway. At the Fort St. John end of the district some of the very small crop of 1927 is still unmarketed.

Almost to the four corners of this vast empire the government has permitted, yes even encouraged home-loving, land-hungry settlers to locate on land which for years must remain beyond the reach of transportation. It would take at least twelve branch lines, aggregating 1,000 miles, to put these settlers within the twenty miles of a railway which is to-day considered the maximum distance from transportation for successful farming. The government has provided for only sixty miles during the next five years. If all these 5,216 homesteaders to whom the Minister of Immigration and Colonization refers with so much pride were to comply with the homestead regulations and move into that country this spring with their wives and children, perhaps 20,000 in all, we would be responsible for a real misfortune. Already a great many settlers in that vast area are beyond the reach of transportation; beyond the reach of medical help and the other necessary facilities. Women and children die there for lack of medical attention. Either there is no doctor at all or the distance to a doctor is so great that the cost makes it impossible for the settler to properly care for the lives of his wife and children.

If evidence of this startling statement is necessary I would call the attention of the hon. members to the press despatches in January last which recited the heroic accomplishment of May and Warner, who flew from Edmonton to Fort Vermilion in January of this year, in a temperature 40 degrees below zero, with the antitoxin necessary to curb an epidemic among the 165 settlers I met there last fall. This is perhaps outstanding as one of the most heroic efforts ever attempted in medical relief work. The eyebrows were frozen off these flyers on their return trip to Edmonton.

Again the air service by its flight 220 miles north of Edmonton to the Pelican portage on the Athabaska river brought out a woman and saved her life. Unfortunately aeroplanes have not yet been brought into as common use as ambulances.

Is there any excuse for all this misplacing of immigrants? Surely there can be no justification for the government repeating the mistakes of the past and permitting innocent people to move into our north country without reasonable provision for their welfare and their success.

Under a proper, systematic plan for consolidated settlement, these 5,216 homesteaders could easily have been located in a block of land not to exceed fifty townships. This would be an area of roughly twenty-four miles wide and sixty-five miles long. A single railway through the centre of the block would place the most remote settler well within twenty miles of a station and would require from our railway companies the least capital outlay. In the past they frequently have had to build unprofitable branch lines through sparsely settled districts, but by following the march of consolidated settlement they would construct the minimum mileage, profitable from the start. In the natural order of events towns and villages would spring up; roads, schools, churches and the other essentials to successful settlement would follow almost immediately.

Mr. Speaker, we have long passed the time when any government should even permit, let alone encourage, this great waste of human effort, this total disregard for the welfare of our fellow men and women. I believe it is the bounden duty of the government to see that new settlers are so placed that they will have a reasonable chance of success, an opportunity to rear a family which will be a credit alike to themselves and to the nation. This, in my judgment, is in many instances impossible in the scattered settlements now permitted throughout the Peace River district.

I therefore offer the following amendment, seconded by Mr. Arthurs:

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefore:

this house regrets the failure of the government to profit by Canadian experience in the colonization and settlement of the country and deplores the fact that men and women have, during recent months, been settled on western crown lands at great distances from transportation, educational, hospital and other necessary facilities, thereby making it almost impossible for them to achieve success and happiness in their new surroundings, and is of the opinion that such conditions can only be remedied by an immediate reorganization of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Hon. ROBERT FORKE (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any great length and I hope to finish by six o'clock. Although I had some intimation that an amendment would be moved when the motion was made to go into supply on Immigration, I had no idea as to what line that amendment would take. One of the peculiarities of the Department of Immigration is that you have no idea from what quarter an attack is likely to come, it may come from one direction or it may come from another. You may be accused of flooding the country with immigrants or you may be charged with failing to obtain enough immigrants; so I was entirely at a loss to know just what the amendment would be. I was quite relieved when I heard the speech on the amendment, and I want to pay to the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) the compliment of saying that he always has something to offer; it is not a negative amendment, it has a plan and a scheme. Probably it is a product of the imagination; I am sure I could sit down and work out a very nice scheme under ideal conditions, dot the country with fine homesteads and have prosperous and happy people everywhere. It would make very nice reading and perhaps I would get on the front pages of the newspapers and they might say that I had some imagination and some foresight.

I have had forty years of pioneer life and I know something of the conditions which govern the success or failure of these people. I have no fault to find with the proposition which has been offered by the hon. member for North Vancouver and I do not intend at this time to criticize at any length the plan which he has put before the house. I do not believe that any government scheme involving the expenditure of many millions of dollars will in the end turn out to be successful.

In regard to immigration, as I said before, I have observed the people who succeed and the people who fail. I think the people who live on the prairies will bear me out when I say that quite a large percentage of those who started with open prairie under very favourable circumstances have failed and the duty of the Immigration department in connection with any scheme that is brought forward is to see that the immigrant has at least a fair chance of succeeding by not being loaded up with too heavy an overhead charge to commence with. I will repeat: I have more faith in the man succeeding who begins slowly as many of our immigrants have done. They have gone up into the northern part of the prairie provinces; they have built themselves log shanties where they have placed their wives and children, and they have gone out and worked by the day or by the month to earn a little money to start with. Then they have gone back to their homesteads; they have cleared them, and I can tell hon. members that those people, starting with practically nothing, in four or five years find themselves comfortably situated and with good homes. This is being and can be done if you have people who will buckle to and face the difficulties which they are likely to meet.

As regards the trip into the Peace River district, let me say this because I think the hon. member for North Vancouver thought I had lost heart right there at Taylor's Flats and that that was the reason why I had not gone up to Fort St. John. The real truth of the matter is that there was a tremendous downpour of rain and, excepting in the city of Winnipeg thirty or forty years ago, I had never encountered such slippery mud anywhere as on the banks of the Peace river. I walked two miles—

Mr. BENNETT: And went back three.

Mr. FORKE: That is the old schoolboy story we used to tell when we were late. The automobile in which I was riding refused to take the slope and I walked two miles down into the flats, expecting to meet the Hudson's Bay boat there at the river. When we arrived there, it was raining very hard and no boat was to be seen. There was no shelter but the woods where I spent the entire night while it rained heavily most of the time. Next morning a small boat came forty miles up the river and I went in that small open boat, on a very cold morning with heavy rain still falling and my spirits not at the highest, though I did not lose heart.

Mr. MANION: I am afraid my hon. friend is a temperance man getting lost in the woods at night.

Mr. FORKE: When I reached the boat about six o'clock in the morning I received a very hearty reception from the captain, and the first thing he did was to fetch a bottle of whiskey, put it on the table and say, "That will put you all right."

An hon. MEMBER: Did it?

Mr. FORKE: It was the temptation o my life.

Mr. STEVENS: Say when!

Mr. FORKE: I am very proud to be able to say that I withstood the temptation, got a good, hot cup of coffee and felt as well as one or two other gentlemen who applied the spirits.

Mr. McGIBBON: The hon. member did not climb the hill?

Mr. FORKE: No, I slipped over the hill. I saw a good many hundred miles of the Peace River district although I admit it was mostly in the settled portions. I have nothing but praise for what I saw. It was a revelation to me and I think I will repeat what I said in my speech on the budget, namely, that I was surprised to see the fields of waving wheat ripening in the sun at least ten days earlier than in the older parts of the prairie provinces. I suppose most of that ripening wheat was reaped before the frost did very much damage. The difficulty that I saw regarding the Peace River country was that of clearing the scrub and small trees which were growing on land that could be made available for homesteads. Of course a large portion of the country is covered with pretty heavy timber and it will take a great deal of work to clear it although something can be realized on the timber. I am quite in accord with what the hon. member for North Vancouver has said as to what can be done with steam power and ploughs in ploughing up scrub. I was very much surprised at the size of the trees that could be pulled down by one of those great ploughs with a strong motor pulling it, but at the same time I think $10 to $12 an acre is possibly too small an estimate for clearing the land.

It would take a good deal of time to analyse all the propositions that have been laid before the house by the hon. member for North Vancouver. He spoke about settling people in a close community and how many families you could place on so many square miles. Human nature being what it is, one cannot control these things as one would like to. He stated that the Department of immigration had allowed people to go into the Peace River district miles and miles away from the railway; in fact he said that was encouraged by the Department of Immigration. That is the only statement to which I am going to object. The Department of Immigration does not encourage people to go any distance away from a railway. I have always contended that no one can carry on successfully more than fifteen or twenty miles from a railway and I have never advised immigrants to go far away from one. I know people have been crossing the Peace river and going as far north as Fort Vermilion almost 100 miles or perhaps more from a railway. I am not very sure of the distances. There is no doubt that this is a mistake, but they are doing it and what can you do about it? They are free people; they can do as they like. They have the spirit of adventure and if they are making a mistake, they will find it out in the future. But that is what they do, and no department of immigration will prevent their doing it. The same thing occurred on the prairies; when good land could be secured near a railway, you would find people going twenty or thirty miles away just to find the piece of land they wanted at that particular time. The same thing will happen again and you cannot prevent people from doing this.

As regards immigration from the United Kingdom, that was mentioned by the hon. member for North Vancouver, that has been one of the difficulties during this year. We have been continually criticized on account of the lack of British immigrants. The fact of the matter is that there is no difficulty in getting all the British people we want of a certain type if the country could absorb and take care of them. It has been the duty of the department to see that so far as possible the supply of immigrants is not larger than the country can absorb. That is perhaps a little different from the criticism we hear all the time that we cannot get immigrants for the Dominion. I would not be afraid to flood this country with hundreds of thousands of people if we want to open the doors and allow all to come who really want to come, but the difficulty is to get the type of people we want who, we know, will succeed and do well for themselves and the Dominion.

Mr. McGIBBON: Why the difficulty?

Mr. FORKE: Because those people are not used to go on the land and suffer the hardships and the pioneering work necessary in commencing a new life in a new country. If we can work satisfactorily with the British government, no more of these people will come than we think can properly be taken care of, so that no idle people will be walking the streets and seeking employment if the department can possibly help it.

I want to say a few words in regard to the statistics quoted by my hon. friend from North Vancouver (Mr. McRae). He seemed to think that I had made a mistake. I used the figures in a little different way from what he did, but my figures are just as correct as his and hon. members can draw their own inferences. I have had some statistics made up in just a little different way. When immigrants enter this country they are entered by race as well as by country and I tried to

ascertain how the 166,722 immigrants who came to Canada last year were made up according to race. The figures are as follows:

Racial origin	Number
British	75,581
Northwestern European	41,059
All others	51,082

It will be noticed that the British and northwestern European nations made up 116,640. This constitutes two-thirds of all the immigration that came to Canada last year. Some of these immigrants of the British race may have come from the United States or elsewhere than the British Isles, but they were all British people.

In the calendar year 1928, 54,709 people left Great Britain for Canada; 33,689 for Australia and New Zealand; 7,095 for South Africa; 13,489 for India and other parts of the empire. and 22,345 for the United States. More people came to Canada from Great Britain than to all the other dominions put together, and 32,364 more people came from Great Britain to Canada than to the United States.

Mr. ARTHURS: Do the figures the minister has given include the harvesters brought out last year?

Mr. FORKE: No. We do not include in any immigration figures more than the 2,000 harvesters who did not go back.

I would also point out that 78 per cent of Canada's population was born in Canada, 12 per cent in Great Britain, and 10 per cent in foreign countries. Surely in view of those figures there is no need for any great alarm on the part of those who are afraid that Canada is going to cease to be largely British and French in its population. I am not saying that to belittle in any way those immigrants who have come to Canada from other countries, because I believe that some day we are going to have a Canadian nationality that will conserve all that is brightest and best in British institutions, and perhaps those immigrants who are coming to our shores from other than British countries will be able to contribute something to our nationality.

The statistics of the department show that we have received 30,560 immigrants from the United States and 33,793 returning Canadians who made declarations that they intended to make their permanent home in Canada. That makes a total of 64,353. The figures I have from Washington of Canadians going to the United States is 57,330, showing a balance in favour of Canada of 7,023. I have some doubts in regard to this figure from Washington because I have seen it stated that the number was 70,000. As the house may know, we have no records in the Immigration department of Canadians who left for the United States, and we have to trust to the Bureau of Statistics in Washington, which is not always correct. It is difficult to get a correct figure of the number of Canadians who are leaving Canada. My hon. friend from Fort William quoted a figure around 73,000.

Mr. MANION: I have the figures here of the American authorities, and they show that last year 72,616 Canadians went to the United States.

Mr. FORKE: Those figures were compiled at the border, and they are just as liable to be wrong as right.

Mr. MANION: That is true of both sides of the line.

Mr. FORKE: It is not a correct figure, but we will let it go at that.

I should like to give the figures for 1924. Our immigration from all sources in that year was 148,560, but instead of 73,000 Canadians leaving this country for the United States, 159,058 Canadians left this country for the United States in that year. So surely the tide has turned and things are very much better than they were just a few years ago.

There is one point of view that I should like to put before the house in regard to the colonization of western Canada, which the hon. member for North Vancouver has brought up in his address to-day. It is a fallacy to suppose that the western provinces were colonized by the immigrants who came to this country. Most people seem to think that the great flow of immigrants to Canada colonized the western prairies. I know exactly what took place in Manitoba because I was there. Who can ever forget the long trains loaded with horses and cattle and implements coming from east of the great lakes and colonizing that western country? These were Canadian people. No doubt there was quite a sprinkling of British people too, and there was a colony of Mennonites which has done well, but in the main that western country was colonized by Canadian people from Ontario and the maritime provinces. It was not the big immigration that came to this country that colonized Manitoba; I know that. There was at that time a large immigration of foreign people into Canada; a great deal of railway building was going on and public works of all kinds were being undertaken, and these people did that labouring work. They came mostly from Europe; a large part of the money they earned was

sent back to Europe, and when the era of railway construction ended these people returned to their own countries. That large immigration, therefore, was not at all the benefit that some people really think it was. It was a benefit in the sense that these people by their labour performed a service for the country, but it was not an immigration that was of permanent benefit to the country as a whole.

We are told that immigration is the supreme need of this Dominion. The whole argument of the hon. member for North Vancouver was that Canada needs a tremendously large immigration. I am not going to say that we do not need immigration; indeed, I should not be true to the position I occupy if I suggested such a thing. But there is this to be considered: will the population that is at present living in Canada gain by a tremendously increased immigration? Does anyone here think we shall all be wealthier and happier if we have a population of twenty millions instead of nine and a half millions? That is the thought I wish to suggest. Not that I am condemning the development of the country, but a large immigration does not necessarily mean that we shall be happier or more prosperous. Why has Canada come back so soon after the war compared with other countries that were engaged in it? Because we are a country of nine and a half million people, endowed with great natural resources, and we had something wonderful to fall back on. That is why Canada, with its sparse population and great natural resources, has recovered more rapidly than any other country.

Now, I am afraid I shall be quoted in the newspapers to-morrow morning as condemning immigration. I say we do not want immigration that we cannot take care of; we do not want immigration that will be a burden on the country. We do not want to bring here discontented people who will be unhappy in this country. We want people to come here who will enjoy our prosperity and who will themselves be prosperous. That has been the aim of the department since I have been at the head of it.

Statistics prove that the lack of immigrants has not been the trouble. Last year we absorbed 166,000 immigrants—and our population is only nine and half million. I am going to repeat what I said in my speech on the budget, that we are trying to absorb more people per capita than the United States ever attempted to absorb. When they absorbed 850,000 immigrants their population was at least 100,000,000. Unless you have some tremendous scheme such as that proposed by the hon. member for North Vancouver, I claim that 166,000 immigrants is no small number for a population of nine and half million to absorb and take care of without dislocating the whole economic system of the country. In the five years from 1910 to 1914 Canada attempted to absorb 1,761,425 immigrants. What happened? Canada suffered from indigestion, and a very small percentage of those people remained with us at the end of ten years. As I said before, the big era of railway building and expansion came to an end, and thereupon those immigrants left the country. It does not do the country any good for this to happen. It may help the transportation companies to bring in hundreds of thousands of immigrants, but when those immigrants do not stay in the country it damages our reputation.

In the past few years great changes have taken place. The wealthiest country in the world, the United States, is facing an unemployment problem. This is one of the paradoxes of modern time—a country the wealthiest in the world and enjoying unprecedented prosperity, and yet with a million and a quarter of its people unemployed. An hon. member speaking some little time ago complained that during the last twenty years this country has been standing still. Well, twenty years ago we were producing 100,000,000 bushels of wheat; last year, with practically the same population, we produced 500,000,000 bushels. That is the economic situation that we have to face. It is so easy to be critical in speaking of this question. It is when you are face to face with the situation that you realize the tremendous difficulties that must be overcome. To-day we have fewer hands engaged in industry, yet there is increase in production. This has brought about unemployment. In the United States the farm population has decreased five and a half million in twenty years. Canadians do not go to the United States to farm. Notwithstanding the great increase in urban population in the United States—and I want the house to pay attention to this—the United States farmer still exports as large a percentage of his produce as he did twenty years ago. He is still dependent upon the foreign market for the price of his goods. I hope those farmers across the line who think they are going to be helped by more protection will realize the fact that they are exporting just as large a percentage of their produce as they were twenty years ago, and that the price they will get for it will be the price which it brings on the foreign market.

There need be no anxiety for the future of this Dominion. We are the happiest and most prosperous people in the whole world at the present moment. Why all this criticism and discontent as if things were not satisfactory?

Mr. McGIBBON: You are speaking only for the government.

Mr. FORKE: I am speaking for every individual in Canada.

Mr. McGIBBON: No.

Mr. FORKE: I know there are no happier people anywhere than in this Dominion, no people who have better reason to be happy. I am not speaking from the political point of view. I am simply stating a fact, and I am sure anyone who considers the situation will admit it to be the fact. There need be no anxiety, I say, for the future of Canada. Development is taking place in all directions. Our business people are holding their own in industry, and we are exporting more per capita than any other country in the world. Why this despondency? The railways are prospering, reaching out into new districts and providing railway facilities for those people who were venturesome enough to settle in remote districts. In a word, optimism and hopefulness are abroad in the land. Immigrants will come to Canada, Mr. Speaker, I have an idea that in the not far distant future we shall have to take measures somewhat similar to those adopted by the United States to restrict the number of newcomers to the point where we can absorb them.

Mr. CLARK: When we get a new government that might be.

Mr. FORKE: I think you might call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FORKE: Since the house rose at six o'clock I happened to pick up the report of the oversea settlement committee in Great Britain, and I came across a few sentences which I shall read, because I fancy they will afford an answer to those who are under the impression that the British people do not appreciate the difficulty of getting their own population to migrate.

In their report for the year 1927 the settlement oversea committee enumerated some of the chief causes, partly political and partly economic, which prevent the more rapid distribution of population as between this country and the dominions, and particularly of those for whom state aid, or at any rate employment on arrival overseas, is essential. Chief among these are:

A. (In Great Britain)

1. The industrial habits and the townward bent of the general population and its consequent unwillingness, and, without training, unfitness, to take advantage of openings overseas (such openings as concern men, are for the most part in land work, and, for women in domestic work).

2. The upward tendency of the standard of living and comfort in Great Britain during the present generation.

That is rather a peculiar sentence and it is worth noting, because a great many people in Canada do not believe that there is a higher standard of living in Great Britain to-day than prior to the war.

As I have once before observed, the people have hard times in Great Britain and know destitution, but that is in spots, in the mining districts and among those engaged in trades whose workers have been thrown out of employment. This would be in large districts and would, of course, make for hardship. But the fact is that there is an upward tendency in the standard of living and of comfort in Great Britain during the present generation.

3. The cumulative effect of schemes of social insurance and especially of unemployment benefits. The effect of these schemes is probably greater than has hitherto been supposed, and it seems inevitable that they should tend to anchor population in this country and decrease its mobility.

4. The fact that Dominion governments have not hitherto seen their way to grant assisted passages to any except single men or families going to land work, single women going to domestic service, or nominated persons.

5. Although it is true that emigration may at times be stimulated by sheer necessity and want, it is clear that under modern conditions the population of this country is most ready to undertake the adventure of migration when it is prospering, and least ready to do so when it is faced with adversity. The spirit of successful migration is a spirit of buoyant optmist.

I have read this to show that the oversea land settlement committee, who have in hand the work of immigration, really understand the position in their own country; so that when we hear the department in Canada criticized, as throwing obstacles in the way of British immigration, I believe that these sentences which I have quoted will serve a useful purpose.

This afternoon we listened to the scheme enunciated by the hon. member for North Vancouver, and I shall make no attempt at the moment to criticize that scheme. It is so vast, it involves such a large sum of money, is so comprehensive and considerable in a great many ways, that I should have to

analyse it very carefully before undertaking to criticize it. Being of a certain nationality, however, I must say that I have my doubts. Probably it will be remembered that last year when the committee on agriculture had under consideration the subject of immigration they made this recommendation:

> The committee having heard the evidence in connection with the experiment of the three thousand settlement scheme, now almost completed, recommends that time be given to test this form of land settlement before embarking upon extended schemes of this character.

Under the circumstances I do not think it would have been wise, even had it been thought practicable, for this department to undertake any land settlement scheme in view of that recommendation submitted last session. It was recommended by that committee that where the Department of Immigration could enter into tripartite agreements with the imperial and the provincial governments in connection with land settlement, such a course should be encouraged. We have made every endeavour to work in cooperation with the provinces in that way, but so far as the west is concerned nothing of a practical nature has been accomplished. They have taken the stand that the Dominion retains their natural resources, and until they possess those resources they are not prepared to enter into any scheme of land settlement. However, we have entered into a land settlement scheme with the province of New Brunswick, and I am happy to say that I believe it will work out very successfully. Under that scheme I believe it is intended to bring out about five hundred families in five or ten years.

Mr. BENNETT: Could the minister, without difficulty or inconvenience, give the details of that agreement up to the present?

Mr. FORKE: I would ask the leader of the opposition to excuse me; I have those details in my desk, and when my estimates are up I shall be glad to give them.

We have sought the cooperation of the provinces in immigration and land settlement and, in fact, in every way we have thought it possible to work together, because the provincial governments are in a position to know the requirements of the provinces perhaps much better than the Department of Immigration and Colonization can know them. Hon. members may remember the severe criticisms which were levelled at the Department of Immigration because to some extent we curtailed the immigration from central and southeastern Europe. Two very prominent gentlemen in Canada went to the newspapers and published articles about a column and a half in length criticizing the department for this policy and claiming that the country would suffer from a lack of labour during the coming summer. I think time has justified the stand I then took, when I said I thought I had a better estimate of what the country required with regard to labour than was possessed by either of these prominent gentlemen, who no doubt thought they were speaking in the best interests of the country. I had taken the opportunity during the summer of visiting the western provinces and discussing with the provincial governments their needs and requirements, and I came to the conclusion, as I have said already, that thirty per cent of the immigration from central and southeastern Europe would amply fill all the labour requirements during the summer. I may tell the house that during the last two or three weeks I have been just a little anxious over what was taking place in the west; I sent wires to the different large centres in the three western provinces just to keep in touch with the labour situation, and at times there has been a surplus of labour, with a large number of idle men looking for employment. I believe that condition now has disappeared; it occurs every spring just after the close of the winter work and before the summer work opens up. However, I am satisfied that the immigration has been quite sufficient to take care of all the labour requirements up to the present. It is a favourite saying of the railway companies that once you stop the stream of immigration it is very difficult to start it again, but I do not think we will find any difficulty in that regard. Whenever this country wants immigrants from Europe all we have to do is open the door and we will get them without trouble. The great difficulty will be in selecting the ones we really want.

Before I sit down I wish to pay a tribute to the voluntary societies which have been working on different immigration lines. The hon. member for North Vancouver stated that these societies had been doing perhaps the large part of the work in regard to immigration. I do not think that is true, although I recognize their services and am glad to have their assistance. At the same time, all that work is carried on under the Department of Immigration; we take the responsibility for all immigration and we see that the people who are brought in by these voluntary societies are of the right type, in addition to making sure that the societies take care of them after they have come to Canada. I have taken what I believe is the correct stand, that in the last analysis no matter who

brings the immigrants to the country the Department of Immigration is responsible; consequently while I am in charge of this department I have no intention of letting my responsibility rest upon any other shoulders. Whether this work is carried on by the railway companies or by other voluntary societies I hold that all selections and examinations must be under the control of the Department of Immigration.

However, as I said before, I want to pay a tribute to the work which has been done by these societies. I believe the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in particular is doing very splendid work in this regard. That work may not always have been a success from a financial point of view, but while the land settlement work carried on by a large corporation such as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company may not be quite as profitable as it could be, still I believe they get their reward in many ways not available to colonization societies. We are ready and willing to assist these societies in every way and we will accept their assistance wherever it is possible for us to do so.

I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the house. I have already said that I have every faith in the future; I believe in Canada; I believe we will continue to prosper and grow day by day, and there is no doubt that the population will increase if the country prospers. It may be asked, what of the future? Who can tell what the population of Canada will be one hundred or five hundred years from now? We talk of Canada's destiny, but each generation will meet its own problems and to-day we cannot foresee what the years will bring. However, a responsibility rests upon this generation to see that the stream of humanity which mingles with the native population shall be of such a character that the highest and best traditions of the past shall be maintained and that Canada's influence in world affairs in the days to come may be for the "healing of the nations." I remember some words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, which perhaps I may be permitted to quote. Speaking of Canada, he said:

> Her bark is on the ocean making for the harbour. I know not where that harbour will be, but it will be a safe harbour.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, at this late stage in the session I do not intend to take up very much of the time of the house, but I have given some study to this question and it is so important that I should like to make a few remarks. Before doing so I should like to congratulate the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) on the effort and energy, the time and probably the money, he has spent in making the thorough investigation which was indicated by his speech this afternoon. Whether or not the house agrees with him and his conclusions we must admit that he has devoted a great deal of time and effort to this difficult problem, and he deserves much credit for his work.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the whole question of immigration is in such an unsatisfactory state that regardless of any attempt at defence on the part of the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) the opinion throughout the country is that the immigration policy of this government has been a complete failure. I do not intend to discuss it at length but I do wish to put on record some statistics; to a large extent my remarks will be a story of statistics, which may be very dry but which will perhaps demonstrate the conditions better than any general remarks of mine could do.

Before going into that, however, I wish in a few words to deal with the remarks of the minister. I am sorry to say, for the sake of the country, that to me he appeared to make a very lame defence of the policy, if it can be called a policy, which he has been carrying out. He complimented the hon. member for North Vancouver on his remarks, and said that at any rate they were constructive. I am sorry I cannot say the same about the minister; as far as I could see—and I say this quite honestly and with no desire to be unfair—his remarks were largely destructive. His whole attitude seemed to be one of despair, a sort of throwing up of his hands in an admission of national failure.

In Canada we have a country covering 3,500,000 square miles. With twice the area of the whole of Europe, we have a population of only ten millions. Europe, with half our area, has a population of 300,000,000. The hon. minister practically stated this afternoon that we are a happy little family and should be content to remain as we are and not look for other people to come to our shores.

Mr. FORKE: I did not say that.

Mr. MANION: Not in those words, but that was the sum and substance of what the minister said, and anyone who reads his speech cannot help but see that he practically doubted the need of immigration. Had he gone but one step farther he would have been praising the exodus and arguing that if we could get rid of a few more thousands of people then we would be still happier; we would

have our great resources to divide among a smaller number and would therefore be that much happier and that much more contented.

We have one of the greatest countries in the world and if it were properly handled it should be the mecca for all the desirable peoples in all the overcrowded portions of the earth. I do not intend to comment further upon the minister's speech except to say that the whole of his remarks were an excuse for the fact that his policy had been a failure. The French have a proverb, qui s'excuse s'accuse—he who excuses himself accuses himself—and I am afraid the minister accused himself this afternoon. Some of the figures which he quoted were not quite correct, but the difference is small. I have the figures from his own department showing that 72,000 British immigrants, including English, Irish, Scotch and Welsh, came into this country from the United States instead of the 75,000 he mentioned. The immigration has been very small while the emigration has been quite large.

We are spending to-day $5,862,900 on immigration and colonization. The Department of Immigration and Colonization will spend $3,462,900, and $1,400,000 will be spent for general land settlement advances. The railways will spend about $1,000,000, which gives us a total of a little less than $6,000,000. Will the country receive full value for that amount of money? That is not the opinion of the people in Canada; the opinion is that there seems to be something radically wrong.

During the calendar year 1928, 166,782 immigrants came to Canada. From the British Isles there came 55,848, from the United States, 29,933, and from other countries, 81,001. In other words, there were 110,934 from other countries and 55,848 from the British Isles, which is a ratio of two to one. It is true that some of the immigrants from the United States were British born, but that ratio still applies.

During the first year of Liberal rule the British immigration into Canada amounted to 47 per cent of the total immigration; last year it was 33 per cent, which shows that the British immigration is decreasing, whatever the cause may be. During the last four fiscal years before the war, 1911 to 1914, we received into Canada 1,451,000 people. During the last four years during which this government has been in office we have received exactly 501,000, or a little more than one-third of the immigration during the four years before the war. The proportion of British immigrants to immigrants from other countries is about the same, but the total must be disappointing to anyone who wishes to see this country prosper and build up.

British immigration during 1925 was 53,000, while last year it was 51,000. In this case I am speaking of the fiscal years, as the figures are easier to get for that period. During the year 1925 we received 15,000 immigrants from America, and in 1928, 25,000, an increase of 10,000. The immigration from countries other than Great Britain or America amounted to 42,000 in 1925 and it had increased to 75,000 in 1928, an increase of 33,000. These figures show that British immigration is the only class which seems to be decreasing, which is certainly not a very satisfactory condition.

Let us consider this question from another angle and take the first fiscal year of the Liberal government, ending March 31, 1923. During the larger part of the year ending March 31, 1922, the affairs of the country were under the direction of a Unionist government or a Conservative government, so I have taken the year 1923. From countries other than the British Isles and the United States we received that year 16,372 immigrants, while we received 75,038 during 1928, or four and one-half times as many. British immigration increased from 34,508 in 1923 to 51,552 in 1928, or an increase of one and one-half times. In other words, British immigration increased one and one-half times while immigration from other countries increased four and one-half times. My complaint is not so much that the number of British immigrants is not larger, as that our immigration of all classes is much too small. The question is often asked: how many can we absorb in this country? I submit that we can absorb as many as we can put at useful occupations and as many as we can handle without crowding out the other classes of the people already here, whether they be farmers or labouring people. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we could take many times the numbers of people of all kinds than we are getting at the present time.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How about doctors?

Mr. MANION: My practice has been pretty well shot since I got into politics, but the doctors have not raised any particular objection to medical men coming in.

Mr. HEAPS: Would the hon. member have them submit to an examination when they come to this country?

Mr. MANION: There is no doubt that they should be fully qualified. I would not

like to have even the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) attended by a doctor who had not passed an examination. I am not saying that in any offensive tone, because my hon. friend is a very good friend of mine and I do not want to hurt his feelings.

I submit that we can take many more immigrants of all kinds. During the last fiscal year before the war we had an immigration of 384,000, but during the fiscal year 1928 it had dropped to 151,000, or a little more than one-third.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not in any way criticizing or attacking those who came from countries other than the British Isles or from the United States. I have many of those people in my constituency and I have the utmost confidence in them. I have practised medicine among them for many years and my feelings towards them are of the kindest. The children of these newcomers to our land make very fine Canadians and I certainly do not object to their coming into this country. I submit that we have a need for people of all classes. These people from the continental European countries are willing to do certain classes of work which the Canadian, British or American will not do and they are needed for those purposes. If our country is as prosperous as the right hon. the Prime Minister and some of his followers claim it is, we should be able to absorb hundreds of thousands of all classes of immigrants from all countries. If immigration is to be taken as a criterion of prosperity, we are certainly not particularly prosperous at the present time.

I know that many hon. members of the house will not agree with me, but my contention is that one of the reasons we do not have a proper immigration to this country is that a wrong practice respecting fiscal affairs has been followed.

I remember being struck, I think a year or two ago, by a very fine speech delivered by the present Premier of British Columbia, the Hon. Mr. Tolmie, a man who was loved in the house and whose opinion on agricultural subjects commanded the respect of not only the house but the country. He spoke of the lack of protection for our sheep industry. He pointed out that in Canada in 1871 we had a little more than 3,000,000 sheep, and that in 1927, fifty-six years later, we had practically the same number, perhaps 100,000 more, whereas in the United States, instead of 3,000,000 sheep as we have in Canada, they have 44,000,000. He claimed—and I have no reason for doubting his word—that we have just as good facilities and just as good a capacity for sheep raising in Canada as they have in the United States. He pointed out that in British Columbia there are 160,000,000 acres of good range land, but they have only 100,000 sheep, and he said that they have room for twenty times that number in that province.

I remember reading last year the evidence of Sir Henry Thornton before the committee on agriculture, and he claimed that the maritimes were just as good a sheep raising section as any other section of the country. The trouble is that we have been giving no encouragement to sheep raising. I made it my business to-day to make sure that my statements were correct, and I found that there was no protection on raw wool coming into this country, whereas the United States has had protection at various times, ranging from 15 cents to 45 cents a pound. The United States as a consequence, although having no greater capacity for sheep raising than we have, have fifteen times the number of sheep. This is another instance of our treating the sheep industry in the same way as we treat the fruit and dairy industries. It might be well to put on Hansard these figures which I took from the International Year Book of agricultural statistics, and I think they are correct. This shows the number of sheep in various countries in 1927:

Country	Number of Sheep
Canada	3,263,000
United States	44,455,000
Bolivia, Brazil, Peru, Chile and Uruguay	50,000,000

These five South American countries have a total of something over 50,000,000 sheep though they have an area about the same as that of Canada.

Australia	104,260,000

Thirty-five times the number that Canada has.

New Zealand	25,640,000

So far as area is concerned we could drop little New Zealand into lake Superior, yet that country has more than eight times as many sheep as we have.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): How many sheep have they in Great Britain, where they have no protection at all?

Mr. MANION: I was going to give those figures: In Great Britain and Northern Ireland they have 25,000,000 sheep. Great Britain, by the way, as my hon. friend says, may not have protection on raw wool, but the reason for that is that Great Britain is the greatest manufacturer of woollen goods in

the world and requires raw wool as a raw material for the manufacture of woollen goods. That is why they have no protection, and probably my hon. friend is correct in saying they have not.

Mr. HANSON: Manufactured goods to export to Canada.

Mr. MANION: Yes, to Canada where we do not protect our sheep industry as the United States are protecting theirs. Let me mention two or three other figures in order to show the small countries which have large numbers of sheep. France, with half the area or less than that of northern Ontario, has more than 10,000,000 sheep. The little Irish Free State has as many sheep as Canada has. Roumania has nearly four times as many.

The same story could be given with regard to cattle. The figures are as follows:

Country	Number of cattle
Canada	9,172,000
United States	55,696,000
Germany	17,982,000
France	14,940,000
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	8,183,000

These little countries with probably one-thirtieth of the area of Canada have practically as many cattle as we have.

Australia	11,880,000

Speaking of prosperity, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) gave as a proof of prosperity the figures for the acreage under field crops in Canada in 1928—59,351,000 acres—but in 1921, seven years before that, we had under field crops 59,635,000 acres, or practically 300,000 acres more the year before the present government came into power than we have now, and a lesser acreage under field crops than in any year between 1921 and 1928. Certainly that is not a very good indication of prosperity, and it does not seem that immigration is interfering with competition in other markets, since our acreage is not increasing. Immigration, according to the figures as to acreage, does not seem to be interfering with the farming sections of the country.

Mr. WARD: Is the hon. member saying that the acreage under field crops is no greater to-day than it was eight or ten years ago?

Mr. MANION: It was 300,000 acres less in 1928 than it was in 1921.

Mr. WARD: Why, then, has production so tremendously increased?

Mr. MANION: I do not know; I cannot answer that. I am giving the acreage as it is set out in official sources. My hon. friend can get them from the Bureau of Statistics, where the Prime Minister got his. The facts are as I give them, but in any case the acreage is less to-day than it was in 1921. That is not due to lack of room in our country, because I made it my business also to ask the Department of the Interior as to the acreage which is not settled at the present time in the western provinces alone. I find that in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta there are in round figures probably 30,000,000 acres of land suitable for agriculture within fifteen miles of the railway. The Minister of Immigration, speaking to-day, said that he would not like to place anybody further than fifteen miles from a railway.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): Broken land or raw prairie?

Mr. MANION: This is land fit for agriculture. Mr. Beatty gave the figures last year before the same agriculture committee as that before which Sir Henry Thornton made the statement which I quoted. Mr. Beatty said that in 1922—and I think I am quoting his exact words—there were 34,000,000 acres of fairly fit land in the three prairie provinces within fifteen miles of a railway. I intend, however, to give the official figures from the Department of the Interior. This is a letter dated April 11, 1929, to myself from the Deputy Minister of the Interior; I shall simply give the essential parts:

> The last compilation of unoccupied and uncultivated privately owned land was made in 1922, and the result was as follows:

He shows that in 1922 there were 18,003,040 acres of privately owned land, uncultivated. That is divided amongst individual owners, the Hudson's Bay Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian National Railway Company, other companies, and unclassified. That is the last compilation of privately owned lands. He gives Dominion lands available for entry in 1928 as 23,167,000 acres, and also unsold school lands 1928, as 6,314,787 acres. These three classes of lands, total 47,484,817 acres. Then he adds:

> With regard to the suitability of the above lands for agricultural purposes, I may say that railway lands were selected by the companies concerned—

The railway lands amount to 5,197,520 acres.

> —and may therefore be looked upon as being suitable for agricultural purposes. There is no definite information as to what proportion of the other above-mentioned classes is suitable for agriculture.
>
> Practically all of the privately owned unoccupied lands are within fifteen miles of a railway, possibly one-half to one million acres being outside that distance. Of the crown lands still available for homestead entry, nearly 12,000,000 acres are within fifteen miles of a railway.

Summing this all up, taking it as well as I can from what he has said about it, I estimate that in round figures there are 30,000,000 acres suitable for agriculture within fifteen miles of a railway.

Mr. FORKE: Why then go hundreds of miles away up into the Peace River?

Mr. BENNETT: Because the minister encourages them to do so.

Mr. MANION: There are also vast quantities of land in other sections of the country that are suitable for agriculture, though in many cases a little more difficult to clear. Northern Quebec, northern Ontario, British Columbia, and the maritimes are empires in themselves. Northern Ontario, extending from North Bay to the Manitoba boundary, is as large as Germany and the British Isles put together, and yet in that area there are but 150,000 people. The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. McLean) said that the land in northern Ontario was mostly rock. There is a good deal of rock, but there are also fine agricultural valleys in many sections; if my hon. friend would some time stay off with me at Fort William I could show him fine agricultural land just a few miles from my own city, cultivated by prosperous and successful farmers. In many such sections throughout that northern part of Ontario, there is as fine agricultural land as can be found in the western prairie provinces. The same is true of northern Quebec, British Columbia and the maritimes.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we are not getting immigrants. Whatever the causes may be, that remains the fact. Or if we are, as has been shown many times—the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) stated recently in the house what the population now should be if we had retained our immigrants and the hon. member for North Vancouver gave the same information to-day—we are losing them to the United States. Immigrants mean nothing to our country unless we keep them here. Unfortunately, we not only are not keeping the immigrants that come here, but we are not keeping our own Canadians. Our immigration from the United States last year—I am giving the minister's own figures—was 29,933, or in round numbers, 30,000. Now I will give the American figures for Canadian immigration to the United States. I have them under my hand in letters that I have obtained from the department in reply to my queries, and they show that we lost to the United States last year 73,605; in other words, two and one-half times as many left this country for the United States as we obtained from the United States last year. The minister's figures differed a little from those I am giving, but I accept the minister's figures as to the number coming into Canada and the American figures as to the number going into the United States.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member has forgotten the immigrants we got from the United States.

Mr. MANION: No. I mentioned that. I said that we got 29,933 from the United States, and that we lost 73,605 to the United States.

Mr. FORKE: Returning Canadians also?

Mr. MANION: The Americans do not give any as Canadians coming from the United States, but as English, Irish, Scotch, Welsh or French, as the case may be; because there is no Canadian nationality in the census and the United States follows the same method.

Mr. FORKE: What I wanted to say was that immigrants from the United States and returning Canadians make up about 65,000.

Mr. MANION: I am afraid the minister's figures are rather high. As a matter of fact, I tried to get from the United States the figures of returning Canadians, but as I said, they do not classify them on that basis, and I have therefore taken the minister's own figures on that.

Mr. FORKE: We have the figures here.

Mr. MANION: I am sorry, but the minister will have to use those figures himself. I have given the official figures as I obtained them. I have very grave doubts, without attempting to impugn the honesty of the minister at all, as to the accuracy of the figures as to returning Canadians from the United States given by the Immigration department of this country. I know that as I go through this country in almost every section pretty nearly every family of any size that I meet has some member of it in the United States, and I rarely hear of their coming back.

Mr. McINTOSH: When did they start going to the United States?

Mr. MANION: They have been going for forty or fifty years.

Mr. McINTOSH: Before 1896 how many went?

Mr. MANION: I have not the figures for 1896, but I will give my hon. friend these figures; they may have some effect on his enthusiasm. I will give the figures of Canadians leaving this country for the United

States during the last four years of Conservative rule, or Conservative and Union rule, and the figures for the last six years during which this government has been in power, according to the American figures.

From 1919 to 1922—part of 1922 was under Liberal rule, but we would have to take whatever blame there is coming for the greater part of the year—we lost to the United States, according to American figures, 267,920 people, or an average during those four years of Conservative rule of 66,980, or in round numbers, 67,000. From the fiscal year 1923 to 1928, which are all Liberal years, we lost, according to this same set of statistics, in those six years, 666,338 or an average for the Liberal years of 111,056, or pretty nearly twice as many per year as we lost under Conservative rule.

Mr. McINTOSH: What are the Liberal and Conservative figures from 1867 up to the present time?

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend can give them; he has more time than I have.

Mr. McINTOSH: You are debating the question.

Mr. MANION: There is nothing to prevent my hon. friend from debating it; he is ready to debate any question. As I was saying, the average for the six years of Liberal rule was 111,056 and the average for the four years of Conservative rule, 66,980, or almost twice as many under Liberal rule as under Conservative rule. The showing would have been very much worse had I taken the first four years of Liberal rule instead of six, for that would have shown the average to be 127,000 instead of 111,000. The emigration has eased down a little in the last two years, firstly because conditions have improved in this country, thanks to Providence, and secondly because most of our people who wanted to go to the United States have already gone. You cannot go on draining the life-blood of a man forever.

Mr. DUNNING: Why does my hon. friend start his calculation from the fiscal year 1918? Perhaps he would give the figures separately for the different years.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend would hardly expect me to take the war years. I have left them out of my calculations altogether.

Mr. DUNNING: But why start with that particular year? Why not one year later?

Mr. MANION: I do not think it would make any difference. I took 1919 because the war was over. I had no ulterior motive at all in taking that year. I should like to point out to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) who has asked that question, that during the four years we were in power hundreds of thousands of soldiers were being disbanded in this country, and in spite of that we lost only 267,000, or an average of about 67,000 a year, while in the year 1922, all the soldiers had been disbanded and the Liberals since that time have been losing Canadians at the rate of 111,000 a year to the United States.

I did not intend to take quite as long as I have done, but these interruptions have delayed me. Our problems at the present time I consider are four. First, and this is most important, we should retain our own Canadian people in this Dominion.

Mr. FORKE: I happened to read an article in the Dalhousie Review recently in which it was stated that immigration to the United States started in 1830 and has continued ever since. I only hope it will stop in a short time.

Mr. MANION: Nobody ever questions that a great big country like the United States will always act as a magnet to some of our Canadian people, but I state without any possibility of disproof that never in the history of our country from long before confederation—and I say this after looking up the figures—have we had six years in which we lost so many people to the United States as we lost during the six years under Liberal rule to which I have referred. I say that without any fear of contradiction.

Mr. FORKE: But the population is now greater. It is nine and a half millions as compared with five millions in those earlier days, and so the percentage must be taken into account.

Mr. MANION: The population of this country has not been increasing anything like as rapidly as it should have done, so that the percentage is not a factor of very much importance.

I was saying that our first aim should be to keep our own Canadian people in this country. That is most important because, with all due respect for the immigrants from other lands, our own Canadian people are more valuable to us than any other people who are coming here.

Secondly, our aim should be to get British immigrants because they understand our institutions, our history, our language and our laws. They are the first people we should attempt to get from outside.

Thirdly, I should say that the next group we should attempt to get are the Americans, who next best understand our institutions, our language and our laws. Finally, Europeans. And I have no quarrel with the minister's division of them into preferred and non-preferred countries.

This should be our aim, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with a proper fiscal policy we would get this immigration. This policy would help the 2,000,000 farmers in Ontario and Quebec who are selling from 90 to 95 per cent of their products to the industrial centres of their respective provinces; it would aid our dairy farmers; it would assist our fruit producers; and it would so aid our industrial life that we could absorb immigrants as we did before the war at the rate of 300,000 to 400,000 under the Laurier regime and the Borden regime. A proper fiscal policy,—whether my friends agree with it or not, I am entirely sincere,—a proper fiscal policy would enable this country to produce in Canada hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of commodities which are now being produced in other countries and imported by us. In other words, it means wages, work and prosperity,—not a fictitious, spotty prosperity such as we have to-day, but a real prosperity.

Some of my hon. friends opposite argue continually that under free trade we get cheaper goods. I do not dispute that that may be true, but there are many exceptions, and I have put them on Hansard in years gone by. Under protection prices have been reduced in some cases 75 per cent. Take, for instance, the price of steel rails in the United States. Under free trade they were four times as high as they now are under protection with proper competition in the home market. But, anyhow, even if we admitted that cheap goods were the be all and end all of our existence, we must not forget that the cheapest countries in the world to-day are the poorest countries —for instance, China and India.

The prosperity brought about by a proper fiscal policy would act as the greatest magnet that we could have to draw people from the other countries of the world. Our land, I repeat, should be the mecca for all the desirable people from all the overcrowded portions of the earth.

Apparently nobody in this country is satisfied with the immigration policy of the government. Perhaps one or two in the house may express satisfaction, and some even seem to think we are getting too many immigrants. The minister himself gave me that impression.

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. MANION: Well I do not wish to be unfair, but his speech was the most despairing effort that I have heard for a long time; it was almost a funereal wail. But it is common knowledge that the people generally are not satisfied with present immigration conditions. The railways are not satisfied. I have before me the joint statement of Sir Henry Thornton and Mr. Beatty expressing their dissatisfaction, but I have not time to read it. I also have under my hand a statement from the Saskatchewan section of the United Farmers of Canada which I got in my mail this morning. Apparently they are not satisfied. But the "most unkindest cut of all" is Mr. W. T. R. Preston. He is absolutely disgusted and dissatisfied with immigration conditions as they are to-day. I like him so much, and his authority has been so often quoted in this house on behalf of the Liberals, that I am going to read his letter.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Who is he?

Mr. MANION: For years he was the organizer of the Liberal party and a lifelong Liberal. I never heard of him making a speech or writing a letter in support of the Conservative party. On January 19 last, only a few months ago, he wrote a letter to the Manitoba Free Press. I am going to read the last two or three paragraphs which sum up his idea. He says:

> Since the Liberals assumed power in 1921 the aggregate expenditure by the government and the Canadian National railway on immigration propaganda exceeds $25,000,000. The addition to the population by immigration scarcely overshadows the volume of the exodus of our own people to the United States. Public bodies, regardless of politics, have requested the government to spend hundreds of millions in a wide immigration propaganda. But supineness, lethargy and indifference has been the official reply.
>
> I know that I am expressing the judgment of a large number of lifelong Liberals when I say that the present declared policy of the government will fail to establish an abiding confidence in their political leaders at Ottawa. The future is fraught with serious consequences to Liberalism, but that is a minor consideration in comparison with the greater and more serious consequences to the Dominion at large, if the sponsors of the openly declared immigration policy continue to dominate the situation.

Mr. CHAPLIN: They had better give him another job.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member for Lincoln has struck the nail on the head all right.

Mr. MANION: I hope Mr. Preston will observe the minister's remark that all he needs is another job to keep him quiet.

It is obvious to my mind that the government has not a satisfactory immigration policy. If Canada is to grow, prosper, and progress, it is the duty of this government to awaken to its responsibilities and really try to bring down an immigration policy adequate to the needs of this Dominion.

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, as one who thirty odd years ago in the province of Alberta took up the class of land mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. McRae), and who had nothing to start with except a couple of cows and an old team of horses, I may be allowed the indulgence of the house for a moment or two while I make a few observations on the immigration proposition that my hon. friend has put forward. I am afraid that I shall have to disagree with him, and possibly I shall also have to disagree with a good many things in connection with the administration of the Immigration department.

It seems that the basic idea at the root of my hon. friend's proposition is that Canada needs more population in order to make her prosperous. My hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) stated that Canada had only about 10,000,000 of population as against Europe with its 300,000,000 to sustain. I wonder if he implied that the prosperity of Europe with its 300,000,000 population is the kind of prosperity he would like to see in Canada. I want to say that population is not an indication of prosperity. It requires something more than population to create prosperity. Great Britain has a large population but she is not prosperous. There is an infinitely larger population in China, but that country is not prosperous and is seeking means to bring about prosperity. That population is the basis of prosperity is an entirely false doctrine.

The question arises, why do you want a greater population in the north land, in the Peace River country. Is it for the purpose of raising more wheat in order to depreciate the present price which is already too low? Our farmers are not particularly desirous of having greater competition in marketing their wheat, for at the present low level of prices they can hardly live on the returns. The fact is that if you would make our farmers themselves prosperous you would need no immigration policy. It is quite true that last year we raised somewhere in the neighbourhood of 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, but our farmers, the primary producers, are not necessarily prosperous as a consequence. True, that tremendous crop brought prosperity to Canada, as pointed out by hon. members in the budget debate. But who are they who are really prosperous? The gentlemen whom my hon. friend from Fort William indicated, those who live on the backs of the primary producers, the railway companies and other great corporations; they do not touch the primary producers' product unless at a profit, and the farmer has to take what is left.

I submit that if the farmers of this country were prosperous you would have no trouble in attracting desirable immigrants. In fact you would not be able to keep them out with a five barred gate if every farmer in this country was able to produce and sell his product on a cost plus basis as the manufacturers are doing. That is the secret of our lack of prosperity. That is the secret of the lack of immigrants. Population, I repeat, is not a criterion of success, because the people who are contented and happy are those who are prosperous irrespective of whether our population be 10,000,000 or 20,000,000. True, it is prosperous for a few. I think it was Stanley Baldwin who gave this advice to Canada: Don't be in a hurry to settle your land; there is plenty of time for that. Let those within your gates become prosperous and you will have no need for a rush of population. So far as I am concerned, and I believe I am speaking for those whom I represent, we are absolutely opposed to spending money to coax people to come to Canada. Canada was a good enough country for me to come to as a boy fifty years ago. At that time I came here and went into the wilds of Ontario, and I have managed to survive. Similarly, it was good enough for the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning), the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) and several others who came to this country and were not at all spoon-fed; they were not treated as though they were babies; they had to make their own way. It is men of that type who will make good citizens of Canada.

My hon. friend from North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) this afternoon made a fine reference to our forefathers of long ago in Ontario. I do not know whether he was referring to the United Empire Loyalists, the old forefathers of whom he is so proud. But I would ask him this question: Does he suppose that those men were spoon-fed? When they came to Canada did they find a ready-made farm, a well built house, a stove burning, the tea kettle steaming, and someone greeting them with, "Come in and have a cup of tea and a piece of cake"? Not at all. They were men who had to hew their homes in the wilds of the province, and it was such men that

made Upper Canada what it became. Any man who knows the conditions which will confront him when he comes to this country and who has grit and determination enough, knowing those conditions, to come to the country and to remain in it, is the sort of man whom we will heartily welcome with open arms, giving him all we can. He is the man who will make a good citizen of this country. But, I repeat, we may not look for good citizens among those who expect to be spoon-fed.

Now, of course, I come to the question which I have raised in this connection, and that is, that prospective immigrants should know the conditions they are to face when they come here. One of the great failures of immigration to Canada, especially in recent years, has been the fact that immigrants have not been aware of the conditions which they were to expect. And worse than that—this is where I address myself to my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration—the truth has been only partly revealed to them. We have all had to face difficulties; I have had to face difficulties. I am not ashamed to say that there have been times when I was not able to buy a pair of rubbers to go to the woods; I had to put on a pair of gunny sacks and go out with a sleigh when I wanted to get logs with which to build my house. I am not ashamed to admit it. But my complaint is that immigrants are not given the facts by the Department of Immigration. I have evidence in my hand to support that charge. If I were a real estate agent, anxious to sell land in Canada, eager to dispose of town lots, this literature which I have in my hand—Canada's descriptive atlas, published by the Department of Immigration and sent to all parts of the empire—is the very thing I would use. Now I say that this is wrong because it is only partly true.

Mr. FORKE: Will the hon. member read a paragraph that is not true?

Mr. ADSHEAD: I did not say that there was nothing true in it; I merely said that it was only partly true, and that is the worst form of deception—putting the bright side of the situation before people and leaving the other side for them to find out when they get here. I will demonstrate to the minister from this atlas and from letters I have in my hand that intending immigrants from Great Britain and other parts of the world are told only half the truth. They are induced to come here by the stories they hear about the place and when they arrive in Canada and see things with their own eyes they say, "We did not know that these were the conditions"; and they become discontented, with the result that we have very often to deport them.

I have here, for example, the description of a scene in Alberta. It is fine; it is perfectly true as far as it goes. Here is the homestead to begin with, and turning over a few pages you come at length to a different picture—a transformed homestead, a beautiful house like a modern city residence, with splendid barns and so forth. These are the pictures presented to immigrants before they come out. But the conditions which they will have to face in the interval, before this rosy picture is realized, are not made known to them. They are not told that they may have to live in a little shack—and I have lived in a sod-roofed shack when it rained harder inside than it did outside. I have seen this happen in a farm in Alberta—and my hon. friend from Battle River (Mr. Spencer), my hon. friend from Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) and many others can testify to the same thing: A man goes into the field, looks the wheat over, and congratulates himself on the fine crop which he will harvest He says, "In a few days I shall cut that wheat and shall have food and sustenance for my family during the winter; I shall be able to pay my debts". But within twenty-four hours—in less time than that—the sky clouds over, and before very long there is not one kernel of wheat left in that field; the whole crop is gone for the year. But these things are not told the people; they are told only half the truth.

Let me mention something else—and I invite the attention of my hon. friend for Yale (Mr. Stirling) to this. Here is depicted a beautiful scene in the Okanagan; there are beautiful trees, with lovely sweet-smelling blossoms; the apples are quite tempting. This is all perfectly true. But what is there that is not true about this picture? Well, I have a letter from a friend in Kelowna in which he tells me about his crop of McIntosh Reds, from which he expected a handsome return. But what happens? He tells me that he has received a red ink invoice, the significance of which my hon. friends from British Columbia will realize. What does it mean? It means that he is out of pocket to the extent of 7 cents a box; in other words, for the privilege of growing those apples he incurs a deficit of 7 cents a box, so that he would have been better off had he left the apples on the trees.

Mr. BENNETT: Swamped by the Americans.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I wish to impress upon the Minister of Immigration the importance, in pamphlets issued by the department, of telling the people the whole truth and nothing but the truth. And that is not done.

Mr. FORKE: I may tell my hon. friend that I have received from Mr. Woods, the proprietor of a Calgary newspaper—I do not know which newspaper it is— a letter in which he informs me about an essay competition which he has been holding among the settlers in western Canada. He has received eighty essays in reply.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It is a wonder he did not receive eight hundred.

Mr. FORKE: Perhaps the hon. member will wait until I am through. He writes telling me that he is delighted with the replies he has received, and the one fact that stands out prominently in every one of these replies is that these settlers were told the truth in England; they formed a fair conception of what they had to face when coming here. This fact appears in eighty different letters forwarded by people in the three thousand family scheme. When the soldier settlement estimates are under consideration I will read some extracts from these letters and my hon. friend will see that things are not being misrepresented all the time.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I did not accuse the department of misrepresenting things all the time; but what I have stated I know to be true; I have given the facts. As it happened, I was in Kelowna this year when the delegation appeared in the western prairie provinces trying to obtain an increased tariff, and Mr. Woods was one of those who met them in Calgary. They were not all fruit growers who came there; there was a newspaper man, there was a real estate man, there was the proprietor or manager of a packing plant. These were the men who represented the farmers, and when they wanted an increased duty on their fruit they met the Calgary board of trade in the board of trade rooms. The farmers' convention was held in Calgary about the same time—two days afterwards. We said. "We want you to meet the farmers whom you want to induce to have a little extra tariff on their fruit." We asked them to stay only two days, but they would not do so; instead they published a statement that the whole of the west was in favour of an increased tariff on fruit.

Now let me proceed further, and I do not make these statements because I do not like the Minister of Immigration; I have a very great regard for him. He may bow sarcastically; I cannot help that. I believe him to be an honourable gentleman who is doing his best, but while I like and respect the Minister of Immigration I like Canada better, and I must deal with things as I find them. I want to say that it is not merely immigrants we want; it is people of the right character.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Conservatives.

Mr. ADSHEAD: All Conservatives are not of the right character, any more than members of other parties. I am not concerned about this party fight but I am very much concerned about some of the people we are getting in Canada. Last fall, before I came to this house, Colonel Saunders, the police magistrate of Calgary, called me to his office and said: "Here is a very serious situation and I wish you would try to do something about it." I asked what he meant, and he said. "To-day three men were convicted of a certain crime, and these men are all recent immigrants who came to Calgary. These men were convicted of the very same crime in the country from which they came." The point I want to bring out is that we want not only men with brawn, muscle and money; we want men of character, not escaped convicts. I would not say that this condition is general, but I hold in my hand the report of the proceedings of the convention of the Chief Constables' Association of Canada, held in Toronto last August, and I desire to read a few statements contained therein. One of the papers read at that convention contained the following statements:

> My attention has been drawn repeatedly of recent years to the number of ex-convicts who are coming to Canada from. . . whose names figure on our dockets and who help to fill our gaols.

I will not read the names of the countries, but hon. members may read this report at any time. The paper continues:

> It will be a surprise to many people that criminals should come to Canada from these countries, because of all the nations that contribute to the immigration totals of Canada there is none more suitable by blood and training to assimilate with Canadian stock than the hardy people who hail from. . . Despite this, it is a fact that quite a large number of criminals are yearly arriving in Canada from there, and a remedy must be obtained for it.

Towards the end of the paper I find the following statement:

> During the war years and for a few years following, the criminals from northern Europe did not cause the police departments much worry, there being no new arrivals to speak of.

But with the influx commencing in 1925 they have been coming to the fore, and unless that influx is checked, Canada will continue to be a haven for the liberated criminal or the wanted one.

I might quote a number of paragraphs from this paper, but there is one statement in particular wihch seems to apply to the present situation:

As was said at the beginning, there is no attack on patriotic citizens and we can do with more of them, provided they do not send any more of their bad eggs as well. The Canadian Chief Constables' Association may be able, in a diplomatic way, to draw the attention of the Department of Immigration to a better way of selection than at present employed. The problem is a tremendous one and it would be quite unfair to attack the Department of Immigration for the oversight or cupidity of some shipping agents abroad.

I do not desire to read the whole paper, but it is worth reading and I draw it to the attention of hon. members of this house and of the Department of Immigration. A better supervision should be maintained of those who come to Canada; we should require something more than merely brawn, muscle or money.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think the hon. member wants to be unfair, but perhaps he does not know that any immigrant convicted of a crime within one year or perhaps within five years of his arrival in Canada is immediately deported.

Mr. ADSHEAD: That may be so, but the point is that they are deported after they have come here, and they should never be permitted to enter the country. If we knew the records of these immigrants and were able to find out their criminal records we would be able to stop them from entering the country.

Mr. FORKE: I am afraid I am delaying my own estimates, but every hon. member knows the complaints which are made continually with regard to asking too many questions of intending immigrants in Great Britain That whole scheme is intended to prevent just this sort of thing.

Mr. ADSHEAD: There you have the statement made at that convention, and I would suggest that the minister read the entire proceedings.

Mr. FORKE: I believe this association recommended that every man entering Canada should be finger-printed, and I want the house to imagine the feelings of any decent Englishman who may be required to have his finger-prints taken before he is allowed to enter the country.

Mr. ADSHEAD: There are other ways of finding out these things, but in the short time at my disposal I am not going to discuss them. Surely the minister will not say that the entry of these men cannot be prevented; I do not want him to leave that impression upon the house, because there are other methods.

Mr. FORKE: Was not that the recommendation of the Chief Constables' Association?

Mr. ADSHEAD: I did not say that. The minister wants me to read the entire report, but I think I have put enough on Hansard now.

My next point, Mr. Speaker, is this: As far as I am concerned and as far as those whom I represent are concerned, I do not believe the railway companies should have carte blanche to bring immigrants to Canada. Time and again in this house I have asked the minister with regard to immigrants from southeastern Europe, and he has told me in all sincerity and good faith that these men are coming to Canada to work on farms. The first year I was here I asked such a question; I did the same thing in my second year, and what happened? As soon as I reached home I found that the Czechoslovakians and others who had arrived in the city of Calgary were taking jobs at lower wages than were being paid other men, thus depriving Canadians of employment and lowering the standard of living. That sort of thing must stop. I do not know whether or not there will be any such trouble this year, but I would cancel the agreements with the railway companies under which they bring to Canada whatever people they desire.

Finally, I believe the provinces should be consulted with regard to the bringing of immigrants to Canada; indeed, I believe their consent should be obtained as well. At present no one is responsible for the immigrants entering this country; I have questioned immigrants who arrived in Calgary broke. When they were asked who brought them there they said, "the Department of Immigration." As far as I could find out, however, the province had nothing to say about it, yet we have to keep them or let them starve. I have on file a hospital bill for over $1,000 for the care of Czechoslovakians who have come to Calgary broke and ill, requiring hospital attention. We have had to pay for this care, but the province did not bring those immigrants there, and the Department of Immigration said there was no column in their ledger for that sort of thing. So we have had to pay the

bill; no one accepted any responsibility and we had to look after these people or let them die in the street. I say that responsibility for immigration to any province should rest somewhere and the provinces should be consulted and assume at least a partial responsibility.

My hon. friend from North Vancouver has proposed an immigration scheme under which ready-made farms will be provided for these people. Why does he not go to the province of Ontario and find out whether the Ferguson government will settle the farms in northern Ontario under his scheme?

I have represented things as I have seen them and I do not do it from any motive of factious criticism. As I said before, I have done this because I wanted to discuss some of the abuses I see in the system. I do it not because I dislike the Minister of Immigration but because I like Canada much beter. I hope that what I have said will produce some good results and bring forth an immigration policy which will be satisfactory to Canada and to all concerned.

Mr. JAMES A. GLEN (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, last year I had occasion to take an active part in the discussion which took place in the immigration committee, and as I remember that discussion it dealt more or less largely with the kind of immigration we were receiving rather than the numbers. The question of British immigration was taken up, and I certainly expected that when this amendment came before the house we should find in it some reference to the question of British immigration. But far from that, we find no reference other than these words:

—that men and women have, during recent months, been setled on western crown lands at great distances from transportation, educationa,l hospital and other necessary facilities, thereby making it almost impossible for them to achieve success and happiness in their new surroundings, and is of the opinion that such conditions can only be remedied by an immediate reorganization of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Not a word about what happened during the last session of the house; nothing with regard to the fiscal policy which was then stated as a means whereby immigration could be increased; nothing as to means of holding immigrants once they come here. The hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) discussed only the conditions pertaining in a certain portion of Canada, and he applied that principle to the whole of Canada. These gentlemen who are presumed to be connected with the big business interests are in the habit of dealing with mass production, and I think the hon. member for North Vancouver has been considering this question from the that viewpoint and has not given any consideration to the human element. Let me point out to the hon. member, and also to the house, that any scheme in connection with immigration to be successful must be considered from the human standpoint. All the hon. member seemed to want was that millions of men should be placed upon farms, farms improved at the expense of the whole Dominion. I would certainly not be in accord with that proposition in its entirety without considerably more information than the hon. member gives. He did not take into consideration the tremendous cost which would have to be incurred by this government and by the country in providing railways, roads and the social relations which must be maintained in the gathering in of these immigrants. And above and beyond all he did not take into consideration, as did the hon. member who has just taken his seat, the question of the provincial relationship. I agree entirely with the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) who states that no immigration policy can have any possible hope of success unless it is carried out with the consent and cooperation of the provincial governments. I do not think it is fair that the provincial governments should be saddled with a scheme without their being active cooperators in it.

I do not intend to deal at any great length with the amendment as introduced by the hon. member for North Vancouver, but I should like to refer to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). He gave us one of his characteristic, genial speeches which always seem to me to have somewhat of an edge in them. He referred, as I assume other speakers from the other side of the house will refer, to the question of protection as an aid to immigration. Members of the house will remember that that was the principal subject of the amendment moved last year by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan), namely, that unless we had the protection of industries in this country we could not hope to have any large immigration and the immigration could not be held here when it did come. The hon. member came to that policy towards the end of his speech and he said that we must have a proper policy, and then he mentioned the fiscal policy. If one considers the other statements made by the same hon. gentleman, one must realize that he means a fiscal policy of higher protection more in conformity with that which is followed in the country to the south.

I should like to read a despatch taken from a paper which published an article with reference to a country somewhat similar to our own in that it is a new British colony,

and therefore its problems are in some degree similar to ours—namely, Australia. Australia has adopted a definite policy with regard to immigration, a white policy, as we all know. They have had many inquiries with regard to immigrants coming into their country, and it would appear that they cannot get enough of them. In the Morning Post, published in London, England, the issue of April 20, 1929, there is an article to this effect:

Retarded Migration

Industrial Conditions in Australia

The report of the British economic mission to Australia, of which some details have already been published, was officially issued yesterday. The members were Sir Arthur Duckham, leader of the mission, Sir Hugo Hirst, Sir Ernest Clark, and Mr. Dougal Malcolm, none of whom had previously visited Australia.

It is stated in the report that the problem of migration from Great Britain to Australia requires special attention. "We are faced with the fact" the mission observed, "that while Australia's door remains wide open to any British subject who cares to pass through it, the total numbers of assisted migrants have in recent years shown a sensible decline."

Figures are given showing that, whereas in 1923 the total number of requisitioned and nominated migrants was 26,511, the number had dropped in 1928 to 22,299.

This diminution is accounted for by the fiscal and financial system and the industrial conditions of Australia and the high level of prices resulting from them, which it is stated "may not be conducive to migration."

"We have felt much force in the oft-repeated complaint," the report adds, "that successive increases in the tariff, which affect prices and the cost of living, following upon or being followed by successive advances in the cost of labour as the result of decisions under the Arbitration Acts, have involved Australia in a vicious circle of ever-ascending costs and prices, and that this condition of affairs is crippling Australia's progress and her power of supporting increased population."

The mission points out that there lies no task before the Australian people more urgent than that of in some way breaking the vicious circle, and of bringing down costs of production as is being done in other industrial countries of the world, without lowering the standard of living of the workers as measured not by money but by real wages, which are the reward of labour in the form of goods and services.

I know that hon. members would expect me to make that statement with regard to fiscal policy but I do not think they thought they would find in the Morning Post of London, England, that famous old family journal, a report which so strongly bears out the contention which I make, namely, that anything which increases the cost of production in a given country must necessarily mean a diminution in the number who come in to that country.

I do not believe that the hon. member for Fort William intended to convey a wrong impression with regard to the circular which he had received from the Saskatchewan section of the United Farmers of Canada. I have a copy of that resolution; it reads as follows:

Whereas this convention is opposed to the present method of securing immigrants;

Therefore be it resolved that we urge the federal government to appoint a national commission of inquiry with just representation thereon from organized labour and organized agriculture, that shall study the problem of immigration and assimilation from every possible angle, such commission to conduct public hearings to make provision for the attendance of representative witnesses whose testimony shall be taken under oath, and to report to parliament the conclusion reached by it and make such recommendations as in its judgment it may deem proper,—

This is the vital clause.

—and that pending the findings of such a commission, no further agreement shall be entered into by the federal government with the railroads after the present agreement has expired.

The meaning of that is that there was a considerable debate last year in the house and also in the committee with regard to the operations of the railway companies under that agreement. Everybody was satisfied that they had abused the provisions of that agreement, and the committee was unanimous that the agreement should be abolished or, at all events, modified. The last clause means that nothing should be done in order to bring in immigration without further inquiries being made.

Mr. BENNETT: No further agreement with the railways.

Mr. GLEN: They say:

No further agreement shall be entered into by the federal government with the railroads after the present agreement has expired.

I wish to deal with some of the phases of immigration as the department is faced with it. I have been reading recently an article taken from the Queen's Quarterly, a very authoritative journal, and the figures given in it are somewhat startling and will probably be of interest to the house. In connection with the question of British immigration, as to which we have heard no word to-night, I wish to refer to some of the facts given in that article in order to show why we do not have from Great Britain the immigration that we expect and hope for.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Who is the writer?

Mr. GLEN: The writer is not mentioned

Mr. FORKE: Professor McArthur.

Mr. GLEN: They say the reasons for non-immigration of British are as follows: The steamship fares now are three times what they were in previous days. Conditions in Canada have changed; there is a decreased supply of homestead and cheap land, and lack of railway construction comparable with pre-war days, the post-war agricultural depression and the greater use of machinery in agriculture, all affect immigration to Canada. There has also been a change in the social and economic structure of Britain. State insurance against unemployment, sickness and old age, until recent years had not become important. Young unmarried men, who constituted and still constitute the main portion of Canada's British immigrants, now form a relatively smaller proportion of the population than ever before. Only slightly more than a million are now engaged in agriculture. In 1851, one in four of the population was engaged in agriculture, while to-day the number is one in ten. There is no surplus of agriculturists. Three out of four of all occupied persons in Great Britain now follow indoor callings and the number is increasing. There are, broadly speaking, over 1,000,000 old age pensioners; two and a half million persons, or nearly 15 per cent of all occupied persons, are engaged in commerce, finance, insurance and clerical work, and nearly one million and a half, or 10 per cent of all occupied persons, are engaged in public or civil service. A further 5 per cent of the population are in receipt of some form of annuity other than old age pensions. These represent classes to which Canada can obviously make little or no appeal. The manual workers' class from which emigration to Canada has been recruited, constitutes about 50 per cent of the total occupied population. The increasing protection afforded to the worker by state insurance is a further bar to emigration. This is perhaps not fully appreciated in Canada. The moderately skilled workman makes comparatively small contributions to his trade union and the various schemes of state insurance. The employer as well as the state is compelled to contribute to these schemes. The worker is thus ensured against a reduction of his wage. He is insured against sickness, unemployment and old age. When he reaches the age of sixty-five, and if his wife is sixty-five or more, he is entitled to a pension of £1 per week on his own behalf and on that of his wife. In the event of his death his widow receives ten shillings per week for life, and smaller weekly sums to the children until they reach the age of fourteen.

These facts lead to the inescapable conclusion that we have in the old land only a limited number of people to whom we can appeal to come to this country, because, if the worker wishes anything, he wishes security in employment. He is getting that to-day as never before in the history of the old land, and as a consequence he is loath to take the risk of bringing his wife and family into a new country with all that that might involve.

Some mention has been made of restrictions placed upon immigration from the old land. The country generally does not really appreciate the fact that there are fewer restrictions on British immigrants under this regime and under the administration of the present minister than there have been for many years. Of course, where the government is paying part of the person's passage on the ground of his actual or intended occupation, there must be some inquiry to determine his occupational and other fitness for the assisted passage. This, however, is not a restriction. For the Britisher who pays his own way and is in good mental and physical health, there are absolutely no restrictions at all. He can go to a booking agency and buy his ticket to Canada without asking any person's leave. He does not require even a passport, while, on the other hand, no Britisher in this country can visit the mother country without one.

Mr. ADSHEAD: No character test?

Mr. GLEN: No. The British immigrant requires to be medically examined before he leaves his country, but this is a convenience rather than a restriction.

Mr. FORKE: One of the questions is: Have you ever been convicted?

Mr. GLEN: I presume that is what my hon. friend is referring to.

For the agricultural and domestic servant classes the ocean rate from the British Isles is £2, and children of agricultural families come free. All other British immigrants ordinarily resident in Great Britain or northern Ireland travel on a £10 ocean rate. In addition to passage assistance, every effort is made to attract British immigration, and it may surprise you to know that Canada receives more British immigrants year by year than any other country, not even excluding the United States. There is a popular notion that most of the British immigrants go to Australia and New Zealand, but this is not correct. During the last calendar year, out of a total assisted movement of 50,973 from the British isles to all parts of the empire, Canada assisted 29,196, or nearly 8,000 more than all other parts of the empire put to-

gether. According to figures presented last session to the committee on agriculture and colonization, the federal government expended an average of $16.67 on British immigrants as against 11 cents per capita for continental immigrants. If, therefore, the flow of continental immigrants is unduly large, it is certainly not because the federal government is spending money to attract them.

It is interesting to note the tremendous difference between continental immigrants and a British farmer. The fare of an immigrant from Antwerp to Winnipeg is $137.50, while the British farmer can travel the same distance in the same or greater comfort for slightly over $20, and all his children under 19 years travel free.

I have under my hand a table here which I shall ask the permission of the house to put on Hansard for the years from 1921 to 1928, showing the emigration from Great Britain (excluding departures from the Irish Free State from 1923 to 1928). These figures have been taken from the board of trade returns and demonstrate conclusively that Canada receives and has received more emigrants from Britain than any other country, including Australia, New Zealand and the United States.

The statement is as follows:

Emigration from United Kingdom

The following figures which have been taken from the Board of Trade returns show the total emigration from the United Kingdom to British North America, Australia, New Zealand, British South Africa, India and other parts of the empire: the United States and other foreign countries, for each of the years mentioned,—

—	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	Total
British North America	84,145	69,690	121,941	99,717	70,810	49,632	52,916	54,709	603,560
Australia / New Zealand	77,934	56,851	55,156	58,500	55,920	61,078	48,832	33,689	447,960
British South Africa	28,138	21,414	18,938	22,452	21,144	8,295	7,572	7,095	135,048
India and other parts of the empire	30,196	24,520	23,748	26,555	28,001	13,301	13,413	13,489	173,223
United States	67,499	61,826	101,063	39,057	54,898	28,740	25,662	22,345	401,090
Elsewhere	12,208	13,986	16,721	17,199	19,541	5,555	5,110	5,507	95,827

N.B.—From 1923 to 1928, the figures do not include departures from the Irish Free State.

I will now give the figures of British immigration, assisted passages and regular fare immigrants. They are as follows:

British Immigration—Assisted Passages and Regular Fare

Fiscal year	Assisted passage	Regular fare	Total	Harvesters who returned	Net
1923–24	3,639	69,280	72,919		
1924–25	8,558	44,620	53,178		
1925–26	8,442	29,127	37,569		
1926–27	20,248	30,130	50,378		
1927–28	24,889	26,663	51,552		
1928–29	23,575	35,305	58,880	−6,455	=52,425

The increase of approximately 150% of assisted migrants as between 1925–26 and 1926–27 was due to what is known as the £3 ocean rate which became effective on the 1st January 1926 and which was subsequently reduced to £2.

The above figures show that during the first three years covered by the assisted passage agreement, the large majority of British migrants paid the regular fare of £18–15–0, and that during 1926–27 when the £3 rate was in effect, there was an increase of approximately 150% of assisted migrants and a corresponding reduction of those who paid the regular fare. During 1927–28 when the £2 rate was in effect, there was a still further increase of those who received the assisted passage, and a corresponding decrease of those who paid the regular fare.

Mr. KELLNER: By "regular fare" does my hon. friend mean that anyone who was not coming here as a land settler would pay the regular fare or the special fare for settlers?

Mr. GLEN: By regular fare I mean the regular fare paid by anyone coming to this country.

Mr. JACOBS: The special rate applies only to British people. None but the brave deserve the fare.

Mr. GLEN: I do not wish to be understood that I am in favour of assisted passages because I agree with the hon. member for East Calgary that Canada is big enough and

good enough for people to come to without being assisted at all.

I wish to state a few facts which seem to be necessary with regard to continental immigrants.

The immigrant from non-preferred countries is subject to a passport regulation and an occupational or a relationship test. He too must be medically examined before sailing. It has been stated or, at all events, there is an impression, that the medical examination and the facilities are much poorer in the British isles than they are on the continent. The reverse of this is true. In the British isles the intending immigrant has never to go more than a few miles to find a doctor by whom be can be examined. We have Canadian doctors at all the ports of sailing, and we have several hundreds of British doctors called roster doctors scattered all through the British isles who also examine. The Britisher may go at any time within four months of sailing to be examined. He does not need to break up his home or make any arrangements for sailing before being examined. If he passes the examination he is given a medical card which is valid for four months. He does not pay a cent for the medical examination whether it is done by Canadian doctors or by roster doctors. All this expense is borne by the government.

On the continent we have medical officers at Paris, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Danzig and Riga. Medical examination of continental immigrants is conducted only at these ports. The continental immigrant cannot go to a doctor in his own country before sailing and obtain the Canadian medical examination. He can get it only at the port of sailing. He must go to the port some days before sailing takes place in order to give plenty of time for the examination. The difference in the medical examination itself certainly does not favour the continental. If British migrants had to go through the same form of medical examination as central Europeans go through at the ports of sailing, I can assure you that we would have very little British immigration. If the continental immigrants are not fit they are returned, so that if the immigrant has sold his place and has paid his fare for himself and his family to these ports, and then is found medically unfit, he can be turned right back at these ports.

In comparing non-preferred country immigration with British immigration it is necessary to call attention to the fact that the only immigrants admissible to Canada from non-preferred countries are:—

1. Agricultural families coming for land settlement.

2. Farm labourers.

3. Domestic servants, and the following relatives who are admitted on the ground of relationship apart altogether from the question of occupation: wives and unmarried children, and parents and unmarried brothers and sisters, of immigrants legally domiciled in Canada who are in a position to receive and care for their relatives.

In conformity with the requirements of the committee on immigration last year it was thought that some reduction should be made in the non-preferred immigration coming to this country, and there has accordingly been a limitation made by the department, under the railway agreement, restricting the non-preferred immigration to thirty per cent of the total movement of that class brought to Canada last year, which I am told amounts to about 11,000. This surely does not look like a preference in favour of the continental immigrant.

The total immigration figure for the fiscal year which ended the 31st March last was 167,722, made up of immigrants of the following origins:—

British	58,880
United States	30,560
Preferred countries	29,579
All others	48,703

I have a table showing the racial origins of all these immigrants, which has I think much interest for the house and the country, and if the house permits, I will place it on Hansard:

Statement showing how the Policy has worked out for the past three Years as shown in the Racial Origin of Immigrants

Statement of Immigration to Canada, by Origins, for the last Three Fiscal Years

—	1926-27			1927-28			1928-29		
	Via Ocean Ports	From U.S.A.	Totals	Via Ocean Ports	From U.S.A.	Totals	Via Ocean Ports	From U.S.A.	Totals
British—									
English	24,890	6,045	30,935	25,991	7,291	33,282	30,355	9,181	39,536
Irish	9,187	2,366	11,553	8,756	2,966	11,722	9,199	3,767	12,966
Scotch	14,296	2,432	16,728	14,341	2,856	17,197	16,137	3,453	19,590
Welsh	1,411	226	1,637	1,784	289	2,073	3,189	300	3,489
Totals	49,784	11,069	60,853	50,872	13,402	64,274	58,880	16,701	75,581
Northern European races—									
Belgian	2,080	69	2,149	2,171	78	2,249	1,222	79	1,301
Danish	2,030	225	2,255	3,835	284	4,119	3,311	351	3,662
Dutch	1,674	568	2,242	1,928	537	2,465	1,599	741	2,340
Finnish	5,180	88	5,268	4,765	112	4,877	3,651	100	3,751
French	548	2,499	3,047	868	3,138	4,006	745	3,934	4,679
German	12,540	2,681	15,221	12,032	3,190	15,222	12,806	3,803	16,609
Icelandic	30	32	62	28	18	46	24	23	47
Norwegian	3,384	1,255	4,639	4,327	1,330	5,657	2,434	1,419	3,853
Swedish	2,628	693	3,321	3,134	757	3,891	3,297	874	4,171
Swiss	568	101	669	614	134	748	490	156	646
Totals	30,662	8,211	38,873	33,702	9,578	43,280	29,579	11,480	41,059
Other races—									
Albanian	17	.....	17	30	3	33	28	7	35
Arabian	4	.....	4	6	1	7	1	1	2
Armenian	65	13	78	44	9	53	17	10	27
Austrian	401	129	530	606	153	759	409	100	509
Bohemian	22	85	107	7	67	74	8	86	94
Bulgarian	126	2	128	249	2	251	282	2	284
Chinese	2	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Croatian	1,085	2	1,087	902	5	907	990	24	1,014
Czech	721	7	728	714	13	727	846	5	851
Dalmatian	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1
East Indian	60	2	62	56	.....	56	52	1	53
Esthonian	92	.....	92	110	2	112	92	.....	92
Greek	340	45	385	583	72	655	736	70	806
Hebrew	4,471	392	4,863	4,296	470	4,766	3,301	547	3,848
Herzegovinian	3	.....	3	4	.....	4	.....	.....	.....
Italian	3,301	165	3,466	3,593	190	3,783	792	272	1,064
Japanese	475	.....	475	478	.....	478	445	1	446
Jugo-Slav	2,084	18	2,102	1,450	19	1,469	2,824	32	2,856
Korean	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Lettish	60	4	64	77	8	85	74	3	77
Lithuanian	842	6	848	1,037	15	1,052	1,608	18	1,626
Magyar	4,863	77	4,940	5,318	103	5,421	6,242	106	6,348
Maltese	33	1	34	39	1	40	18	1	19
Mexican	1	2	3	.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....
Montenegrin	5	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Moravian	36	.....	36	33	2	35	4	1	5
Negro	51	241	292	88	237	325	96	280	376
North American Indian	.....	13	13	.....	28	28	.....	23	23
Persian	6	.....	6	4	.....	4	1	.....	1
Polish	6,505	199	6,704	6,733	254	6,987	8,269	246	8,515
Portuguese	14	4	18	7	4	11	12	10	22
Roumanian	292	38	330	237	38	275	284	48	332
Russian	1,127	169	1,296	948	184	1,132	908	285	1,193
Ruthenian	9,995	66	10,061	10,128	61	10,189	15,571	39	15,610
Serbian	885	8	893	411	15	426	390	20	410
Slovak	4,274	10	4,284	3,714	20	3,734	4,303	40	4,343
Spanish	29	20	49	28	17	45	18	49	67
Spanish American	6	2	8	.....	.....	.....	3	4	7
Syrian	218	23	241	82	31	113	75	44	119
Turkish	8	2	10	4	2	6	3	4	7
Totals	42,520	1,745	44,265	42,016	2,027	44,043	48,703	2,379	51,082
Grand totals	122,966	21,025	143,991	126,590	25,007	151,597	137,162	30,560	167,722

There are certain things that should be asked of those who are dealing with the immigration question. In view of the agitation that took place in this country during the last year since the immigration committee sat, I think a statement should be made in this house as to what is being done and as to what we actually want in the matter of immigration.

I would ask what interests are most concerned with and clamouring for an open door policy in immigration? The answer is that most of the criticisms of any policy of restriction in any direction come directly or indirectly from interests which profit by the transport of immigrants.

What provinces are urging more immigration? The answer is, not one of the provinces is asking for more general immigration. I differ entirely from the hon. member for Fort William when he says that this whole country is asking for immigration; for I am satisfied that I speak for the three western provinces when I say that not a single organization there, except those who profit by the transportation of the immigrants, is asking for more immigrants. I know that some other hon. members will be able to corroborate what I say. It is an absolute fact that in the three prairie provinces there is no demand for immigrants except those who can come into this country with capital and, after landing, can maintain themselves.

Now, thirdly, if the labour situation in Canada is not being fairly met there will be an evident shortage of: (a) farm labour; (b) skilled and other industrial labour; (c) general unskilled labour. Is it true that an unhealthy shortage actually exists?

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. GLEN: The answer is that it is not true. At the beginning of the present month, May, 1929, reports from western Canada showed a surplus of labour in almost every centre of the west. At Prince Albert continental immigrants were offering to work as general labourers at $1 per day and board themselves.

It is not reasonable to expect that immigration should provide ample labour for the peak of the seasonal demand such as occurs annually in August and September, nor is it fair to hold that immigration should be reduced so as to prevent any unemployment at the other end of the scale during midwinter when seasonal labour is not in demand. It is necessary to avoid either of these extremes.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we recognize that Canada requires increased population. But no one will deny that in this stage of our development the governing factor shall be quality and not quantity. I think our department recognizes this factor in insisting upon the examinations, mental and physical, and, if you will, moral, which have been in practice for some time.

The efforts of the department to stimulate and primarily encourage British immigration into this British dominion, the house and the country will support. But with immigration there must of necessity be given instruction, care and assistance in the period of colonization, and, as I said at the outset, this work cannot be better performed than by the provinces and their units, the municipalities.

These are general principles, but I am satisfied of this, Mr. Speaker. Nothing has been said so far in the debate in condemnation of the policy of the Minister of Immigration during the past year. He has followed up entirely the recommendations made by the committee on immigration which sat last session, with one exception, the granting of homeseekers' fares from eastern to western Canada. I understand from the Passengers' Association that they did not think it was proper to make this concession. I think he has administered his department admirably, and he and his officials are entitled to a considerable amount of credit. I believe that but for the cry for purely British as against any other immigration we would have no amendment offered at the present time. Therefore I wish to give to the minister that meed of praise to which I think he is entitled for carrying out the recommendations of the immigration committee. I believe that the sound, sane policy pursued by the department to-day will be found to be the best for Canada in the long run.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): There is, Mr. Speaker, probably no question of a political nature that requires greater thought than this question of immigration. If we are going to carry on a policy of immigration, some valid reason should be given to the country. Yet I think there is no question so badly neglected by social workers, by statesmen and by the public generally than this great question.

To-day seemingly the government follows a policy which has been outlined by the directors of industries in our cities whose chief aim seems to be to direct great waves of human beings to this country for the sake of cheap labour, with the idea of exploiting their capabilities for labour and low living standards so that urban industry may be the better carried on.

Now, the material or monetary value of a multitude of human beings is perhaps the lowest conception we can have of the value of our immigrants. It is the very lowest conception of a movement on which we are spending millions of dollars each year to bring in people from Europe, the United States, and other parts of the world. Immigration is a failure as far as the increase in the values of land go, if that is the policy we have in mind. It might be a factor in increasing mass production in our cities, that is if mass production depends on the export of goods and the exploitation of the immigrants' ability to live on low wages, coupled with the fact that to-day all our export trade is carried on because the home consumer is paying prices for all manufactured goods that insures a profit over the whole output.

Agriculture can no longer carry the burden of urban industry, but that seems to be the reason to-day for the advocacy of a vigorous immigration policy. If that is what we are doing, then I say we are piling up wrath against the day of wrath, because artificiality in trade sooner or later must be reckoned with. To-day the United States government is face to face with the result of its own policy. The concentration of wealth has gone forward in that country with such acceleration as to render necessary direct aid to their millions of farmers. I want to warn our government that through a false fiscal policy we have brought about an unstable condition in the industry of agriculture in Canada. That is, urban industry is fast destroying agricultural industries, and also it is destroying community life in our rural areas.

But to return again to land values. If that was the idea of immigration, I want to say it is the development of a community life which increases the value of land. I do not think we can afford lightly to pass over the facts as they face us to-day. First, let us be sure what is the purpose of this nation in spending many millions of dollars to bring in millions of human beings, whom, I am sure, under present conditions it will be impossible for us to absorb in our social and economic life, under our present fiscal system. It is a thorough insight into actual facts and forces with recognition of their bearing upon what makes life worth living that constitutes the true foundation of national life. Woodrow Wilson, not long before he died, said:

> All this country needs,—
>
> Speaking of the United States.
>
> —is a new and sincere thought in politics coherently and distinctly uttered by men who are sure of their ground.

President Wilson was conscious that something was wrong, that something was needed in the national life of the United States to offset the selfish attitude of those who at that time not only completely controlled industry and credit—and credit particularly to the agriculturist—but controlled the government of the United States as well. Let me say that practically speaking Canadian urban industry has been built up on the same sort of selfishness, which is ruining the agricultural life of the country to-day and making necessary a policy of immigration. It is destructive of rural life because it drives the virile and what should be the contented farmer, or the farmer's sons and daughters, into the city. If we are going to carry on an active immigration policy for the one purpose of filling our vacant lands, then let us do first things first; and the first thing to do is to find out that farming can be carried on in such a way as to justify our placing on the land an immigrant with the average capital and ability which immigrants have. Those of us in this house who know most about farming can come to only one conclusion on this whole matter: You cannot make farming pay to-day, either in eastern or in western Canada, unless it is carried on on a large scale. The farmer who is going to be successful in Canada must now be a real capitalist himself. This is why I say that to bring in working people to make homes on the land is a useless policy for the government to pursue; all it can do is to provide cheap labour for urban industry. These industries are controlled by a class of people who admit that they cannot live except by class privilege. They must therefore live by exploiting their workers and the rest of the population. Through high prices this policy has made it impossible to carry on and to compete in world's markets. But the farmer has to compete against the cheap labour of the whole world, and were agriculture to-day to be treated as other industries are treated, if it were possible to do so, you could not keep people off the land wherever there was a farm to be got. It is because of our false economic and fiscal policy that immigration proves to be so futile.

I come now to another point which is bound to create some concern and which the government is bound to take note of sooner or later if our immigrants are to be settled on the land to any great extent by educational and financial aid. I want to ask: What is to be done with the product? Will the government of this country have to undertake to guarantee a price in the market for agricultural produce if raised in much greater quantities than it is to-day? That has already

become necessary, seemingly, in the United States; direct aid there has become essential to the agriculturist. But why do we blindly follow the same policy, as we are doing, without considering the consequences that are bound to ensue? For many years past we have listened to the fatuous argument of the protected interests about creating a home market for agricultural products. This is perhaps the most stupid argument ever put forth to get the agriculturist population to vote for class privilege. Now before you put forth a plea for immigration, I repeat that farming cannot be carried on to-day without large capital. Let me ask this question of those who are urging a policy of immigration: Will they undertake to provide work for all who come? Will each undertake to provide employment for a given number? Since the country is guaranteeing profits to urban industries, will they take care of the labour which they advocate we should bring in from other countries? I should like, too, to hear what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) has to say on this question. Will he say now how many workers are needed—workers whom Canada cannot supply at the present time? So far as I can find out, there was a surplus of labour in every city this spring throughout Canada. The argument put forth to-day is this: we need immigration to make Canada prosperous. The policy evidently is to fill up the vacant lands much further north than we have already done. Will the government, let me ask, take the produce then from the farmer's hands at a profit and treat the agriculturist as we are now treating the capitalist, ensuring a dividend to all expended capital each year? And, indeed, not only invested capital but watered stock, on which the public is expected to pay dividends but which drives prices away out of line with world's markets. All our urban industries are waterlogged, and we give to the capitalist and the industrialist the privilege of fleecing the consumer to pay dividends on this watered stock.

There would be no need of an immigration policy to-day if the agriculturist were treated as he ought to be and the burden of urban industry taken off his back. Now last August —on August 14, 1928—there was a conference in Saskatoon among the United Farmers of Canada and the women's section of that institution, the Canadian Legion, the Saskatoon Trades and Labour Council and the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan, and they were all unanimous in opposing the present immigration policy of this government. They urged in a resolution, passed unanimously there, that the government appoint a commission to inquire into the need or otherwise of immigration, and that the commission report here before any policy of the kind be followed.

I want to deal with one or two things in connection with what the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) has said. He says that the question is of great importance and, further, that matters are not very satisfactorily carried on; in fact, he says that the government's policy has been a failure. He says that we have in Canada three and a half millions of square miles filled with natural resources which need to be developed. Yet he himself has repeatedly, even this session, advocated a policy that fleeces every inhabitant in that great area to provide a living for those who choose to live in a very small area in Quebec and Ontario and who admittedly must have special privilege before they can exist, not having the initiative to go into these great areas where these natural resources are to be found and to develop them and this country, as the hon. member advocates.

Then the hon. member said we could take many more people of all kinds, and I was glad to hear him make that statement. In answer I want to say that what Canada needs most is a group of business men who will invest capital in industry without first linking up with the politicians as the one essential to going into business in Canada. We want a group of business men who can carry on by their own industry and ability without coming here to seek a special privilege which places an unjust burden upon the whole population. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Fort William put forth that argument.

The hon. member doubted the statement of the Minister of Immigration with regard to prosperity. I want to say that if the wealth in Canada to-day were properly distributed we all would be able to feel something of the prosperity which is said to be prevalent throughout the country. However, the class for which the hon. member speaks does not care to develop the natural resources of this country with their own earnings; they prefer to invest their money in foreign countries. To-day we have invested in foreign countries over $1,700,000,000 of Canadian money, the earnings of our agriculturists and others, taken out of their pockets by high prices and high rates of interest, yet those who are concentrating our wealth in the hands of the few do not see fit to put their money back into the development of their own country. That is why we need a policy of immigration; that is why our people are leaving the land, and for one I wish to protest to-night against an immigra-

tion policy under which the government brings in peasants from central Europe to take our places when, under present conditions, we cannot live on the land. These are facts we must face, and I want this house to face them squarely.

The hon. member spoke about sheep raising; he said there were twenty-six million sheep in Great Britain, and the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. McLean) interjected that those sheep were raised in that small area without protection. The hon. member for Fort William replied that this was the case because England is the greatest cloth-producing country in the world. Why is that so? Why cannot Canada be, in proportion, an equally great cloth-producing country? The reason is that our false fiscal policy has driven the cost of manufacturing cloth entirely out of line with world prices and we are unable to compete in the markets of the world except by placing the burden upon the agriculturists and workers of this country. Our policy of trade penalties has so driven the cost of production out of line with world prices that we cannot compete in world markets. The labourer and the mechanic, through proper organization, to some extent have raised their wages to meet the high cost of living, but that is something the agriculturist cannot do; he must accept world prices. We have an object lesson today in the United States, where the farmers are calling for direct aid; and what about our own maritime provinces? Even they need direct aid to-day; they cannot live without such aid. Why is that necessary? It is necessary because the cost of manufacture and distribution is such that those who are now producing the greatest part of the national income, the agriculturists, fail to stay on the land and make their permanent homes there.

Again, the hon. member said he wants to keep our young people in our own country, but in my opinion before we can do that we must keep our own money here to develop our natural resources. You cannot take the money out of the pockets of the agriculturists through high prices and high rates of interest and invest it in foreign countries, and at the same time expect our young men to remain in Canada. Of those who have claimed for many years to have a monopoly of patriotism I would ask if they consider it a patriotic act to invest over $1,700,000,000 of Canadian money in foreign countries and then bring in from southern Europe immigrants who are accustomed to a lower standard of living and who work for lower wages. Is that reasonable? We must face first things first; let those who advocate a policy of immigration be consistent in what they say and do.

The hon. member for Fort William also said that cheap countries are poor countries. Canada is not a cheap country, but I venture to say that the average worker in Canada to-day is no better off than the average worker in any other country, particularly countries such as Denmark and Holland. The United States is not a cheap country; it is not a country of low prices. We have been advised by every advocate of protection in this house to follow the policy of the United States, but to-day the farmers of that country are at their wits' end; they are at the end of their tether and they can go no further until aid is given. President Hoover was elected on his promise of agricultural aid.

I merely desired to place some of these ideas before the house, particularly since the hon. member for Fort William did the same thing in a very passionate speech. I want to warn this house that a vigorous immigration policy is not suited to Canada at present. We have plenty of farmers and we appear to have plenty of workers, and unless the government will face this question of finding markets and finding work for all immigrants I think we should be very careful of the class and quantity of people we bring to this country.

Mr. M. J. MALONEY (South Renfrew): I should like to say a few words in connection with this very important matter, but before doing so I might mention that I was very much struck by the speech of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Glen). In that connection I might report a rumour which I am sure will bring joy to the heart of the Minister of Immigration and at the same time consternation to the hearts of many hon. gentlemen from the western provinces who for some years have stood solidly behind the government. The rumour is that my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) is about to be raised to the dignity of a senatorship and that his successor in the cabinet as Minister of Immigration will be the hon. member for Marquette.

An hon. MEMBER: Either of them would be good.

Mr. MALONEY: If that is the intention of the government, I do not think the selection will secure for this country an adequate supply of immigrants, and that is very unfortunate indeed. After hearing the hon. member for Marquette I was struck by the fact that you

could not tell whether he favoured bringing immigrants into the country or keeping them out. There is one thing I will say for him, he was honest in many of his declarations. He stated that in various sections of western Canada there were men who were willing and ready to work for a dollar a day and board themselves. If that is the fact, can that be considered as a strong advertisement to induce the outsider to come here and seek a home in Canada? What a sad commentary on the efficiency of the present government!

The question of immigration has been dormant throughout this present session; nothing has been heard of it until to-day. This seems all the more significant in view of the fact that last session it was perhaps the most important of all topics discussed by the house. It was a topic which engaged the attention of a very important committee of members of the House of Commons, men who sat day after day, week after week, taking evidence from every part of the country. They had before them men of science, men of everyday walks of life, men who are at the head of our great industrial organizations and transportation systems. They all told their story and it was all taken down. Their evidence was aimed at the one point, that increased immigration would be the salvation of this country. What has become of the labours of that committee? All this evidence has been pigeon-holed and carefully hidden away in some obscure government office, resting side by side with many other abortions which may be laid at the door of the present government. What a sad disappointment it is to those people of Canada who had the high hope, after hearing of the extensive investigations of that committee, that this question of immigration was about to be definitely settled for all time to come. What a disappointment there must be in the hearts of the people of Canada when they consider the attitude of the government in connection with that matter.

How different is the attitude of the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae). He brings forth a bold, advanced scheme, remembering as he does that we in this country have stupendous resources as well as staggering liabilities. The hon. member realizes that we require men and women of the right type to assist us in developing and exploiting those resources but who will be willing to share the liabilities with us. Realizing that fact, the hon. member presented a bold and advanced plan for the colonizing of this country. Right at this point I beg to extend to him my very sincere congratulations on the magnificent effort which he put forth this afternoon. He spoke because of personal contacts; he depicted the possibilities of that section as perhaps few members of this house would be able to do. He had confidence in his argument, and I for one see much of merit in what he had to say because I believe his project would solve many of the difficulties now confronting the people of Canada in the matter not only of provision for future immigrants but also of providing occupations for those who are now here.

I believe that people of the right type, no matter where they come from, are the most desirable for Canada at the present time. There is one phase which strikes me more forcibly than any other in connection with the problem of immigration, and that is the bringing back to this country of those of our sons and daughters who are to-day living outside of Canada and earning a living away from home. The most important aspect of the whole immigration question is that which has to do with the repatriation of our fellow Canadians who are now living in the United States. Our population to-day is estimated at about 9,500,000. Consider the fact that at least half as many more are residing outside of Canada; almost 5,000,000 Canadian people are to-day living in the United States. That is a very pathetic condition. Our every effort should be bent in endeavouring to recover those who have gone from our shores, but up to the present we see no evidence of any improvement so far as that phase of the question is concerned. It is true that the Minister of Immigration quoted figures; it is true that he haggled for two or three minutes on the figures of some 25,000 Americans who had come here and some 30,000 Canadians who had returned. They came back, but for a visit only. More than half of those he mentioned stayed here for two or three weeks with the old people at home and then returned to the United States with a brother or sister for whom they had procured employment. During the last seven years we have lost 240,000 more than our total immigration for the same period. During that period 962,000 immigrants entered Canada; in other words, we lost 1,200,000 people in the last seven years. Where did they go to? In looking over a monograph issued by the Department of Commerce of the United States I find that French-Canadians comprise 33.1 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state of Maine; they comprise 42 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state of New Hampshire; and they comprise 31.8 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state

of Vermont. The French-Canadians are our greatest colonizers, and we have allowed them to escape from Canada, their native home, to settle in a foreign land. Why should that be? These men and women should be back here in Canada and to that end our every effort should be bent. The same thing applies to Canadians who are not of French extraction. That class of Canadians comprise 35.9 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state of Maine, 15.3 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state of New Hampshire, and 24 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state of Vermont. Take the totals: Canadians as a whole comprise 69 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state of Maine, 57.3 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state of New Hampshire, and 55.8 per cent of the foreign-born white population of the state of Vermont.

If we go farther west we find that the border states from New York right through to the Pacific coast are filled with our sons and daughters. That is a pathetic situation. Why should it exist? It has been said here to-day, and it has been said before, that the attraction of the larger for the smaller body may have something to do with the situation. In other words, the force of gravity comes into operation, but for the benefit of those who reason in that way I would say that there is another physical law, another physical force greater even in its application, its might, than is the great force of gravity. I refer to the force of cohesion, that force which binds and holds together the various units of any body. The Canadians who are now in the United States are bound to us by that power of cohesion. They cherish the land of their birth; the years of their childhood days are ever before them. They are our own flesh, blood and bone; why should we not make every effort to have them return?

It is said that population depends greatly on subsistence; that wherever we have the most food suitable for sustaining the human race, there we find the greatest congregations of people. It is said that the people in those sections are happy in proportion to the quantity of food which a day's labour will procure. If that be a correct statement, why should Canada not be filled from end to end with the very best type of citizens selected from all over the world? Here we have a country independent economically of the rest of the whole, wide world; no other country on the face of the earth is more independent economically than is the great Dominion of Canada. We can, if we so desire, live within ourselves for all time; we do not have to depend for our existence on any other nation, and yet when the Hawley-Smoot proposals were laid before the congress of the United States a short time ago, the comments made thereon by some of our citizens were somewhat perturbing. We had for example our good Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), when he heard the news of what the proposals meant to the people of Canada, reported by the newspapers as shouting: "Good cheer, we shall survive." Of course we shall survive. We shall survive in spite of the Hawley-Smoot proposals. We shall survive in spite of the inaction of the government in the matter. Let me say that the worm will turn some day; the farmer of Canada who is to-day the under-dog will, just as soon as there is a change of government in this country, come into the position which is his, namely, a position of prosperity. The minister must feel that, had our friends to the south gone further and imposed a little extra tariff in addition to that which they have proposed, they would have crushed us out of existence; that we are dependent on them almost completely. Has it come to this, that a country situated and endowed as ours is to feel that it is dependent on any foreign power? Has it come to this, that we, free men of Canada, are compelled to turn the other cheek and say to those of our competitors who see fit to impose trade barriers against us: If you do not increase the tariff too greatly, we shall survive. Such an attitude of mind on the part of our statesmen is sufficient to make any Canadian's red blood boil. I submit that is a condition which should be remedied by the government of this country.

The United States of America had their immigration problem just as we have ours. In 1810 the population of the United States was 8,000,000. In 1812 a war which broke out forced that nation to fall back on their own resources and to manufacture that which they needed for themselves. The result was a tremendous advance in industry in that country, and with that advance and growth of industry there occurred an accompanying development and opening up of new lands. It is a positive fact that during almost three-quarters of the last century the United States of America absorbed more than 30,000,000 unassisted immigrants, men, women and children. Why? Because the immigrants followed prosperity; with the industrial and agricultural development which took place after the war of 1812, the trend of immigration could not be stopped. The result was that in a comparatively brief period more than 30,000,000 people came into that country

unassisted. There is in this a very striking lesson for our own country. The population of Canada to-day compares with that of the United States of a century ago. We have in our possession to-day resources which perhaps they did not have in those days, resources which are superior in many respects to those possessed by the United States. We must do what the United States did after the war of 1812, namely, manufacture our own raw products in our own country and import raw materials to manufacture for our own use as required instead of exporting to the United States and other foreign countries hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of raw or semi-raw products to be manufactured abroad, bringing work, comfort and happiness to men and women of a foreign nation rather than our own. Let us manufacture these products at home: let us give that work to the boys and girls of this country; let us increase our population as the United States did theirs after 1812, and then Canada will not require any government assistance in regard to immigration. If conditions such as these were brought about, among the first to return to Canada would be many of the 5,000,000 Canadians who are to-day south of the line, men and women who can never forget the old home ties, who are looking longingly to Canada, their home, awaiting an opportunity to come back and better themselves.

This government has never made an honest effort to aid immigration; in fact, on the other hand, it has apparently done what it could, without too much publicity about it, to impede immigration. The Minister of Immigration and his prospective successor spoke in the house this afternoon and evening, and yet we cannot honestly say whether they are prepared to receive immigration or whether they are anxious to keep it out. They are marking time. That is not what we desire in Canada. As a matter of fact, the whole history of this government has been against bringing immigrants to Canada. I notice in the Hansard of March 20, 1923, a statement quoted that was made by the Minister of the Interior. He said:

> What is the use of bringing people to this country if they cannot exist?

That was a fine advertisement for this great Dominion of Canada, coming from the lips of an important member of the government. If he held those views in 1923, they must of necessity be greatly accentuated at the present time because conditions in Canada to-day are less favourable for the ordinary individual than they were in 1923. Take agriculture, for instance. The position of the farmer in this country is not an enviable one.

[Mr. Maloney.]

Let me read a short extract from a speech delivered by Captain John D. Cameron, of the Canadian Pacific Railway colonization department. Speaking a few weeks ago in this city he said:

> He had recently surveyed old Ontario and he was amazed to find rural figures in many places now stood lower than they did before confederation. The rural population of Oxford county was 40,969 before confederation, and now was only 23,342.

That is in Oxford county, the garden of the great province of Ontario. If the farming population of the county of Oxford has become depleted to that extent, surely the government should take heed and do something to remedy the conditions. What has the government done to encourage the farmer? What has it done to encourage the young men and the young women to stay on the farm? What has it done to make farming more profitable and more pleasant? Has it done a solitary thing to aid the farmers? It did do one thing. By order in council, passed without the sanction of parliament and without the consent of the people, the government entered into an agreement with New Zealand under which thirty million pounds of New Zealand butter were brought in last year, thousands of tons of beef and lamb, and at the same time millions and millions of dozens of eggs were allowed to come in from the United States and China, all of which were thrown on the open markets of this country to come into competition with the produce of the Canadian farmer. Is it any wonder that the rural population of the great county of Oxford has become rapidly depleted, as shown by the statement of Captain Cameron? The farmer who works from early morning till late at night will, I am sure, appreciate the fact that the government has allowed one of his competitors seven thousand miles away from here to ship in his produce almost free of duty—the very products that the Canadian farmer is endeavouring to supply.

If the scheme proposed by my hon. friend for North Vancouver should go into effect it would relieve the situation to a considerable extent. It would, in the first place, apply to our Canadians, something which no scheme brought forward by this government up to the present time has done. It would give the farmer and the farmer's sons in eastern Canada and in western Canada the right to take advantage of the privileges which this scheme offers. It would give to our Canadian boys in the United States who are to-day anxious to get home an opportunity to return and start life on the farm in this great western

country. It would relieve the unemployment situation to a great extent. It would repatriate many of our citizens. It would bring happiness to a great many of the citizens of this country.

If we want immigration we must improve conditions. We must make Canada a country fit to live in, a country which will attract the better elements from all over the world. To do that we must have a complete change of front on the part of our government.

In the first place, to be prosperous and happy and to attract immigrants to our shores, we must manufacture our raw materials at home. We must bring in raw materials to manufacture for our own purposes where required. We must preserve the home market for our farmers; we must preserve the home market for our industrialists. We must make Canada the greatest producing nation on earth, and when we have accomplished that let us see to it that markets are found throughout the length and breadth of the world. When these conditions are brought about Canada will have no need of a minister of immigration and no need of an immigration policy, for immigration will flow to us, unsolicited, from all sides.

Mr. W. E. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in view of the constructive suggestions that have been offered from this side of the house and the criticism that has been made of the Department of Immigration, I feel that I must confine my observations to a very limited time.

Probably one of the most fundamental problems affecting the growth of a young country is that which relates to immigration. The keen interest that the Canadian people have taken in this great problem is indicated by the comment and continued criticism of the public press, the churches, societies of various kinds, organized business interests—not the least among which have been the two great transportation systems in Canada—as well as criticism by the opposition party which sits to your left, Mr. Speaker, in this house. We have indeed a real problem on our hands. Lack of interest in it has been shown by the inactivity, dire neglect, and stagnant attitude of the present administration. Since they came into power they have talked of unbounded prosperity. They have received proposals of assistance from the British government, which has set aside $225,000,000 to assist the emigration of the unemployed in Great Britain to the British dominions. During all these years the government of Canada has been jostling about this Department of Immigration, letting it grow daily weaker and weaker like an illegitimate child crying for adoption. In 1922, when this government came into power, immigration and colonization was thrown into the Department of the Interior, under the careful management of the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). In 1924-25, the department for a while was taken care of by the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb). Afterwards it was taken care of for a time by the Hon. Mr. Low, and later, in 1925, just prior to the election, it was loaned for a time to the Hon. Mr. Gordon, the then member for West Peterborough, afterwards sadly defeated in that riding. In 1926 it was again thrown into a corner of the Department of the Interior, under the tender care of the present Minister of the Interior. In 1926, when this great ship of state set out to sea, the department was used as a political lifebuoy to pick up the then drifting captain of the Progressive boat. We find that he had with him in these stormy waters the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) as first mate.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. gentleman has missed one minister of immigration.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A minister for two months.

Mr. ROWE: He was in just as long as the Hon. Mr. Gordon, in fact a little longer. I thought probably the Minister of Immigration was going to deny that the member for Lisgar was his first mate in the old Progressive boat. He has drawn my attention to another feature. I have been looking through this little red book which gives a record of the members of this house. I find that the Hon. Mr. Forke is listed here as a Progressive. Then I recall those days when the right hon. Prime Minister, in answer to a question by the then leader of the opposition as to what kind of cabinet he was going to form, stated emphatically across the floor: No member will join my cabinet unless he is a straight out-and-out Liberal. This book was printed in 1929—this year. I pause for a moment to ask the Minister of Immigration whether he sits in this house as a Liberal-Progressive or as a Liberal.

Mr. FORKE: I was nominated in the city of Brandon by a Liberal convention.

Mr. BENNETT: Following the Progressive convention.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A good combination.

Mr. ROWE: Then I will pass this book across to the Minister of Immigration for revision. I well remember the occasion when

in the city of Toronto he declared himself in these words: I am not only a Progressive, I am an advanced Liberal. So I could scarcely understand how he was elected as a Liberal-Progressive in the last election. However, this red book shows that he was elected a Progressive in September 1926, and on November 2, 1926, he was nominated as a Liberal-Progressive candidate and reelected. Apparently there are grave errors in this red book. I have no doubt that his friends on this side of the house who followed him so loyally through those years will be satisfied with his declaration that he no longer wishes to bear their name.

While, Mr. Speaker, we have had no lack of schemes proposed in the immigration department, those schemes have never been put into execution. Since this government came into power we have had eight speeches from the throne enunciating six different policies on immigration; in two years there was no policy set forth. In 1922 the speech from the throne contained this pronouncement: We must have a renewal of effort on the part of the Immigration department in order to bring in an increased number of immigrants. In 1923 the speech from the throne contained this statement: We must have a wide expansion, a new publicity program, a program to reach throughout the empire and also into the United States and other foreign countries. In 1924 there were two or three changes of ministers and no policy. In 1925 the speech from the throne contained another pronouncement on immigration. In that year we on this side of the house recall the manufacture of that famous phrase "The high cost of living". It was discovered that the only relief for this condition was greater production, and that the only way to bring this about was to increase the flow of immigration. Therefore the government decided that efforts must be made to increase immigration to bring about that greater production, and incidentally to extend the settlement of crown lands, with special consideration of the Peace River district. In 1926 the speech from the throne stated that in view of the favourable conditions prevailing in the Dominion the government had formed a new and comprehensive immigration policy, and as a corollary the government proposed a broad repatriation scheme by way of rural credits and other benefits to the country districts. In 1927, although six new ministers had been appointed since 1921, the then holder of the portfolio started the year without any policy at all. But in 1928 another new policy was announced. The speech from the throne stated: We must have cooperation with the different provinces, we must pass the responsibility on to the provincial authorities, and we are now going to make a definite attempt to bring in British youths under a special settlement scheme. In the speech from the throne this session, in pursuance of the recommendations of the committee on immigration and colonization, we were to enter into an arrangement with the different provinces to bring to Canada juvenile immigrants who were to be strictly selected for their adaptability as settlers with a view to promoting general prosperity throughout the Dominion.

Now, after all this publicity, after six years with programs announced and two years without any at all, we find the Minister of Immigration still drifting peacefully on the quiet waters of government inactivity. To-day we realize that the government of Canada has practically no immigration policy. It is not much wonder that through all this confusion we have the present stagnation in immigration. Illuminating figures have been placed on Hansard to-night. Everyone throughout the Dominion realizes that the flow of immigration has been changed almost to a flow of emigration; tens of thousands of our best sons and daughters have left their native land for the United States. I venture to say that in the New England states to-day there are almost as many French Canadians as there are, Mr. Speaker, in your native province. We have heard supporters of the government state to-night that they do not want any more immigration. They are prepared to concede that Canada needs a few more of the right class, a few "hand-picked" immigrants. I submit that while they are hand-picking those immigrants the department will have no time for any other activities. In fact the real work of the department will stagnate as usual.

On motion of Mr. Rowe the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, May 23, 1929

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill No. 309, respecting The Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Dominion of Canada General Insurance Company."—Mr. Geary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Twelfth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Brown.

Twelfth report of the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. —Mr. Cahill.

Seventh report of the select standing committee on standing orders.—Mr. Morin (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville).

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

REFUND OF FEES AND CHARGES

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac): With the leave of the house I would move, seconded by Mr. Neill:

That the recommendation contained in the twelfth report of the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines respecting refund of fees and charges, less the cost of printing and translation, of Bill No. 40 to incorporate the Montreal Underground Terminal Company, be concurred in.

This is merely to enable the promoters of the bill to have the fees refunded to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course that money must be voted by the house because the moment the money is deposited with the officers of the house and the bill does not pass, the money automatically goes back to the receiver general.

Mr. CAHILL: The motion is to refund the money.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would say: Stand.

Mr. CAHILL: Why should it stand? I think it has been the custom to make a motion of this kind in the past.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

Motion stands.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. GEORGES BOUCHARD (Kamouraska) moved:

That the select standing committee on the printing of parliament be given leave to sit while the house is in session.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Antigonish-Guysborough) moved:

That the select standing committee on marine and fisheries be given leave to sit while the house is in session.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford): I beg to move:

That the recommendations contained in the second report of the select standing committee on industrial and international relations presented to the house on May 1st last be concurred in.

Mr. BENNETT: I think that should stand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand? Notice has been given.

Mr. McINTOSH: Notice of this motion has been given since May 1, and I think it has stood long enough. I am ready to go on with this motion to-day.

The report presented to the house by the committee on industrial and international relations on the first day of May, and printed in the votes and proceedings of May 1, No. 52, is a report based on a resolution adopted by this house on February 14. That resolution, after adoption by the house, was sent to the committee for investigation and report, the committee being instructed to investigate and report on insurance against unemployment, sickness and invalidity. The house will remember that last year this same resolution was before the committee on industrial and international relations, and last year's report was adopted by the house on June 6th. That report is of importance at the present time.

Before entering into an analysis of last year's report, I should like to say on behalf of the committee of which I am chairman that we have done our best during the last two years to unravel this complicated question and bring in a report that would be favoured by the house. If there is any fault to find with the report I believe that it can be traced to the fact that the resolution which was before the house was not considered seriously enough before being sent on to the committee. I believe the committee has done excellent work. I am not speaking for myself as chairman of the committee, but I believe that we have given to the resolution all the time, care and study that was possible. Lord Disraeli once said that man has been made to adore and obey. I do not know about the adoration so far as this committee's work is concerned, but I do know that the committee has tried to obey the instructions of the house, to investigate and report on a very difficult question, one of the most technical questions that can come before any committee of the house. There is more than one viewpoint to consider when ex-

amining a question of this kind. It needs not only vision to see the problem in hand, but a little sentiment also to warm up to a resolution of that nature, and then it is for the committee to do its best in an executive way to bring in a report that will be satisfactory to the house and to the country.

Hon. members will notice that in the treaty of Peace, in section 1 of part XIII, dealing with labour and the question of universal peace, the statement is made, and I believe it is true, that if we want universal peace in the world it must be based on social justice. If we are to have social justice we must pay attention to some of the fundamentals of labour.

The preamble of this labour section of the treaty of peace first of all deals with a number of important questions affecting labour. It speaks of the injustice and hardship surrounding, for instance, the control of labour; secondly, of insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity and old age; thirdly, of the necessary organization and association to bring labour problems before the public; it also deals with the special need for vocational and technical education. These are some of the labour problems that we must face if we are to solve the problems of the labour world and do social justice to all in need in order to bring about national and international peace. They are ideas which concern the justice of labour, and must be carried into effect if humanity is to play its part in solving problems of this kind.

The report that was presented to the house last year was divided into numerous parts. The committee took the stand, in the first place, that unemployment is an important national problem, and a problem that must be faced and solved if we are to solve the problems of the labour world during the next few years. We cannot dodge the issue; we must face it provincially and nationally. Some hon. members may think that a resolution of this kind is not very important, but it is bound to assume more and more importance as the years pass by.

In the second clause of last year's report the committee took a square stand on the question of unemployment insurance; that is, insurance against unemployment based on compulsory contributions by the employer, the employee, and the state. The next clause in that report, which was adopted by the house on June 6th last year, places the responsibility for unemployment insurance upon the different provinces. It was a question that the committee considered to be one of provincial jurisdiction.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

The committee next drew attention to the fact that in Canada we have not got the necessary data upon which to base the approximate cost of an unemployment insurance scheme in Canada, and it asked the Labour department at Ottawa to get to work during the ensuing year and do its best to provide that data.

The other clause in the report was to the effect that the committee would like to reinvestigate the question this session. We have spent one or two months on this work.

The resolution this year again deals with insurance against unemployment, sickness and invalidity. The report presented a few days ago to a large extent covers the same ground as the report of last session, with one or two new features.

The committee, after investigating as far as possible the subject matter of the resolution, took pretty much the same ground as I have mentioned, last year, that insurance against unemployment should be based on a compuulsory foundation. Since the matter is one of provincial jurisdiction, and since all the provinces last year were notified of the report of the committee and replied that they were not ready to take any action, the present committee recommended: that the Department of National Health be asked to initiate a comprehensive health program by cooperating with the provincial and municipal health departments; that in the forthcoming census provision be made to register all unemployment and sickness in Canada, and that when that data is secured it should be compiled and published as quickly as possible; that when the next provincial-federal conference is held, the Dominion government should invite the representatives of organized labour and of organized industry to be present to discuss the subject matter of the report.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the present report to a large extent follows the lines of that presented last year; they have certain points in common. Briefly, both recommend compulsory contributions from the state, the employer and the employee. As the subject matter falls within the competency of the provincial authorities, the committee recommends that action be taken by the legislatures of the respective provinces. The committee recognizes the importance of securing all the data possible on sickness insurance.

This is a very important problem, Mr. Speaker, and the time has now arrived when the report of the committee should be concurred in by the house or rejected. I believe that many hon. members may not be cog-

nizant of the subject matter of the investigation, but I believe there are others who are quite anxious to see something tangible result from it, and the sooner this report is thoroughly debated so the country and parliament may know where we are at, the better it will be for all concerned.

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (North Winnipeg): With the hon. member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. McIntosh), Mr. Speaker, I realize the very great importance of the subject matter of this report. I have followed the chairman of the committee with a great deal of interest and the closest atention in the hope that he might give the house a little more enlightenment as to what is really contained in the report.

I am one of those in this house who do not feel satisfied with the recommendations embodied in the report. I have gone into the matter rather carefully, I have attended as many of the meetings as I possibly could, and although I am not a member of the committee I appreciate the many courtesies that were extended to me by its members. They went about their work in the most diligent manner, they examined a great many witnesses, and I had hoped that after the recommendations presented last year, we might have had something more tangible as a result of their labours this session.

There has been, I believe, a great deal of unfair criticism levelled against the work of that committee. With such criticism I have absolutely no sympathy whatsoever. Nevertheless, I do think that constructive criticism —and that is the form I wish to employ on this particular question—is the kind that the chairman of the committee and the whole house will welcome.

The state has a certain responsibility to the man or woman who happens to be out of work. I believe the employer has also a certain amount of responsibility. As recorded in the report last year, it was the intention of that committee that a form of such insurance should be compulsory and be participated in by the state, the employer and the employee. With that suggestion I have no quarrel, because it follows the practice of other countries which have had similar schemes in operation for a number of years.

Last session the house accepted the principle of compulsory unemployment and sickness insurance. We are asked this year to adopt the principle once again. Personally I do not see the necessity of asking the house to endorse the same principle twice. When the committee was asked this year again to consider the question, the intention behind the resolution was for them to bring forward something more concrete than they submitted last year. In this case I must disagree with what the chairman has had to say. I regard this report as a step backwards, and I shall try to prove this to the house.

Now, the chairman of the committee in bringing this matter before the house, stated that the question was a national problem. With that statement I am in hearty agreement. If it is a national program, then I think it must be dealt with in a national manner, and not in a provincial manner. In section 3 of the report of last year, dated June 1, 1928—and the report was adopted by the house—the following recommendation is contained:

> That the evidence of the Justice department makes it clear that the responsibility for such legislation rests on the provincial authorities, it being within their jurisdiction under the provisions of the British North America Act, but that it would be within the power of parliament to contribute, by grant, to such provinces as adopted such legislation, following the precedent set in the matter of technical education, highway construction, and, more recently, the Old Age Pension Act.

Now that was the recommendation of the committee last year and it was unanimously adopted by the house. This year what do the committee recommend? A comparison of the two recommendations will show my hon. friend the chairman of the committee (Mr. McIntosh), and hon. members of the house generally, just why I regard the present report as a backward step. Paragraph 2 of the report this year has the following to say with reference to the question of jurisdiction:

> Your committee recognizes that while it is highly desirable that such legislation should be uniform in all the provinces, and while social insurance has a federal aspect, nevertheless, according to the Department of Justice, under our constitution legislative jurisdiction in relation to the establishment of a compulsory system of unemployment insurance is vested exclusively in the provincial legislatures.

And it stops there. Hon. members will here observe the difference between the report of the committee last year and the report submitted this year: last year they stated that the Dominion parliament might, if it so desired, assist in some way in the matter of legislation of this character, just as it has assisted under the Old Age Pensions Act; this year they claim in the report that the matter is entirely one within provincial jurisdiction. Now if we were to depend entirely upon the strict letter of the British North America Act, there are a great many things which this parliament has undertaken which would never have been put into force. The fact is that we have tried to find ways and means of over-

coming some obstacles in the British North America Act in order that we might be able to put certain legislation into effect. Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that this parliament had taken, in respect to the question of old age pensions, the attitude which the committee has taken on the question of social insurance: there would never have been any Old Age Pensions Act on the statutes of this Dominion.

Again, in its report this year, the committee states that the provincial legislatures were not anxious to come within the provisions of such legislation. Let me once more refer to the question of old age pensions. If we had waited until all the provinces had signified their intention to take advantage of that legislation there would be to-day no Old Age Pensions Act on the statute books of Canada. Well, the very same thing applies now to social insurances. In this regard I venture to make this observation. Since last year, and since the beginning of this session, there seems to have been a change of opinion on the part of certain ministers of the crown. A few months ago the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) described as a vicious principle what he regarded as an encroachment by the federal authorities into the provincial sphere; he said that there should be a clear line of demarcation between the work of the provinces and the jurisdiction of the federal parliament. I am just wondering whether the report submitted by the committee this year does not carry out that view indicated by the Prime Minister in this house some months ago in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. However, I hope I am wrong in that surmise. Personally I hold that the questions of unemployment, sickness and invalidity insurance should be mainly a Dominion responsibility, and I believe that if the government is willing it can find ways and means of overcoming any obstacle in the way of jurisdiction as between the provinces and the Dominion. In this connection I wish to read a paragraph from the platform of the Liberal party—I am sure the government is not going to go back on its own platform of 1921.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is only a chart.

Mr. HEAPS: Well, I regard this as a very good chart, exactly as I am going to regard the Conservative party's platform of 1927 on the same question. Reading from this chart or platform I find at page 9 the following reference to this matter:

> That in so far as may be practicable, having regard for Canada's financial position, an adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age and other disability, which would include old age pensions, widows' pensions, and maternity benefits, should be instituted by the federal government in conjunction with the governments of the several provinces; and that on matters pertaining to industrial and social legislation an effort should be made to overcome any question of jurisdiction between the Dominion and the provinces by effective cooperation between the several governments.

I hope I am not asking too much of the government when I suggest to them on this occasion that they put into effect their own platform of 1921 just on the eve of the election. And having read that particular plank in the Liberal party's platform, I turn now to the more recent convention held by the Conservative party in the city of Winnipeg. I do not know whether the environment of Winnipeg made them think of social insurance, but if it did I am glad that the Conservative party's convention was held in that city. Let me read just one or two paragraphs from their platform in regard to what they term capital and labour. Beginning with paragraph 9, they say:

> So far as is practicable—

Mark you, exactly the same words as used by the Liberal party in 1921. My hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) asks me whether this is a chart. No doubt they are both charts, but at any rate I am going to ask that legislation be enacted along the lines charted by both parties:

> So far as is practicable, to support social legislation designed to conserve human life, health and temperance, to relieve distress during periods of unemployment, sickness and old age.

This is substantially, in effect, the same as the resolution adopted by the Liberal party in 1921. On a previous occasion I expressed the opinion that when the house is too unanimous on a question we generally get nowhere. I hope I am not justified in that opinion and I trust that on this occasion, in view of the unanimity of the Liberal and Conservative parties on this question, something in the way of definite legislation will result from the present committee's deliberations.

To the working people of this country this is probably the most important question that has come before the house this year; I do not think I am exaggerating in the slightest degree when I say that in the report submitted this afternoon at least 25 per cent of the people of Canada are vitally interested. Legislation along the lines I have suggested would affect that proportion of the population. Of course, I realize the difficulties in the way of enacting such legislation; but the average man and woman are not very much concerned with difficulties of jurisdiction as

between the provinces and the Dominion. We overcame one difficulty in 1926 in connection with old age pensions and there is no reason why we cannot ovecome the same difficulty in relation to legislation of this character. It appears to me that if the house adopts, as it stands, the report of this committee it will be shirking its responsibility, because the whole responsibility will then rest on the provinces; and if we asked the provinces to enact such legislation it would mean that no legislation would be enacted. I cannot imagine that one province would enact a scheme of insurances while neighbouring provinces did not pass similar legislation. I can understand the situation in regard to old age pensions legislation, which is on a basis entirely different from that of a scheme of social insurances. No question of insurance is involved in the old age pension legislation; it is entirely a contribution by the state to aged persons requiring assistance. Therefore in one sense it is not such a great hardship if persons in one province do not obtain old age pensions while persons in another province are given that assistance, but in the case of social insurance in which unemployment, sickness and invalidity are involved, and where there is compulsory contribution to such a scheme by the employees, that is on an entirely different basis. Let us imagine for a moment that in the province of Ontario it was desired to adopt such a scheme; we can understand how difficult it would be for a man living in Ottawa and working in Hull. It would be almost impossible to work out such a scheme unless there was uniform legislation in all the provinces. In order to obtain the uniformity which is necessary there must be some central and responsible body to enact that legislation, and the only responsible and central body is this Dominion parliament.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if possible I would like to help the committee out on this question. According to this motion they now wish to put the whole responsibility on the provinces, but in this country we cannot have nine different schemes of social insurance; I would much prefer one scheme enacted by the federal parliament, and I believe there is a way out of the difficulty. It is a debatable question whether or not this parliament has sufficient jurisdiction in this matter, but assuming we have not that jurisdiction we can do in this matter just as we did in connection with the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. Under that act the powers vested in some of the provinces have been handed over by them to the Dominion parliament, and now this parliament has the full right to legislate with regard to industrial disputes in those provinces, under the provisions of the act to which I have just referred.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this report referred back to the committee. I know that by so doing at this stage of the session it will mean that the report is dead so far as this year is concerned, but I will take full responsibility for such action. I would much prefer to have this report killed than to have this house adopt a report which means practically nothing to the vast majority of the working people in this country. I think if the report went back and the committee considered the suggestion I now make, that the provincial authorities vest in the Dominion authority the right to legislate in connection with unemployment, sickness and invalidity insurance, we would be taking a step forward. Even in this report it is claimed that this should be a matter for federal legislation, in order that the legislation might be uniform, and if this is the case I think we should at least try to bring into being such uniform legislation by a federal enactment.

Therefore I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill):

> That the said report of the select standing committee on industrial and international relations be not now concurred in but that it be referred back to the select standing committee on industrial and international relations with instructions that they have power to amend the same by adding thereto a clause recommending that all the provinces of the Dominion be requested to pass legislation under which the jurisdiction in relation to legislation providing for unemployment, sickness and invalidity insurance based on compulsory contribution and which is now claimed to be within or subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces be vested in the Dominion government.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a rather ambiguous position with regard to this matter; I am seconding a resolution moved by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) asking to amend the report of a committee of which I was a member, and in whose report I acquiesced. However, I am prepared to take the full responsibility for my action; I could not think of a better solution of the problem before us, and somewhat shamefacedly I am compelled to say to my hon. friend from North Winnipeg, in the words of Kipling, "You're a better man than I am, Gunga Din." I only hope this condition will not become habitual.

The report of the committee deals with the question of unemployment in three sections; first it endorses the principle which we en-

dorsed last year and then it says that the provinces, on being consulted, apparently were not prepared for immediate action. The provinces were very wishy-washy in their answers; some of them merely acknowledged receipt of the letter, and no province exhibited the slightest interest in the matter. The third and the only active suggestion contained in this report is that in the forthcoming census provision should be made for the securing of the fullest possible data with regard to the extent of unemployment and sickness, and that this information should be compiled and published as soon as possible. I must confess that when we drew up that report I felt this to be quite inadequate, because the census will not be taken for another two years, and two or three years more will elapse before that information is compiled, tabulated and published, so it will be practically useless.

If I remember correctly, in the report of this committee last year it was suggested that the Labour department should take steps to ascertain by practical methods, from month to month, the extent of unemployment in Canada. Some of the officials of that department appeared before the committee this year and stated that this was practically impossible. I do not think it is impossible, and I believe a better attempt could and should have been made to obtain that information. The officials did not say it was absolutely impossible; they said it would involve enormous expense, but I do not agree with that contention either.

The hon. member for North Winnipeg has stated that the adoption of this amendment would mean the abandonment of any report from this committee this year. Seeing the nature of the report I think no great hardship will result if the matter is held over for another year, because the census will not be held for two years, and that is the only practical suggestion contained in the report. This amendment does contain a practical, concrete suggestion, and it does seem to clear the air of this continual miasma which we meet at every turn, as to the respective jurisdiction of the Dominion and of the provinces. We have been travelling around and around that question for the last two years in this committee; we have had reports and opinions from the legal officers and so on, but we do not seem to go ahead. As the hon. member stated, a precedent exists for this action; a similar policy was adopted when the provinces waived their rights under the Industrial Disputes Act, turning them over to the Dominion. That gave the Dominion full jurisdiction; that appears to have worked well and I see no reason why it should not work well in this case also.

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does my hon. friend think the provinces have the right to do that without an amendment to the British North America Act?

Mr. NEILL: Yes, because whatever divergence of opinion there may be as to the rights of the provinces, we must accept the fact that they have some rights, and if the provinces pass legislation turning over these rights, whatever they may be, to the Dominion, certainly I think that would be constitutional.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does not my hon. friend think it would be more intelligent to proceed in this way: Have the federal parliament pass the legislation which is desired and make it operative only after concurrent legislation has been passed by the respective provinces?

Mr. NEILL: No, that principle was adopted in the Old Age Pension Act and it was made permissive to each province. The general scheme of unemployment, owing to its very nature, could not be made provincially permissive; it would have to be universal, and for that reason we would desire to have it handled by the one federal authority.

Mr. CAHAN: The amendment is:

That the said report of the select standing committee on industrial and international relations be not now concurred in but that it be referred back to the select standing committee on industrial and international relations with instructions that they have power to amend the same by adding thereto a clause recommending that all the provinces of the Dominion be requested to pass legislation under which the jurisdiction in relation to legislation providing for unemployment, sickness and invalidity insurance, based on compulsory contribution and which is now claimed to be within or subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces, be vested in the Dominion government.

Does the hon. gentleman suggest that, when specific jurisdiction is vested under the constitution in the provinces, the provinces by any conceivable legislation could revest that jurisdiction in the Dominion parliament? It seems to me to be the most extraordinary suggestion I have heard for some time.

Mr. NEILL: That was the belief of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) and myself, and we have the precedent of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. However, the recommendation was merely that it be referred back to the committee with instructions along those lines. This is not an enactment and it was drawn by men who are not constitutional lawyers like my hon. friend. When it is sent back to the committee we hope to avail ourselves of the opportunity of putting it in the precise legal phraseology.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I am bound to object to the amendment of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) as I believe that it could not be adopted by this parliament, as is suggested by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). The amendment proposes:

that all the provinces of the Dominion be requested to pass legislation under which the jurisdiction in relation to legislation providing for unemployment, sickness and invalidity insurance based on compulsory contribution and which is now claimed to be within or subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces be vested in the Dominion government.

We would be asking the provinces to do something which they have no right, no power and no authority to do.

Mr. HEAPS: Will the hon. minister explain how the authority was given under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is quite different. The hon. member proposes in his amendment that it would of necessity be a compulsory contribution. A compulsory contribution by employers and by employees, as has been said in the house, is undoubtedly a matter of civil rights as it affects the civil rights of both the employers and the employees, and it comes clearly and exclusively within the scope of the matters assigned to the provinces for legislation under the British North America Act.

Mr. HEAPS: Are there no civil rights under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was no compulsion placed upon anyone. That act had to be changed in order to make it constitutional, as my hon. friend knows. That act was declared unconstitutional by the Privy Council and we had to change it and limit it to federal matters which came within the powers of this federal legislature. We offered the machinery of the Labour department and of this enactment to the provinces who might ask this parliament to put that machinery at their disposal in the case of industrial disputes.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Did not the provinces surrender certain rights which they claimed to be provincial?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: They passed enabling legislation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am quite sure that the provinces would never agree to this parliament imposing contributions and taxation on their citizens in matters which were undoubtedly provincial; they would not agree to that, and even if they did agree I do not think they would have the right to do so. The provinces have the right to delegate certain powers to municipalities, to commissions and to bodies which are of their own creation, and those bodies have the right to pass regulations and by-laws, but the provinces under the provisions of the British North America Act cannot delegate those powers to the federal parliament. That act is a charter—it is not a chart as explained by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) a few minutes ago—of the provinces and a charter of the Dominion, and neither one has the right to change it. If my hon. friend will not accept my views in this matter perhaps he will accept the views of the Privy Council. I have here the words of Lord Watson, given in a case reported in Lefroy's Canada's Federal System, in which he said:

The Dominion cannot give jurisdiction, or leave jurisdiction, with the province. The provincial parliament cannot give legislative jurisdiction to the Dominion parliament. If they have it, either one or the other of them, they have it by virtue of the act of 1867. I think we must get rid of the idea that either one or the other can enlarge the jurisdiction of the other or surrender jurisdiction.

To these remarks Lord Davey added, "or curtail."

Mr. CAHAN: Have you the reference from which you are quoting?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is in the course of the argument in Canadian Pacific R. W. Co. versus Bonsecours, (1899) A.C. 367.

Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice in 1889—the house will find his words on page 218 of the same book—said that he had to express his dissent from the view:

—that the interpretation of the British North America Act can in any way be affected by subsequent legislation by parliament, or the legislatures, or by any action of the government. No legislative body can, by legislation, increase or diminish the authority conferred upon it by the constitution, nor can any expression of opinion or course of legislative action by either afford any conclusive or even satisfactory guide to its interpretation.

No person in Canada can be bound by acquiescence in unconstitutional legislation on the on the part of governments, even if such acquiescence has occurred.

It is an elementary principle that governments, no more than individuals, can do indirectly what they cannot do directly. In that regard I will read two leading propositions of Lefroy in his book entitled Canada's Federal System. They are propositions Nos. 17 and 18, as follows:

17. The parliament of Canada cannot under colour of general legislation deal with what

are provincial matters only, and conversely provincial legislatures cannot under the mere pretence of legislating upon one of the matters enumerated in section 92, really legislate upon a matter assigned to the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada.

18. If the Dominion parliament or the provincial legislatures have no power to legislate directly upon a given subject matter, neither may they do so indirectly.

This is not new; the desire of going beyond the jurisdiction of a parliament is not peculiar to this one nor to the provincial legislatures in certain matters. Experience shows that all bodies are rather impatient of the limitations imposed upon their jurisdiction and powers, but in the case of a confederation like Canada, which by a contract binds every part of it together, we ought not to enter lightly upon any steps or make any move which would be an encroachment upon the powers of one or another of the legislative bodies created by that act.

There are, I believe, only two matters which clearly, under the British North America Act, come under the joint jurisdiction of the Dominion and the provinces. These are agriculture and immigration. As regards anything which concerns agriculture or immigration the federal parliament has the right to legislate and so have the provinces. In regard to health there are certain matters which the British North America Act gives to the federal government to supervise, for instance, matters concerning seamen. As a matter of fact, hospitals, with the exception of marine hospitals are placed under provincial jurisdiction. Matters concerning quarantine, inspection of immigrants and that sort of thing come under the jurisdiction of the federal parliament. When parliament created the Department of Health, there were some who entertained the view that it was rather doubtful whether parliament had the authority to do so, but if my hon. friend will read the act he will see that the Canadian parliament was very careful to say that the department has no control over matters which are under provincial control. They took care to say that they would not have any control whatever of provincial bodies, and the federal acts which are to be administered by that Department of Health are specially mentioned. They also say that one of the duties of the department would be to collect information and as far as this goes I have no objection to the report of the committee in respect of the matter which we are now discussing, because it is identical to the power given to the Department of Health, to collect information, to endeavour to obtain the cooperation of the various provinces with regard to matters of health which in certain emergencies might become national in their scope. But I repeat that the amendment of my hon. friend, which specifically states that unemployment insurance would have to be established by way of compulsory contributions by the persons concerned, both employers and employees, in the provinces, it is entirely outside of our jurisdiction and we would be asking the provinces to do something which they would have no right to do by transferring their powers to the federal parliament.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): Personally I endorse the principle stated by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) but it seems to me to have a wider application than that which he has given to it. The first clause of this report which is found on page 338 of the votes and proceedings of May 1, 1929, reads:

> That your committee accept and endorse the principle of unemployment insurance, based on compulsory contributions derived from the state, employer and employees.

Obviously, according to the opinion given by the law officers of the government, reaffirmed to-day by the Minister of Justice, unemployment insurance which is based on compulsory contributions from the state, employer and employees, is a matter within the legislative and administrative jurisdiction of each of the several provinces of Canada. That being admitted, why should the parliament of Canada express a gratuitous opinion upon a public matter which is not within the legislative jurisdiction of parliament or the administrative jurisdiction of the government responsible to parliament? Why should we in this parliament, who have very extended duties and obligations to the public, set ourselves up as the judges of the duties and responsibilities of members of the several legislatures, and attempt, by adopting a report of a nature which I have read, to superimpose our gratuitous opinions upon the legislatures of the provinces and the governments which are responsible to those legislatures? Even if we adopt the report of the committee in its present form, we are going far outside of any jurisdiction committed to the parliament of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: It is eyewash.

Mr. CAHAN: Perhaps it might be so termed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend will permit me, perhaps it is a reciprocal act of courtesy, because it occasionally happens that the legislatures offer views to this parliament on certain matters.

Mr. CAHAN: I doubt whether the Prime Minister and his colleagues appreciate the courtesy of the provincial governments when they seek to impose provincial duties and responsibilities upon the government represented by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, and such returns of courtesies of that nature simply lead us into grave and almost irremedial difficulties, or at the least they lead us into confusion of thought always. Speaking for myself, because I do not know that this report has ever been considered by the other members of the party to which I belong, and as I have no right to express their opinions, and my opinions are therefore wholly personal, I could not endorse this report containing that clause; I could not even vote for the adoption of the report. I admit that there are several other matters mentioned in the report which are within our jurisdiction; that the census, for instance, is within our jurisdiction, and it is perfectly proper for this committee to recommend to the house and for this house to recommend to the government that in the taking of the new census certain additional information should be sought by means of that census, information which is useful to this parliament and which may be particularly useful to the legislatures of the several provinces. Therefore, I would support some of the recommendations under clause 4, but I am not able personally to endorse and accept the report as a whole. I also find great difficulty in accepting the amending resolution moved by my hon. friend.

The amendment that the report should not now be concurred in I can support in its entirety. That it should be referred back to the committee for further consideration I would endorse most heartily, but that it should be sent back to that committee with a precise recommendation of this house that the committee should add to the report a clause which is not within the purview of the committee and which deals with matters that are not within the legislative jurisdiction of this house—a clause which presupposes that we are assuming powers that are not vested in this parliament under the constitution of the country—is something that I certainly could not support.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is the amendment imperative on the committee?

Mr. CAHAN: An amendment is always expressed in the courteous terms, "that the committee have power to add," such and such a clause, but it leaves the assumption that that particular clause is the matter which the commitee should consider, and that parliament anticipates and expects that the recommendation which the committee will subsequently make will be in line with the recommendation of this parliament.

First, this amendment says that the report shall be referred back to the select standing committee on industrial and international relations, "with instructions that they have power." Now when we state by our instructions to the committee that they have power to do something which is utterly beyond the powers of this parliament under the constitution of the country, we are making what is obviously not a true statement of fact or of law. We are stating to the committee that they have power, and we all know that they have no such power.

Mr. HEAPS: I would take exception to that statement. There are other authorities to the contrary which might be quoted.

Mr. CAHAN: If my hon. friend wishes to argue that issue, he can do so in his proper turn. This resolution says that "they have power to amend the same by adding a clause," but I think the implications are that the committee, a committee of this house, has power to recommend. Now what are the recommendations? First, that all the provinces of the Dominion be requested to pass legislation under which the jurisdiction—that means the jurisdiction now vested in each of the provincial legislatures—

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member says that he has just quoted the assumed instructions to the committee which request the provinces to do something. He has stated before that the committee has no power and this parliament has no power to do so. We surely have power to request the provinces to do something, whether they do it or have power to do it or not. Certainly we in this house and in that committee have power to make the request, and that is all we ask.

Mr. CAHAN: Suppose we examine that statement. The word power may be used with various meanings. I was dealing with the use that expresses the legislative and administrative powers of parliament and of the government responsible to this parliament. We can make requests, it is true. We can pass a resolution to-morrow to request the states of the United States to take certain action with regard to national prohibition. Not long ago I was paying a visit to one of the states of the American union and I went to the counter of the hotel to buy a package of cigarettes, and I was told that it was criminal to sell cigarettes in that jurisdiction. Of course, I might have come back to parliament and have asked this parliament to request that

the legislature of that state should amend its laws so that foreign visitors like myself might indulge in their ordinary liberties while in that state.

Mr. NEILL: Does my hon. friend suggest that that is a parallel in any sense?

Mr. CAHAN: I think it would be regarded as equally discourteous as for us to pass a resolution requesting the provinces to revest in this parliament certain powers which they now have or which they are assumed to have under the British North America Act, because they themselves might make the retort courteous, that powers vested in those legislatures cannot be revested by them in the parliament of Canada.

Mr. HEAPS: The Prime Minister of Alberta has made this request.

Mr. CAHAN: What request?

Mr. HEAPS: He says that the question of unemployment insurance is one of federal jurisdiction.

Mr. CAHAN: That may be so. If it is a question of federal jurisdiction, then make that clear to this house, and let this house after argument and on due persuasion exercise that jurisdiction. This amendment assumes that that jurisdiction is vested in the legislatures, and we are asking the legislatures to transfer to the parliament of Canada powers which we assume are already vested in those several legislatures, and we all know that that is a constitutional impossibility.

I was referring to the amendment. It says:

that they have power to amend the same by adding thereto a clause recommending that all the provinces of the Dominion be requested to pass legislation under which the jurisdiction—

in relation to unemployment, sickness and invalidity insurance,

—based on compulsory contribution, and which is now claimed to be within or subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces, be vested in the Dominion government.

Mr. HEAPS: Read what is in between.

Mr. CAHAN: I will read the whole thing again, although I have put this whole clause on the record once. It says:

That the said report of the select standing committee on industrial and international relations be not now concurred in,—

That is the first. The second is:

—but that it be referred back to the select standing committee on industrial and international relations with instructions that they have power—

That is that the committee have power.

—to amend the same—

[Mr. Cahan.]

That is, the report.

—by adding thereto a clause recommending that all the provinces of the Dominion be requested to pass legislation under which the jurisdiction in relation to legislation providing for unemployment, sickness and invalidity insurance based on compulsory contribution, and which is now claimed to be within or subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces, be vested in the Dominion government.

I think I am correct in my construction, that what the provinces are asked to do is to pass legislation vesting in the Dominion government—not even in the parliament of Canada—

Mr. HEAPS: It is merely claimed to be.

Mr. CAHAN: If it is claimed to be, and is not, then the request is ridiculous. If it is justly claimed to be within the jurisdiction of the provinces, and this resolution so assumes, then it requests that that jurisdiction shall be retransferred—at first I thought it was to the parliament of Canada, but now I find that it is to the government of Canada. In other words, that the legislative power of the provinces is to be delegated by their respective legislatures, by legislation passed by them, to the government of Canada, and that hereafter a legislative jurisdiction which is now vested in the provincial legislatures shall be exercised, not even by the parliament of Canada but by a government responsible to this parliament. Now, I suggest, with all deference to my hon. friend who proposed this resolution, that he really must see the absurdity of it, and, rather than ask us to deal with so great an absurdity, I suggest he should withdraw the resolution in its present form.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, if a layman may venture to intervene between the legal lights of this house, I may say that I find myself in a position somewhat similar to that of my neighbour who supports an amendment to a report to which he previously agreed. My position is this. I feel like supporting an amendment which I think has been unfortunately worded. From my humble point of view, the purely technical objection made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) and supported by the member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) is incontrovertible. It is obviously against the spirit and the letter of the constitution that the provinces should by any form of legislation divest themselves of a jurisdiction which they exercise in order to vest that jurisdiction in this parliament. Likewise, I do not think this parliament can make matters any better by inviting the provincial legislatures to do so.

But if one goes beyond the wording of any resolution or report of a committee, one must come to the conclusion that this is another exemplification of what is coming to us from year to year as a growing truth, that we have outgrown the literal bounds of the written constitution under which we live. There is not the slightest doubt that when this constitution was framed neither the upholders of legislative union nor the defenders of provincial rights ever anticipated the immense importance which labour problems would assume. They never anticipated that this question of social insurance, whether applying to unemployment, to sickness, or to any other form of social suffering, would be of such importance that it is now one of the national problems with which we have to deal.

If we take this factor as existing to-day in this year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine, a factor which is growing fast upon us, which will be more important next year and the year following than it is now, we cannot solve the problem by looking into this or that clause, or word, or semicolon of the charter under which we are governed. We must find some means to adjust those problems, and we must devise a way to come to an agreement with the various provinces wherever provincial jurisdiction is an obstacle to the exercise of national jurisdiction by the federal parliament. It seems to me that it is an imperative duty upon us.

To claim that because civil rights and property are under provincial jurisdiction this parliament is debarred, legally and constitutionally, from the accomplishment of its duty to the people of Canada at large in regard to those great social problems—I cannot agree to that. Whether or not we could by some means legislate upon this question of social insurance without an amendment to the constitution I do not know. I do not pretend to the legal knowledge and experience that may be necessary to settle that first point. But I know this, that on many other questions of state and legislation, experience has proven that the general jurisdiction exercised by the parliament of Canada for the good of Canada at large, or according to the usual phraseology "for the general advantage of Canada," has in many instances overcome the objection of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. May I quote one or two examples? With regard to the law of bankruptcy, it was questioned for many years in the province of Quebec whether this parliament had the right or the jurisdiction to legislate upon that matter, because once a law of bankruptcy was enacted by this parliament it would of necessity amend, directly or indirectly, the civil code with regard to the application of many articles of that code, promissory notes, interest, and so forth.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend will allow me. Section 91, which gives the powers to the federal parliament, mentioned specifically bankruptcy and insolvency.

Mr. BOURASSA: Quite so; I do not dispute that. I am simply saying that once this parliament exercised its jurisdiction on matters of bankruptcy, its legislation came into conflict with many articles of the civil code, and constituted an amendment to that code without any cooperation on the part of the provincial legislature.

Now, with regard to railways, I remember a famous case in the province of Quebec a case which was pleaded by one of the most eminent lawyers of that province, the late Sir Lomer Gouin, who became premier of Quebec and afterwards Minister of Justice in this government. It was a case in which the sole issue was a conflict between the right exercised by the individual, under a certain article of the civil code, to enjoy his property as against damages sustained through the acts, whether culpable or not, of another party, and, on the other hand, the jurisdiction granted by this parliament to the railway company to operate its railways as a common conveyance, whatever might be the consequences to individuals. The question of fact was not disputed; it was admitted that the railway company had done all it could to ensure the preservation of private properties along the roads traversed by its railways. Fire was set to the individual's building by the engine of one of the company's trains and that individual sued the company. He pleaded that article of the civil code under which he was entitled to enjoy his property and under which he claimed that the railway company was responsible for all its acts. But the Privy Council decided that, parliament having granted, for the general advantage of Canada, the power to that company to run its trains throughout Canada, the right of the individual under the civil code must yield to the right of the company under that federal legislation. I cite this not as a legal point touching the matter now under discussion, but simply by way of illustration of the problems that arise day by day, placing us in the position of having to choose between the discharge of our duty to the people of Canada at large, and a scrupulous respect for the letter of the constitution

I am second to none in my respect for the basic principles of the constitution. But, I repeat, we must go ahead. This country must face its duties and the problems that arise from year to year. We cannot remain shackled by the strict letter of a constitution which was written some sixty years ago and which no longer corresponds to all the needs of the people. It is from that point of view particularly, leaving aside the wording either of the committee's report or of the proposed amendment, that I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) that this matter should be referred back to the committee for more careful consideration at another session; because if we go on at this rate, many problems that ought to be seriously studied and ultimately solved by this parliament or by the various legislatures of the country will remain unsolved, or will be delayed to the detriment of all the provinces and of the whole population at large.

We cannot divide this country into nine compartments labelled Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and so on, for the simple reason that each compartment or province has its raison d'être. As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) has said, this is a confederacy and ought to remain a confederacy. But Canada is also a nation; it is one country and ought to be broad enough, with a constitution flexible enough, to meet the needs of all classes of the population irrespective of province, race or any other consideration. Now these labour problems, these social insurance problems, are essentially national questions. If you wait for the nine legislatures of Canada all to deal with the situation, you will wait a long time. The reason is obvious: the labour problem may be a rural problem in one province; it may be an industrial problem in another province; or it may affect a large proportion of the population in one province and a small proportion of the population in another. We have to admit, human nature being what it is, that governments and legislatures are mainly concerned with those problems that are sufficiently acute to force themselves upon public opinion in the respective provinces. And if this social question is not of immediate concern to the government of one or another of the nine provinces, that government will take no stock in it inasmuch as the question will have no bearing upon the next provincial election. The result is that that particular province will stand as an obstacle to the action of the Dominion or of the other provinces that happen to be more concerned in the matter. I submit, therefore, that if we have to wait until the nine provinces are of one accord on every single aspect of this question we shall wait a long time; and in that event we shall remain far in the rear of all those countries which, having to face these social problems, have at least taken some action—action which, while not always leading to perfection, has at any rate brought such countries nearer a solution of their difficulties.

I do not think we should shelter ourselves for any length of time under the protection of constitutional rights, thus refraining from dealing with these problems. I must confess, as a member of the committee, that I was not as faithful and constant an attendant at its meetings as I should have been had I not been otherwise busily engaged. I may say, however, that I have followed its proceedings with sufficient care, and have read sufficiently in various publications appearing not only in this country and the United States but in Europe as well, to realize that we are far behind most other countries in dealing with social problems; and largely as a result of this situation which has presented itself to-day, as it has done on many other occasions in relation to social and other problems, whenever the question has arisen as to the respective jurisdiction of the provinces and of the federal government, we find ourselves taking the attitude that we cannot deal with the matter for the reason that it affects provincial rights. Some province will say. "We will not deal with it because, irrespective of what the people of the other provinces may feel, our people are not interested in the question." Another province will say, "Let the federal government deal with the situation."

What the hon. member for North Winnipeg has said is absolutely true. I have read the correspondence exchanged between this government and the various provincial governments in respect to this question, and the same thing applies to family allowances. We have had practically no replies from any of the provincial governments. Are we going to leave this matter at a standstill because provincial politicians, busy with other questions, refuse rightly or wrongly to deal with it? No; we must face the situation. I think, therefore, that the question ought to be referred back to the committee, not to adopt the wording of this or that clause of the amendment, or of the report itself, but to study the broad question, if necessary, of an amendment to the constitution of Canada to enable these problems to be considered in a proper and practical manner. So far as the language is concerned, I should be inclined to agree with my hon. friend from St. Law-

rence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). If anyone objects to the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Winnipeg because of the suggestion contained therein, I do not see how that person could accept the report of the committee itself; because, as the hon. member says, the first paragraph of the report lays down in a different form the very same principle indicated in the amendment of the hon. member for North Winnipeg. If we have no right to request the provincial legislatures to enact legislation enabling this parliament to deal with the question, then how can we lay down, as is done in the first paragraph of the report, the principle that compulsory contributions to unemployment insurance ought to be the basis of such legislation? If we have no right to request the legislature to agree to that, how can we agree to it ourselves? On the other hand, if we leave aside for the time being the narrow letter of the law; if we simply desire to express broadly an opinion as to the desirability of doing something in the matter and referring the question back to the committee in order to have this aspect of the question studied, that is, the possibility of enacting legislation which will apply to the whole of Canada, then I think the amendment moved by the hon member for North Winnipeg should be supported, not because of its wording but because of its spirit.

Mr. CAHAN: Why not move an amendment to the amendment referring the question back for full consideration?

Mr. BOURASSA: I am not sufficiently apt in these things to get the proper wording for such a motion.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a rather peculiar position in regard to this matter, since I was a member of the committee and also of the subcommittee which drew up the report. I may say frankly that the suggestion contained in the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Winnipeg had not occurred to me before we drew up that report or I should have endeavoured, with what success I do not know, to have something of the kind inserted in the report. However, we are now faced with the question of dealing with this amendment.

May I recall what was stated by the mover of this motion, that under the treaty of Versailles we are already under certain obligations, and if the federal government assumed certain powers at that time and signed a treaty, later assuming the responsibility for carrying out certain conventions involving this question of unemployment insurance, it does seem to me that there is a continued responsibility laid upon us to solve the problem in some way. Apparently in this house it is very easy to raise all sorts of legal objections; technically they may be quite correct but, as the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has said, we must look beyond these technicalities to the great reforms which some of us at least have in view.

Back in 1919 you will recall, Mr. Speaker, a royal commission was appointed to consider industrial relations, and I desire to read paragraph 21 from the report:

> The chief causes of unrest may be enumerated as follows:
>
> 1. Unemployment and the fear of unemployment.
> 2. High cost of living in relation to wages and the desire of the worker for a larger share of the product of his labour.
> 3. Desire for shorter hours of labour.
> 4. Denial of the right to organize and refusal to recognize unions.
> 5. Denial of collective bargaining.
> 6. Lack of confidence in constituted government.
> 7. Insufficient and poor housing.
> 8. Restrictions upon the freedom of speech and press.
> 9. Ostentatious display of wealth.
> 10. Lack of equal educational opportunities.

Further, the report states:

> We have placed unemployment first because we found that there was the greatest unrest where there were the most unemployed.

The commission recommended:

> We recommend immediate inquiry by expert boards into the following subjects, with a view to early legislation:
>
> (a) State insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity and old age.

That was ten years ago, but so far as I know nothing has been done in a legislative way to meet any of these evils complained about, and we are still quarrelling over the question of jurisdiction. In 1920 the Privy Council adopted the report of a committee of council which is P.C. 2722, in which I find references to this matter. With regard to the draft conventions concerning unemployment, the report states:

> The minister is further of opinion, seeing that the principal object of this convention is the establishment of a national system of employment agencies under the control of a central authority, that the Dominion is the proper authority to give effect to the proposals of the convention.

I may say that a system of federal employment agencies, carried on in conjunction with the provincial governments, has been put into

effect. Then I pass on to paragraph 3 of this report, which deals with unemployment further:

> The minister observes that the experience of other countries has demonstrated that a system of unemployment insurance, in order to be effective and successful, must be merely ancillary or complementary to a system of labour exchanges, the whole being adapted to the principal function of finding work for unemployed insured workmen.

I would direct this to the attention of the present Minister of Justice, as the opinion of the Minister of Justice at that time. I am quoting from the report of the Privy Council, which I presume represented the considered findings of the government of that day. I proceed:

> In this view, unemployment insurance has a pronounced federal aspect, and on the whole, the minister thinks the establishment of a system of unemployment insurance is competent to the Dominion in the exercise of its residuary legislative power with relation to the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Of course, it is easy for the the Minister of Justice to repudiate that position and establish a new one of his own.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, because the Privy Council has repudiated it in its judgment with regard to the Industrial Disputes Act.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, the Privy Council can now repudiate what a previous Privy Council did.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am referring to the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I will discuss that in a moment. It is rather curious to note the development which has been going on in Canada during the past few years, as contrasted with the developments which have taken place in the United States. In that country the different states started out with a great deal of authority while the federal body had very little, but gradually there has been an increase in authority on the part of the federal government. Curiously enough, in this country the reverse has been the case; residual powers were held originally by the federal government, but there seems to have been a tendency to lop off, if I may use the phrase, different powers from the federal government, and state that these are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

In this respect I agree absolutely with the hon. member for Labelle. I am sorely tempted to go into the question of the British North America Act, but I will refrain from so doing. However, it does seem to me that we must face this question before long; we cannot forever continue to be tied down by an instrument which was drawn up sixty years ago and which is absolutely inadequate to carry on the functions of government and meet the needs of this country as we find them today.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But so long as it is there we cannot get around it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is quite true, and that is what led me to sign that report. Here is what we are faced with: Last year the committee recommended, and this year the recommendation was endorsed, that the only possible, effective system was one of compulsory insurance. We start with that. The second point is that the Department of Justice tells us that under the British North America Act it is not within our power to do anything, that we have not jurisdiction. Then, as far as I could see, putting those two things together there was only one conclusion to which we could come. The conclusion was that we would simply refer this to the provinces; give the scheme our blessing and refer it to them. That is the only thing I can see which can be done short of a revision of the British North America Act. All of us who have been in this house for some time know how difficult it is to start any movement towards the revision of that act. When we had the federal-provincial conference a year or two ago the sentiment along that line was not very encouraging, but if we have failed once we will have to try again. The possibility of having a revision of the British North America Act was so remote that we hardly thought it worth while to mention it in the report of the committee, but the suggestion which has been embodied in the amendment of the member for North Winnipeg would give to us a modus operandi. Both the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) have said that this cannot be done. I do not profess to be able to dispute legal points with these eminent authorities, but I do believe that there was an effort made to get around this point in the legislation connected with the Industrial Disputes Act. I agree with the hon. Minister of Justice that this act was unconstitutional, and we had to get around it in some way. It was imperative that some sort of expedient be arrived at; so finally a number of the provinces passed enabling legislation. I should like to read the act which was passed by the Manitoba legislature. This act is entitled "An Act respecting the Investigation of Industrial Disputes within the Province," and is as follows:

> Whereas the provisions of The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, chapter 20

of the Acts of the Parliament of Canada, 1907, have been held not to apply to industrial disputes which are within the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of any province of Canada; and

Whereas it was enacted by chapter 14 of the Acts of the Parliament of Canada, 1925, entitled An Act to amend The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, that the said act shall apply to, among other things, "any dispute which is within the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of any province and which by the legislation of the province is made subject to the provisions of this act"; and

Whereas it is deemed expedient, in view of the amendment recited above, that the provisions of the said act, with amendments, shall be made to apply to industrial disputes of the nature defined in the said act, which are within the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the province:

Therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the legislative assembly of Manitoba, enacts as follows:

1. This act may be cited as "The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (Manitoba)".

2. The provisions of The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, chapter 20 of the statutes of the parliament of Canada, 1907, and all amendments thereto up to and including the said chapter 14 of 1925, shall apply to every industrial dispute of the nature therein defined which is within or subject to the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of this province.

3. This act shall come into force on the day it is assented to.

That act was assented to on March 31, 1926.

Whether or not that legislation is good I am not in a position to say, but surely it must be admitted that powers which were regarded as being exclusively provincial were turned over to the federal authorities; I do not think that the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George or the Minister of Justice will deny that. We have been getting along tolerably well under that makeshift legislation and it occurred to some of us that it might be possible to use that as a precedent. Until such time as a conference can be called at which there could be a discussion of the revision of the British North America Act we might utilize this expedient to relieve the situation and at least get something moving along the lines of unemployment insurance.

Mr. BOURASSA: The Manitoba legislature enacted as its own law a law which had been adopted by the federal parliament; that would be coming to the same end but by a different process.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is quite true, and I am quite prepared that we should take the initiative. But when we suggest proceeding along those lines in this parliament we are immediately met with the statement that such action would be ultra vires; so we cannot act. We simply ask that if we cannot get started in one way we be allowed to get started in another. We are quite prepared humbly to request the provinces to consent to giving us jurisdiction and then we shall be free to take action.

Mr. BOURASSA: I think it is better to pass a law here.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If the Minister of Justice and the government will consent to that I shall be very happy indeed. They have always protested that it is impossible to proceed in that way, but I should like to see us get away from these technicalities. There is a great deal of industrial trouble in this country and, as we said in our report last year, there is very little doubt but that industrial insurance would do a great deal to prevent the troubles which are occurring in the industrial field at the present time and would prove to be at least a partial solution of some of the most outstanding problems in the industrial world. I would ask that this question be treated in a generous way. Being a member of the committee I dislike asking that the report be amended, but I think that my colleague is perhaps right when he says that it would be better to defer this matter to another year rather than to pass a motion which, after all, is no much more than a pious hope that something will happen some time.

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD: (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the house very long, but as a labour member I must say something with respect to this matter. Unemployment has been a plank of the Labour party in all parts of Canada and organized labour, no matter of what affiliation, is extremely interested in this matter. I am not concerned about the legal entanglements of the British North America Act, because when anything occurs which relates to labour or other matters which it is the part of the government to look after, as the hon. members for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) have both said, we are always met with these legal entanglements.

My hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) read a part of the plank of the Liberal party which distinctly stated that they were to institute under the federal government, in conjunction with the governments of the several provinces, unemployment insurance. Perhaps it was a foolish thing to do, but I believed that proposition; I believed that they would do what they said they would do in 1921, but we have waited for eight years and nothing has been done as yet.

A short time ago the right hon. the Prime Minister was charged with saying that the

principle of old age pensions was a vicious one. As far as I am concerned I am willing to defend the right hon. the Prime Minister and say that he did not say that, but he did say something which was of equal importance. He said that for one government to collect taxes for another government to spend was a vicious principle. I hope he did not mean to repudiate the plank in the Liberal platform when he said that he was going to act in conjunction with the provinces in connection with unemployment insurance, whereby the government of the province would contribute part and the federal government would contribute the balance. If he did mean that, he cuts from under his feet the plank contained in the Liberal platform for 1921. If he did mean that, then there is the next proposition that he must make it a federal platform altogether, if the federal authorities are not going to act in conjunction with the provincial authorities, then there is the last proposition, which I do not like, namely that he intends to abandon the matter entirely.

So far as I am concerned, I do not care what the committee do; that is up to them. But it is for the Dominion government themselves to say, as a plank in their platform, what they are going to do now after waiting for eight years to deal with the matter. They have implemented the plank in regard to old age pensions: they have done a good deal along the lines of social insurance, and I think I may put this question to the Prime Minister and the government: What are you going to do in connection with this matter regardless of what the committee says or what is to be found in the British North America Act? We laymen seem to be a lot of flies when the legal authorities start speaking; we get tangled up in a web of various things and we do not know where we stand. It is not my business to clear these things up. The lawyers themselves who enacted this plank must have known how far the British North America Act went. They knew the various difficulties in the way. Let them clear away their own difficulties and tell us where we stand and what they are going to do in regard to what they promised eight years ago. Will the Prime Minister say something along this line?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I just inquire, before the question is put, whether the amendment is in order or not?

Mr. SPEAKER: In my view, this is a constitutional question. Bourinot, in defining the powers of the Speaker, says at page 180:

[Mr Adshead.]

He will not give a decision upon a constitutional question, nor decide a question of law, though the same be raised on a point of order or privilege.

I have no doubt that this question is constitutional; that is to say, it involves a change in connection with the respective powers of the federal parliament and the provincial legislatures. To make such a change in the constitution requires a joint address of both houses of parliament to the Imperial parliament.

A similar question arose some years ago, in 1903, when I was a young member of the House of Commons. After the census of 1901, the province of Prince Edward Island lost two members, and when the new redistribution based on the census was being put through the house, a motion was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Hackett, one of the members from Prince Edward Island, seconded by the hon. member for Lincoln, Ontario, Mr. Lancaster, to the effect that in spite of the census the representation of Prince Edward Island should be six members instead of four. Thereupon the Prime Minister of the day said:

I submit that this amendment is out of order, because it is contrary to the constitution. The constitution provides for representation by population between the provinces. The very question raised in this amendment has been submitted to the supreme court, which has decided that the province of Prince Edward Island and all the other provinces are entitled to the number of members which are mentioned in this bill. The British North America Act provides that the representation of the other provinces shall be based upon the unit fixed by the representation of Quebec, and this amendment would violate that provision of the British North America Act.

Just as this amendment violates one of the provisions of the British North America Act, as was pointed out by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). The Speaker of that day gave this ruling:

The question which has been raised in regard to the amendment is a very difficult one, and I am very sorry that I have not had more time at my disposal to give it the fullest consideration. It would appear, as has been stated before the house, that this parliament has not the necessary legislative authority to grant Prince Edward Island the number of members asked for by this amendment and the supreme court, having been consulted upon the matter, declared that the British North America Act does not give to the province the right to have more than four members.

He goes on:

According to rule 37 of the House of Commons, the Speaker has the right to declare out of order any motion contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament. I see that there is a

very serious doubt, whether under our rules of procedure the Speaker has the right on his own authority to interfere and declare irregular and out of order a motion of this kind. May, at page 331, says:

"But doubtful cases may arise, upon which the rules of the house are indistinct or obsolete, or do not apply strictly to the point at issue; when the Speaker, being left without specific directions, refers the matter to the judgment of the house."

I am of the opinion, under the circumstances, that, on account of the serious doubt which may arise as to the irregularity of the motion made by the hon. member for West Prince, I should leave it to the house to determine whether this motion is irregular or not, or whether it should be accepted or not.

In my own mind, I have no doubt as to the unconstitutionality of the amendment if it were carried, but Bourinot says that the Speaker cannot decide on constitutional questions. and therefore I think the best way is for the house to pronounce on the amendment now that the members have been called in.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I say one word on the point of order ? In the case to which Your Honour referred, namely, the case with respect to the redistribution in Prince Edward Island in 1903, the issue there was somewhat different from what it is here. There was a question of doubt and it was referred to the courts, and I believe an appeal was pending to the Privy Council, but it does seem to me, if I may direct Your Honour's attention to the last words of this amendment, that it is so clearly in violation of the constitution that this house should not even consider it. While Bourinot's opinion was as Your Honour has quoted, nevertheless it is pointed out in May, as in the rules of the house, that when the matter is clearly a subject that this house should not pronounce upon, it should not be asked to do so, because by so doing the house would be pronouncing on something over which it had no jurisdiction. The last part of the amendment asks that the legislative powers—the legislative powers, mark you—of the provinces, which are defined by section 92 of the British North America Act, shall be vested in the Dominion government.

Mr. DUNNING: Not in the Dominion parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: No, not in parliament at all, and I do submit that there is quite a clear distinction between this case and the one with which the Speaker had to deal in 1903. The question that I think, with all deference, Your Honour should leave to this house is: Is this amendment in order? Let us decide that as a preliminary question. That is what the Speaker said in that other case, but they discussed it further. I submit to Your Honour, having taken the course you have, that the proper matter now to be submitted to the house is whether this amendment is in order, and we can vote on that because this house makes its own rules in a matter of this kind, and we can declare once for all that an amendment to a motion submitted to the house that involves the amendment of the constitution of Canada which would divest the provinces of Canada of their legislative powers which have been granted under the British North America Act is wholly beyond the power of this parliament to deal with.

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (North Winnipeg): I do not think that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has stated the case quite clearly. He has quoted only one portion of the amendment. One portion of the amendment is not binding on anyone at all. It is just an expression of opinion. I am asking the house to refer this report back to the select standing committee, but it is wholly within the power of that committee to bring in a completely new report, and this may be the last we shall ever hear of this motion.

Mr. STEVENS: That is just what they cannot do.

Mr. HEAPS: Oh yes, they can. Although I have not the 1903 case before me, I am of the opinion that the motion in that case must have been completely different from the motion that I have made this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my own personal opinion as to the constitutionality of this amendment, but I am guided by Bourinot; he is my master. He says that the Speaker,

> will not give a decision upon a constitutional question nor decide a question of law, though the same be raised on a point of order or privilege—

as in the present instance.

But the house by pronouncing immediately on the amendment will decide whether it is constitutional or unconstitutional.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Heaps) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adshead,	Gershaw,
Bird,	Heaps,
Bourassa,	Kellner,
Bradette,	Lucas,
Carmichael,	Luchkovich,
Coote,	Neill,
Evans,	Speakman,
Gardiner,	Spencer,
Garland (Bow River),	Woodsworth.—18.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),	Lacombe,
Arthurs,	Laflamme,
Barber,	Lapierre,
Bell (Hamilton West),	Lapointe,
Bennett,	Letellier de St. Just,
Benoit,	Lovie,
Black (Yukon),	Macdonald (Glengarry),
Blanchard,	Macdonald (Richmond-West Cape Breton),
Blatchford,	MacLean (Prince),
Bock,	McLean (Melfort),
Bouchard,	MacNutt,
Boucher,	McGibbon,
Boulanger,	McIntosh,
Bourgeois,	McKenzie,
Bowen,	McQuarrie,
Boys,	Malcolm,
Brady,	Mercier (St. Henri),
Brown,	Millar,
Cahan,	Milne,
Cannon,	Morin (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville),
Casgrain,	Morrissy,
Charters,	Motherwell,
Chevrier,	Peck,
Clark,	Perras,
Denis,	Price,
Desaulniers,	Quinn,
Dickie,	Ralston,
Donnelly,	Rinfret,
Dubuc,	Robb,
Dunning,	Ross (Kingston City),
Esling,	Ryerson,
Euler,	Séguin,
Fafard,	Short,
Forke,	Spence,
Fraser,	Spotton,
Garland (Carleton),	Stevens,
Gervais,	Stewart (Edmonton West),
Girouard,	Stewart (Leeds),
Glen,	Sylvestre,
Gott,	Taylor,
Hanson,	Telford,
Heenan,	Totzke,
Hepburn,	Vallance,
Howden,	Young (Saskatoon).—92.
Ilsley,	
Johnston (Long Lake),	
King (Kootenay East),	
King, Mackenzie (Prince Albert),	

Mr. MARCIL: I was paired with the hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. The question is now on the main motion.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I want to add just a few words to the main motion. Before doing so, may I congratulate the intelligentsia of the house on the moral victory we have just achieved. How often is the old saying true, Mr. Speaker, "Right forever on the footstool; Wrong forever on the throne."

Mr. BENNETT: That is not the correct rendering.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. NEILL: I remind my fellow victims that fewer than our number once saved Sodom and Gomorrha, and possibly there is hope yet for something better even within these walls. While the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George was following the Minister of Justice in the early part of his argument, he was talking with his usual sound constitutional ability, but as he warmed up and threw the ponderous weight of his legal attainments upon the humble amendment presented by the hon. member for North Winnipeg and myself he termed it absurd, ridiculous, and used other such unparliamentary language; but I noticed that he had to resort to a play upon words to arrive at that vicious state of mind. In the amendment we used the words "Dominion government" when we should have said "Dominion parliament."

Mr. SPEAKER: Might I remind the hon. gentleman that he must speak now to the main motion. The amendment has been lost.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I think I can connect my remarks with the main motion. Of course, sir, I shall be subject to your discretion as I go along, but certainly what I am about to say is all part of my argument on the main motion, and I say so in all seriousness. I noticed that the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George tried to draw a parallel—and this is where I am coming to the motion—he tried to cinch his argument by drawing a parallel—I do not think it was a parallel, and I so told him, but he said it was—between the desperate condition of women and children suffering in Canada from want of employment and sickness with some grievance of his own when he went to the States and could not buy a cigarette. I shudder to think of the place he was in where it was an offence to buy cigarettes. But I rather think his whole later argument savoured of the reductio ad absurdum.

Now I come to what I wanted to bring before the house. I presume this report will pass. While along with other members of the committee I share my full responsibility for the report, I must confess it is rather a poor production. I cannot see that it is going to bring about any tangible results. But I want to tell the government and this house that we cannot evade this situation by taking refuge behind technical objections. I admit that the argument of the Minister of Justice was probably sound when he urged that the provinces cannot do what we suggest they should do. He ought to know, and his argument appeared to be sound. But, I repeat, we cannot get rid of this subject by having recourse to technical objections or points of

order. The question of unemployment and sickness insurance will be more and more a burning question in Canada with our modern methods. We are abundantly prosperous in Canada to-day, that is not denied, but with our modern methods of rapid production, as soon as there is a demand for a certain article scientific methods rush in to fill that demand, and they fill it with such tremendous facility that overproduction results. Prosperity or no prosperity, we are always going to have an increasing measure of unemployment, and trouble resulting from sickness. Other countries have recognized this and have taken steps to meet the situation. Now, it seems that we have a tendency to travel in a circle, in connection with questions of this sort, and we always find ourselves finally running into the great wall of the British North America Act. But I would suggest that the British North America Act is not an act of God; it is not one of the natural laws, such as the laws of astronomy, which cannot be upset or changed. The day is coming, indeed it has passed, when we should be taking steps to consider an amendment to that act not only in regard to the question now before us but in connection with several other matters that come up from time to time and which clamour for a change in the act. From time to time the Dominion holds conferences with the provinces and I would ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to give us some encouragement now to hope that when next we have a conference with the provinces he will take up with them the question of amending the British North America Act—adopting, of course, regular procedure—such as will enable us to deal finally and decidedly with this question of jurisdiction, not only as regards unemployment, sickness and so forth, but in connection with various other matters which are causing us more and more trouble, unrest and difficulty as between the provinces and the Dominion, both in our judicial and in our social relations. That is a subject that might well engage the attention of the government at the next provincial conference.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. BENNETT: On division.

Motion agreed to on division.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING—SENATE BILL

Bill No. 301, for the relief of Bertha Jane Phelan.—Mr. McQuarrie.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

FEDERAL APPEAL BOARD

Mr. COOTE:

1. How many appeals have been received by the Federal Appeal Board, since the formation of the board to December 31st, 1928?
2. How many of these appeals have been heard by the board?
3. In how many cases has a decision been given by the board?
4. In how many of these cases was a pension granted or increased?
5. How many appeals lodged with the board had not been heard on December 31st, 1928?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. 15,075 appeals were received of which, on consideration by the board, 3,719 were adjudged to be outside the jurisdiction of the board, 1,112 were reopened and pensioned by the Board of Pension Commissioners, 749 were awaiting further information and 9,495 were appealable.

2. 6,369.

3. 5,829.

4. 1,341 appeals were allowed. The Federal Appeal Board does not grant pensions. There is no appeal on assessment.

5. 3,126, made up as follows: 2,173 awaiting hearing; 737 also awaiting hearing and awaiting advice by official soldiers' advisers of their readiness to proceed; 216 deferred indefinitely for various reasons, principal one being that the Federal Appeal Board is unable to locate the appellants.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—SHERBROOKE, N.S.

Mr. QUINN:

1. What is the name of the collector of customs at the port of Sherbrooke, Nova Scotia?
2. What salary is paid said official?
3. Is there also a sub-collector at this port?
4. If so: (a) what is the name of said official; (b) date of apointment; (c) by whom recommended; (d) amount of salary; (e) duties of office?
5. What were the amounts of customs receipts at this port during the years 1925-1926-1927-1928 and 1929?

Mr. EULER:

1 and 2. There is no collector of customs as Sherbrooke is an outport.

3. There is a sub-collector in charge of the outport.

4. (a) Charles Russell Cameron; (b) 2nd April, 1929; (c) Minister of National Revenue, temporary pending permanent appointment by the Civil Service Commission; (d) $360

per annum; (e) All customs excise work of the outport.

5.	Import Duties	Excise Taxes	Total
1924-25.. ..	$2,015 27	$ 910 99	$2,926 26
1925-26.. ..	1,479 47	1,426 54	2,906 01
1926-27.. ..	1,123 73	952 81	2,076 54
1927-28.. ..	276 69	516 65	793 34
1928-29.. ..	341 71	502 62	844 33

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

RETURNS TO ORDERS OF THE HOUSE

Sir GEORGE PERLEY:

1. When orders are issued by the house for the original files, or copies of the same, regarding appointments under the Civil Service Commission, as has been the case in several instances lately in connection with the Post Office Department; are all the papers on the files of the Civil Service Commission brought down, including the reports or recommendations of the senior officials, any observations or opinions of the commissioners, and generally, everything on the files that appertains to the appointment in question?

2. If not: (a) what is the practice, by whom and on what basis is the selection made of the papers that are brought down; (b) why is not everything brought down in accordance with the order of the house?

Mr. RINFRET: Order for return.

Mr. BENNETT: The Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret) will agree, I think, that this question is not one that should stand as an order for return. The questions are specific. For example, there is the question:

What is the practice, by whom and on what basis is the selection made of the papers that are brought down?

Possibly the hon. gentleman confuses this with another question.

Mr. RINFRET: The only reason for making the question an order for return is that I shall have to bring down considerable correspondence in connection with the question. The Civil Service Commission has made an official reply. The chairman of the commission has written a separate letter and I have had to write him with a view to clearing up a certain point. There will be no delay in bringing down the correspondence.

Mr. BENNETT: Thank you.

Mr. RINFRET: It will be all produced.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. NEILL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I wish to rise to a question of privilege. It is not a question of privilege so far as the house is concerned but one touching me personally in my position as a member of parliament in this house. In this regard I wish to cite the authority of Bourinot, at page 303.

There it is stated that many questions of privilege are permitted in the Canadian house, the category embracing:

Reflections or libels in books and newspapers on the house or members thereof.

I wish to discuss a reflection on myself as a member of parliament, in association with other persons, and the circumstances are very similar to those under which the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) rose to a question of privilege some weeks ago. In an almost identical case that hon. member was allowed to speak for some thirty minutes, no objection having been raised on this side of the house. He spoke as a prominent member of his party. I hope I shall receive the same courtesy, although I am an insignificant member and cannot claim the allegiance or support of any party.

The article of which I wish to complain is to be found in The Mail and Empire of Toronto, of Tuesday, May 21, 1929. The article is accompanied by a large map of the province of British Columbia. I shall read certain portions of the article, those that I omit being quite immaterial to the main argument. The article, written by The Mail and Empire staff writer, reads:

Ottawa, May 20.—By the Pacific fisheries treaty negotiated by the King government with the United States and now before parliament for approval, it is proposed to give the United States equal control with Canada in the immense territory in British Columbia outlined in the map above.

The map takes in practically the whole or greater part of British Columbia.

This treaty is to preserve the sockeye salmon industry, almost ruined by the United States, and would place the watershed of the Fraser river under the control of a joint international commission—three from the United States and three from Canada.

Now I come to the point at issue:

This immense area, over which the King government proposed to give the United States equal control with Canada regarding lakes, rivers and improvements thereon, is about 100,000 square miles, equal in area to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island combined. . .

This treaty is viewed with grave suspicion by British Columbia members—

Of whom I am one.

—as giving the United States an economic partnership in half of that province. International joint commissions have been disastrous to Canada.

Then, after some further remarks about international commissions, it concludes in this way:

It is felt the proposed treaty in giving the United States equal authority in Canadian territory is creating a precedent that may strike a deadly blow at Canadian independence.

Think of that, Mr. Speaker; it may strike a deadly blow at Canadian independence.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order; this cannot possibly be a question of privilege affecting the hon. member. What he is now reading may hereafter become the subject matter of a very complicated debate, and this question is now before a committee of this house.

I think Your Honour pointed out not many days ago that if it is felt by a member that he has been libelled, the proper course is for him to place the paper on the table of the house and make the proper comment. I dare say Your Honour will recall the case in which that was done and the author of the article brought to the bar of the house. When the hon. gentleman stated that certain British Columbia members viewed with suspicion a certain course of action, and that he was one of them—

Mr. NEILL: I did not say that.

Mr. BENNETT: When he said that, he was within his rights as a matter of privilege in saying, "I was not one of those who took that view."

Mr. NEILL: You did not give me time.

Mr. BENNETT: No, for the simple and obvious reason that the hon. gentleman was discussing something else that had nothing whatever to do with him, and I submit that when we get into a discussion as to what that treaty involves we are on ground which should not be entertained as a matter of privilege with respect to any individual member. Your Honour laid down the rules I think the other day; I looked up the authorities and I believe Your Honour gave the correct ruling. The question of privilege is only a question where reference is made to British Columbia members; the moment my hon. friend went beyond that he was traversing ground he should not have traversed on a question of privilege.

Mr. NEILL: I had not finished reading the article of which I complained and which attributed to me, along with other members from British Columbia, sentiments which are entirely false. I do not see how I can be out of order yet. I would direct attention to page 303 of Bourinot:

In the Canadian house, questions of privilege take a wide range, but it may be stated in general terms that they refer to all matters affecting the rights and immunities of the house collectively, or to the position and conduct of members in their representative character. In this category may be placed: motions touching the seat or election of members (a); reflections or libels in books and newspapers on the house or members thereof...

The article in question touches my position and conduct in my representative character; it is a reflection on my standing and reputation in British Columbia if I endorse or allow to go uncontradicted that scandalous libel, which is a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end. I have every right to defend my character, which is being assailed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to speak on the point of order?

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): All I wish to say is that if such a statement and presentation as my hon. friend is making on a question of privilege is to be permitted, then other hon. members whose opinions may differ as to the article certainly should have a similar right to discuss that question.

Hon. LUCIEN CANNON (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the opposition was perfectly right when he stated that any matter which has been referred to a committee cannot be the subject of discussion in this house until that committee has reported. However, if I understand the point raised by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, it is a question of privilege in that, being a member of the house, he draws the attention of the house to the fact that a newspaper, commenting on a matter which is now before parliament, has misrepresented the matter.

Mr. BENNETT: No, he complains that his position has been misrepresented.

Mr. CANNON: He wishes to show that there has been misrepresentation. If that be the case, and if the hon. member succeeds in putting before the Chair such a case, certainly the privileges of the house generally and those of the hon. member particularly have been invaded.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Comox-Alberni should have been allowed to make his statement, but I have not yet gathered where the point of privilege arises. However, I might remind the house that even if it were not strictly a question of privilege, at page 304 of Bourinot I find the following:

Members sometimes correct reports of their speeches, or inaccurate statements in the press on the ground of privilege; but these are personal explanations, not matters of privilege, and are allowed only by the indulgence of the house

I have not yet seen the point at issue, so I would ask the hon. gentleman to state exactly where the question of privilege arises.

Mr. NEILL: I should think I might be allowed to finish the quotation of which I complain:

> It is felt the proposed treaty in giving the United States equal authority in Canadian territory is creating a precedent that may strike a deadly blow at Canadian independence. It is argued if this is done in British Columbia, United States partnership and control may be extended to areas in every province.

The question of privilege is this: I do not want to be associated with a statement so utterly and absolutely removed from the truth. The writer of this article suggests that he has obtained his information from, or that it has been inspired by, the members from British Columbia. Where else could he get the views of those members? After the great latitude which was allowed the member for St. Lawrence-St. George I think I should be allowed to explain where this statement is wrong. That is not a question of argument; it is a question of fact.

Mr. BENNETT: Again I raise the point of order. Look at the clock; surely the rules of this house must be obeyed. The hon. member has made two misstatements in the last five minutes. I apprehend that this is all a by-play between the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has no right to bring me into this matter at all.

Mr. BENNETT: The anxiety of the Prime Minister was such that I apprehended that this was a by-play between him and the hon. member; if the Prime Minister says I am wrong that settles it. He says he has nothing to do with it.

Mr. NEILL: You are also wrong in saying that I made two misstatements.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Comox-Alberni said a moment ago that the members from British Columbia had made certain statements.

Mr. NEILL: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Pardon me. He said further—

Mr. DUNNING: He denies it.

Mr. BENNETT: That only makes it worse. He also said that it was felt that so and so was the case, but the article does not say that this was felt to be so by the members from British Columbia.

Mr. NEILL: The article states that the treaty is viewed with grave suspicion by British Columbia members and then says a little further on "It is felt"—

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, and when the hon. member says that as a British Columbia member he desires entirely to dissociate himself from that statement, he has discharged his duty and his right in claiming his question of privilege. That is the whole point. He said that he was not one of those members from British Columbia who share those opinions, and a moment ago he was discussing whether or not this meant independence. The record will show that he started to discuss that when I raised the question of order, and now he reads on again. The point is this: Are we going to traverse and argue and discuss the merits of a matter which is now before a committee on a question of privilege raised by the hon. gentleman, or are we going to permit him to say, as it is plainly and clearly his duty to say, that the statements thus made incorrectly indicate his position? He has a right to do that, but he used language which was wholly unparliamentary in describing it a moment ago—wholly unparliamentary as defined by Bourinot—and I merely suggest that we should have some regard for the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman might state briefly the question of privilege which he raised this afternoon. I understand that a certain paper published an article wherein the members of a certain province were said to have apparently sacrificed the interests of Canada to the United States.

Mr. STEVENS: No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what I inferred from the remarks of the hon. gentleman. He dissociates himself from that group of members who had sacrificed Canada. That article was in connection with the salmon treaty, and having said that, I think he has used his right as a member in claiming his privilege, but now he desires to say more.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Speaker, I have used it, but I do not think I have exhausted it. I do not think the house has clearly grasped the situation and perhaps I had better begin again. As it is close to six o'clock perhaps we might call it six o'clock so that the opposition may have an opportunity to grasp my views.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): By leave of the house, I beg to present the fourth report of the special committee appointed to study the Dominion Elections Act.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. NEILL

Mr. NEILL: Just before six o'clock, in the few intermittent moments that I was allowed to speak, I thought I had put on Hansard all of the article of which I was complaining, but I find that in one of the interruptions I had lost my place and left out a sentence which I would ask permission to read now. It is only a sentence and Hansard can insert it at the proper place or it can go in now. It makes no difference. This is the sentence I wish to insert:

> In the territory is included Canada's great Pacific port of Vancouver, which may be subjected to certain control by this international commission.

That suggests to me a view which is more than my personal grievance; it opens up a wider sphere.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman who is an experienced member and who is not ignorant of the rules of the house, knows that on a question of privilege he is not permitted to discuss the question whether the port of Vancouver is or is not included.

Mr. NEILL: I am not going to speak about the port of Vancouver.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what the hon. member has just started to do.

Mr. NEILL: If the hon. member was not quite so previous, and would allow me to develop my argument then he could find fault with it. Surely it is not necessary to find fault with what I am saying before I say it.

Mr. BENNETT: I will make my point clear. The hon. member said: I now propose to make an argument. The question of privilege does not permit argument. Your Honour has so declared so frequently that I am not going to trespass upon the time of the house in making further reference to it. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to say, after reading that article: I am not one of the members from British Columbia who think so and the references which are made to myself are incorrect or not founded upon fact. But he must not enter into a discussion or an argument respecting the matter.

Mr. NEILL: I am not making an argument and surely I should be allowed to indicate what my stand is going to be before I am checked up. I have for the moment not abandoned but simply sidestepped the situation as regards myself. I want to lay before the house a question of privilege, of all our privileges, of the dignity of parliament itself. On the 20th May the Prime Minister of Canada asked the house to send to the marine and fisheries committee this treaty that was mentioned in the article. That committee consists of thirty-five members of whom ten constitute a quorum. Naturally those members are drawn from the provinces fronting on the Pacific or the Atlantic ocean. Consequently the committee is very largely composed of members from the maritime provinces who live a long way from British Columbia. Those men are in the position of a jury; they are going to deal with this question. That occurred on the 20th May. On the 21st May, the next day, comes out this malignant, treacherous, disloyal piece of propaganda. That is all parliamentary, for I have looked the matter up. I do not often prate about loyalty in the house, but that is disloyal to everyone in British Columbia, and to Canada and every member who cherishes ideals of truth, honour and decency in our political relations.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely this is not a question of privilege. If the hon. member is not to observe the rules of the house, where is this to end?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I may say just a word, the hon. member is speaking about an article which reflects upon parliament as a whole and upon the honour of parliament. I have the article in my hand and the first sentence of it reads:

> By the Pacific fisheries treaty negotiated by the King government with the United States and now before parliament for approval, it is proposed to give the United States equal control with Canada in the immense territory in British Columbia outlined in the map above.

That is an absolute untruth.

Mr. BENNETT: I think it is true. That is the difference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is absolutely untrue.

Mr. BENNETT: I say it is absolutely true.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is before us is an article referring to parliament and an international treaty which is before a committee of parliament. No newspaper has a right in these circumstances to make the statement that the treaty means something which it does not mean.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. gentleman continue and state his point?

Mr. NEILL: The point I was wanting to make at this moment was that the publication of this document was highly calculated, intentionally or otherwise, to influence the members of the marine and fisheries committee who act as judges or jury in the consideration of the treaty which is now before them. How can they be unbiased when a journal by which at least some of the members swear politically, comes out with definite statements, fortified by a map and supported by what is alleged to be the views of British Columbia members who are supposed to know? How can they give a fair and honest judgment to the consideration of the treaty when it comes before them? That is the point I want to make which affects the honour, dignity and rights of us all. Supposing it was a jury and a man was being tried for his life, and the counsel for the prisoner discovered that the jury had been secretly, or publicly, if you like, served with an extremely ex parte statement of the man's guilt. What would the prisoner's counsel's position be? Would he not ask for a new jury that had not seen and was not privy to this propaganda? That is the point of order which I submit. The Prime Minister said it was false and I understood the leader of the opposition to say it was not false.

Mr. BENNETT: It is absolutely correct that under the terms of that treaty nearly 100,000 square miles is handed over to the joint control of the United States and Canada for fisheries purposes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Fisheries purposes is a very limited phrase, and even that is not correct.

Mr. NEILL: I wonder who is discussing the terms of the treaty now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BENNETT: That is trifling with the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think if the hon. gentleman was allowed to make his statement as briefly and concisely as possible, there would not be any trifling, but he must not make any contentious argument. He must simply state what in that article reflects on his dignity or on his honour as a member of the House of Commons, and having said that, he has said enough.

Mr. NEILL: And until he has said that, he has not said enough.

Mr. McGIBBON: Are you going to rule this house, Mr. Speaker, or is the hon. member for Comox-Alberni?

Mr. STEVENS: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that before the six o'clock recess the hon. member for Comox-Alberni had dissociated himself absolutely from this article and repudiated all responsibility for it, and now he is attempting to read and discuss the article and to malign the party who wrote it and the paper in which it is printed. Furthermore, I submit that he is introducing an opinion of his own regarding the terms of the treaty to which we shall be precluded from replying by the rules of the house, and as to which treaty we hold diametrically opposite views from those he is expressing. That is utterly unfair. We have a right to claim the privilege of replying to the hon. gentleman if he, the Prime Minister, and others are going to be permitted to comment on the treaty. If that is to be permitted, although we are not asking for that privilege because the matter is before the fisheries committee, we claim the right to reply. But if the matter is to be introduced we claim the right of expressing our views because this is one of the most important matters before parliament.

Mr. NEILL: There is a good deal of truth in what the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has said, only he has begun at the wrong place. It is not he that demands the right to reply; I am demanding the right to reply. They have had their innings in the Mail and Empire.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman cannot impute motives to hon. members.

Mr. BENNETT: Take that back now. He said they have had their innings in the Mail and Empire. I ask that that be withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw that statement.

Mr. NEILL: Which statement?

Mr. SPEAKER: That they have had their innings in the Mail and Empire. He is accusing hon. members of having written that article—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: By inference, yes.

Mr. NEILL: I will withdraw it and put it this way.

Mr. BENNETT: That is more offensive still.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Wait till you hear it.

Mr. NEILL: The first statements that came out in connection with this matter appeared in the Mail and Empire, did they not? For the honour of parliament and myself and in the interests of British Columbia I want a chance to reply. My hon. friend wants a chance to reply to me. I am only replying to the statements in the Mail and Empire. But we will leave aside their origin.

Mr. BENNETT: Now the hon. gentleman is clearly out of order. He has no right to reply. The debate will afford that opportunity. The house must be deeply grateful to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, in the absence of any effort being made by others, for protecting its honour. Usually the Prime Minister is looked upon as the leader of the House of Commons, but in this instance the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is protecting its honour. The question is a very simple one, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman says: I now claim the right to reply to what appeared in the Mail and Empire. Surely, once he dissociates himself from the article the question of privilege is done, and he has his opportunity to reply when the treaty comes back from the committee and is debated in this house.

Mr. NEILL: I am not going to reply to the Mail and Empire. I was following up the line of argument that was used by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, who asked the right to reply to me.

Mr. McGIBBON: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. NEILL: Oh come, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. gentleman rising to a point of order?

Mr. McGIBBON: Yes. I say that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has twice defied your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: In what respect?

Mr. McGIBBON: You asked him to withdraw and he refused.

Mr. SPEAKER: He withdrew the statement and wished to qualify it but was not allowed to do it. The hon. gentleman will proceed.

Mr. CLARK: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has spoken on this question of privilege on more than one occasion. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that while you are in the chair a member can speak to a question of privilege only once. The hon. member had spoken before dinner, and he chose to discontinue before six o'clock. He called it six o'clock to suit himself, but you, Mr. Speaker, did not call it six o'clock, and after the hon. member from Comox-Alberni took his seat from his own choice the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) proceeded with an entirely different matter. As you, Mr. Speaker, permitted the hon. member for Quebec South to proceed, thereby the question of privilege was closed and I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is now definitely closed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not understand that the question was closed at six o'clock. By unanimous consent it was declared six o'clock.

Mr. CLARK: There was no unanimous consent because another matter was proceeded with and it was not six o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: Everybody understood that it was six o'clock. I saw the hands of the clock at six just before hon. members left their seats, and the hon. member for Quebec South asked the leave of the house to lay documents on the table. I must say this, that the hon. member since he rose has been so frequently interrupted that he has not been able to make his point clear. Speaking from the chair I have said that he must be allowed some latitude in placing his question of privilege before the house. I think that if he was allowed to point out without interruptions what he complains of, it would take very much less time.

Mr. CLARK: I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling has been based upon a decision of this house given by unanimous consent. There was no such unanimous consent. So far as I personally was concerned, when the hon. member sat down and presumed to call it six o'clock, I personally did not consent to any such proceeding, and I dissent from it now. There was no unanimous consent of the house asked by the hon. member or by the Chair of the right to proceed

after six. It was not six o'clock, and you ruled, Mr. Speaker, that it was not six, because you permitted another member to another member to introduce an entirely different subject which was proceeded with and disposed of.

Mr. SPEAKER: Every day at eleven o'clock I allow the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) and others to ask questions of the Prime Minister, to which he replies. That is done every day. It is true there was no unanimous consent given, but tacit consent is tantamount to unanimous consent.

Mr. NEILL: Dire indeed must be their need when they take refuge—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. NEILL: —in such a quibble.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, we are going to have some semblance of fair play in this house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention certain facts in connection with this matter. I have the article complained of before me—

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems that we cannot proceed very regularly in this way. I can direct the hon .gentleman to send the article to the Clerk of the House so that it may be read, and then action may be taken on it by proper notice being given, when the whole question can be debated. Otherwise it is trifling with the time of the house.

Mr. STEVENS: Absolutely.

Mr. NEILL: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McGIBBON: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. NEILL: I have the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. NEILL: Did I understand you, sir, to rule that I must send the article to the Clerk of the House, or was it only a suggestion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. We shall not have order in the house unless this is done properly.

Mr. NEILL: On that one point, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CLARK: The ruling has been given.

Mr. NEILL: Am I to be howled down?

Mr. CLARK: You ought to be put out for disregarding the ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. We shall not have order unless we proceed regularly. Generally great latitude is given on a question of this nature, but I see this evening it is impossible to proceed except regularly. Therefore I rule that the strict procedure must be followed. The article must be sent to the clerk to be read in English and in French. Then notice will have to be given and action taken on the article.

The newspaper article having been handed to the clerk, the Clerk Assistant read as follows:

United States Partnership in Canadian Territory.
From T. H. Blacklock
Mail and Empire Staff writer

Ottawa, May 20. By the Pacific fisheries treaty negotiated by the King government with the United States and now before parliament for approval—

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion should be made by the hon. gentleman that the article be read.

Mr. NEILL: In deference to your ruling, sir—because I would be quite prepared to go on with my remarks—I make a motion that the article complained of be read by the Clerk of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Thereupon the Clerk Assistant read as follows:

United States Partnership in Canadian Territory
From T. H. Blacklock
Mail and Empire Staff Writer

Ottawa, May 20. By the Pacific fisheries treaty negotiated by the King government with the United States and now before parliament for approval, it is proposed to give the United States equal control with Canada in the immense territory in British Columbia outlined in the map above.—

Mr. BENNETT: That is true.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

The Clerk Assistant resumed the reading of the article as follows:

This treaty is to preserve the sockeye salmon industry, almost ruined by the United States, and would place the watershed of the Fraser River under the control of a joint international commission—three from the United States and three from Canada.

This immense area, over which the King government proposed to give the United States equal control with Canada regarding lakes, rivers and improvements thereon, is about 100,000 square miles, equal in area to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island combined, and also equal in area to that part of Ontario between Ottawa on the east, Windsor on the west, Niagara Falls on the south and Sudbury on the north. In the territory is in-

cluded Canada's great Pacific port of Vancouver, which may be subjected to certain control by this international commission.

The treaty is viewed with grave suspicion by British Columbia members as giving the United States an economic partnership in half of that province. International joint commissions have been disastrous to Canada. The St. Lawrence power diversion was secured by a Canadian commissioner joining with the American members of the International Joint Commission. Fortunately that Canadien representative has been retired, but not before he did irretrievable harm. The international joint engineering board on the St. Lawrence development recommended the power plant on the international section be placed in the American territory. This was done by a member of the Canadian section joining with the American section.

It is felt the proposed treaty in giving the United States equal authority in Canadian territory is creating a precedent that may strike a deadly blow at Canadian independence. It is argued if this is done in British Columbia, United States partnership and control may be extended to areas in every province.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Tory propaganda.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the article be translated into French.

Mr. SPEAKER: The article will have to be sent to the translators before it can be read.

Mr. PERRAS (Translation): Why, sir? Is it not possible to translate it immediately?

Mr. SPEAKER (Translation): There are no translators here, in the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Number 13.

Mr. BENNETT: But, Mr. Speaker, there is a motion pending. We cannot have two motions before the house at the same time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We are not going to wait until the article is translated. I understood Mr. Speaker to say that the article is to be sent to the translator.

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Surely we are not going to wait until the article is translated.

Mr. BENNETT: The motion must be disposed of.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Then everybody will understand it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The motion was to the effect that the article be read.

Mr. BENNETT: Forthwith.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And it has been read. Now Mr. Speaker says it is to be sent to the translator. I presume in the meantime we had better proceed with other business.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, we can go on.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE ACT

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RECEIVING APPLICATIONS

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved that the time for receiving applications for insurance under the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act be extended for one year from the 31st August, 1929.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the Chair.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister might explain the circumstances.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, last year the special committee on pensions and returned soldiers' problems considered the question of insurance, and part of their report reads as follows:

It was strongly represented to your committee by returned soldiers' organizations that their members and returned soldiers generally should again be afforded the opportunity of applying for and receiving insurance under the provisions of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, under which no applications have been receivable since September, 1923.

In accordance with the recommendation of the committee a bill was presented in the House of Commons and passed extending the time for applications for insurance until 1933. In the senate the bill was amended so that the extended time will expire in September, 1929. Under this measure we propose to extend the time for another year.

Mr. CLARK: To refresh the memories of the members of the committee, would the Minister of Finance read the provisions of the act which extended the insurance? It was amended, as I recall, by the senate; consequently we are not very familiar with the provisions.

Mr. ROBB: As compared with the original measure we introduced—is that what my hon. friend means?

Mr. CLARK: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: The act was amended, by recommendation of the parliamentary committee, in 1922, to provide an extension of one year in which applications for insurance might be made. When this extension was

granted certain special cases were made non-insurable. These special cases are: (1) Applicants without dependents seriously ill; (2) Applicants with dependents, who had no expectancy of life and where disability was not due to war service; (3) Applicants who had suffered impairment of health due to immoral conduct. These are no longer admitted to insurance under the act.

Mr. CLARK: I wished to get the actual amending provision passed last year by the house.

Mr. BENNETT: It is the section which now appears in the bill, with the exception that 1929 is now being made 1930.

Mr. ROBB: That is all; application for insurance may be received under this legislation up to and including October 31, 1930, but shall not be received thereafter.

Mr. BENNETT: Previously it was 1929 and you are now changing it to 1930?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: That answers the question as to the date. But what I should like to know is this. The committee last year recommended 1933 and the Senate changed that. Is it not desirable, if we are going to extend the time now, to extend it to 1933 and be done with it?

Mr. ROBB: All we are asked to do at the moment is to extend it one year; that is all that the representative of the legion requests.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the actuarial effect of it?

Mr. ROBB: The applications received between June, 1928, and April, 1929, were 5,222.

Mr. BENNETT: New applications?

Mr. ROBB: Yes. Of these, 4,530 were accepted. There have been refused 604, and outstanding, not reported on, there are 88. The total applications accepted, 4,530, represent insurance to the amount of $11,018,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: What has been the loss, if any, on this scheme?

Mr. ROBB: It is difficult to tell what the actuarial loss is; some have not yet matured. The financial statement as of March 31, 1929, shows a balance of funds on hand of $7,651,878.18. Out of that we paid $540,044.93 in death claims, surrender values to the amount of $239,366.72, disability claims amounting to $5,555.40, leaving a balance of $6,866,911.13.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. BENNETT: What would be the amount necessary to hold as reserve, under actuarial life insurance figures, to meet the liability?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friends will recall that this scheme was introduced with the idea of giving the soldier reasonable insurance at moderate cost.

Mr. McGIBBON: Last year it was stated that the scheme was self-supporting and that the government would not be called upon to shoulder any liability.

Mr. ROBB: We always hope that these schemes are self-supporting. I should not like to go on record as saying that this scheme is self-supporting, but it is not in an unhealthy condition at the moment.

Mr. CLARK: What was the general ground on which the 600 applications were refused?

Mr. ROBB: I cannot say. The applications are passed on by the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Mr. GEARY: Do you set up a reserve as provided for in the insurance act? Is the scheme actuarially sound by means of an ordinary reserve at 3½ per cent or whatever the rate may be?

Mr. ROBB: The scheme was introduced in 1920 but I should not care to say that it was actuarially sound. It is probably not far enough advanced yet to warrant that statement.

Mr. GEARY: If the policy is not loaded too heavily for expenses it can be made actuarially sound by setting up the required reserve at the rate of interest called for by the department, and I understand that is actually done. It is only a question of loading or not loading for expenses.

Mr. ROBB: There are no expenses.

Mr. GEARY: And that is why we can make it sound. I do not think the government wants the impression to get abroad that this is not sound insurance. It is not a gratuity; I hope it is not regarded as charity to the soldiers. The soldier is paying insurance that carries small loading for expenses and that is why the rate is lower than corresponding rates in line companies. I consider the proposition a good one and I should like the soldier to feel that he is getting something worth while by reason of the fact that the government is carrying it at cost; he is getting insurance at a good deal less than he would if he went to an ordinary line

company. I believe such to be the case. The minister will correct me if I am wrong, but my impression is that there is no examination of any rigidity; the 600 applicants who were refused are in all likelihood those coming under the three classes of exceptions referred to by the minister and therefore not entitled to insurance. But so long as a man is under a disability, I do not care whether it be 100 per cent, the government should grant the insurance practically without examination. Perhaps the minister will enlighten us on that point. It is something that should be brought clearly to the attention of the soldiers, because they can obtain this insurance at much lower cost than they can outside.

Mr. ROBB: I am glad to have my hon. friend express those views. If the government did not believe it was a good scheme for the soldiers they would not to-night be asking that it be extended another year. As I have said, all that the legion asks is that we extend it a year, and that we are granting.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: While in the west during the last recess, I was approached by some veterans of the South African war. They pointed out to me that almost all our other legislation dealing with returned men had been so amended as to give to veterans of the South African war practically the same terms, in every respect, as were conceded to veterans of the Great war. In the matter of pensions, in the matter of hospitalization, in practically every measure introduced in relation to the reestablishment of returned soldiers of the last war, the South African veterans, it was stated, had been placed on a parity with their brothers. But it was pointed out to me that in this one particular there was an exception, and it was urged upon me with a good deal of force and, I may say, quite convincingly by a man with whom I am very well acquainted, that this entailed a real hardship. A South African veteran who had lost his leg as the result of services at that time had volunteered for service in the expeditionary force in the Great war but naturally was not accepted on account of his physical condition. He has a pension with which, in addition to what he can earn, he supports himself, an invalid and widowed mother and one or two helpless members of the family. Not long ago he made an attempt to obtain insurance under this act which would enable his mother and other dependents to carry on in case of his death. He made his application in good faith, enclosing the amount required as a premium for a $3,000 policy, but of course he was informed that this act did not include South African veterans but only veterans of the Great war. He spoke to me on the subject and I must say he was very convincing, so much so that at least I saw the justice of his contention, particularly as this would affect comparatively few men. So I told him that as far as I could see the matter was fair and that I would bring it to the attention of the minister having charge of the act and all the members of the cabinet, who are anxious to see justice done to all returned soldiers so far as that is possible.

I would like to know from the minister if he would consider the extension of the benefits of this insurance act to that comparatively small handful of veterans who remain from the South African war, who as I said before have been placed on a parity with other veterans in everything except this matter. If they could come in under this act they would come under exactly the same terms, regulations and laws under which the veterans of the Great war now carry on, and I would be very glad if this question could be considered. I do not feel that it would involve a great deal of money; there are not very many of these men left, and those men who were crippled in the South African war and who have lived up to the present time obviously were not those who were in immediate danger of death.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Before the minister replies I might state that representations were made to me by a substantial number of South African returned men on this particular question, and I had intended to bring up the matter. The hon. member for Red Deer has covered the position so thoroughly that I will not go over it again. I believe the matter was considered in this house on a previous occasion, and I understand that the government bears part of the cost of this insurance. It is not, as my hon. friend has stated, upon a self-sustaining actuarial basis; if that were the case the matter would not be here. The government bears a portion of the cost for the simple reason that many of these men were not insurable risks, as was explained by the Minister of National Defence previously, and as the matter now stands we do not quite know what the ultimate responsibility may be. I understand that the officials of the insurance department say it is quite impossible, having regard to the type of risks carried and the difficulty of fixing any adequate premium, to indicate with certainty what the actuarial responsibility will be. Some of these men who returned from the South African war are in

fairly good physical condition; some of them would not be accepted by line insurance companies but were hoping they might be permitted to come in under this act before they became entirely too old to enable them to make some provision for their families.

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister say whether any favours at all have been granted the South African veterans? I happen to be one myself and I am approaching that period when favours may be required. It strikes me that the contingent which went from Canada to South Africa was sent under the Liberal party, and we were paid by Canada up to the time we got on the boat. From then on the poor old mother country had to pay us and bring us home, and as a matter of fact I believe all the pensions which are paid in Canada as a result of that war are paid by the mother country. So if any favours are being distributed I think this suggestion might be well considered.

Mr. ROBB: This is the first time politics have been injected into this debate; I thought this was a non-political question.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is that not true?

Mr. ROBB: I am not going into that question now, but I have some recollection that the South African veterans were given some privileges with regard to grants of land. However, I would not like to delay this bill by referring it back to the committee for consideration of this South African question. The bill now before the house is the result of an inquiry by a joint committee representing all parties, and the insurance is based upon the report of that committee. If at that time the South African veterans thought they had a claim, that claim should have been considered by the committee, and possibly that was done. My hon. friend from Red Deer was a member of that committee and he knows more about that matter than I do, but at this late stage all we propose to do is to extend for another year the benefits of an insurance scheme which has been recommended by a joint committee of the house.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Robb thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 310, to amend the Returned Soldiers Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

[Mr. Bennett.]

On section 1—Time extended one year for receiving applications.

Mr. CLARK: I would like to have a short statement, perhaps from the Minister of Pensions, giving the reasons for the refusal of so many applications for insurance. The reason I ask for this statement is because during the past year I have had many complaints from returned soldiers and returned soldiers' organizations that applications for insurance have been refused. My personal impression is that the great majority of these applications were refused because of the serious state of health of the applicants, but I have been assured that in some cases the matter was looked into by counsel on behalf of these applicants and that in their opinion the insurance should legally issue. I have never seen a case in which I could have given a similar opinion because I have not had the facts of these cases before me. I am not aware of the real reasons for these refusals, but I think it would clarify the situation throughout the country if the minister could give a short statement as to the general reason, if there is a general reason, for the refusal of so many applications for insurance.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of course, that is rather a difficult question to answer, because the adjudication of these cases is entirely under the jurisdiction of the Board of Pension Commissioners. They have a medical officer who is in possession of the file of the applicant. An inquiry is made as to the present condition of the applicant and where there is a reasonable expectancy of life he obtains his insurance; that is according to the act. There was probably some delay last fall with regard to rejections, but that has been adjusted and I think that many of the applications which were held up have been adjudicated on since. Out of six thousand applications something over four thousand have been favourably considered, which would indicate that a fair number are receiving consideration. As to those claims which the commission would not grant, that is a matter which is entirely out of my hands.

Mr. CLARK: Do the pensions board doctors examine each applicant?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. CLARK: How do they come to the conclusion whether or not he is a man suffering from a disability?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In nearly every case the medical history of the applicant is well known; the file is in the office and it may be adjudicated upon from the records. If there is any doubt there is a medical officer in each locality and he can inquire and report directly upon the applicants.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAR REPARATIONS

AUTHORITY TO PLACE $2,500,000 TO CREDIT OF CUSTODIAN FOR PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of Bill No. 285 to provide for the payment of claims for compensation for loss sustained by the civil population of Canada during the late war.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Definitions.

Mr. RINFRET: I have a suggested amendment to this section. When the resolution was before the house I indicated the reasons why the government had limited its proposed award to $2,500,000, but during the course of the present session considerable pressure was brought to bear upon the government to increase that award. Representations were made that the recommendations of Commissioner Friel be carried out, including his recommendation for the payment of interest. When the resolution was before the house I invited the fullest discussion on the matter and I indicated that the government had no intention to impose any policy in this matter. As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, every hon. member who spoke on that occasion took the stand that full payment should be made of all awards recommended by Commissioner Friel, and that we should take into consideration his recommendation as regards interest. The government has reconsidered the whole matter in the light of the discussion which took place in the house, and also in the light of representations which have come from all quarters of the country and which have appeared in the Canadian press. It is the intention of the government to recommend to this house, partly by means of this bill and partly through the supplementary estimates, the full payment of the awards made by Commissioner Friel and the payment of interest on same. As the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has pointed out, it is not possible for a money bill to go beyond the amount stated in the resolution, and, therefore, it is not my intention to recommend an amendment to this bill as regards the amount of money. The amendment I intend to recommend will make it conform to the intention of the government in this respect. If this bill passes the house, and is adopted by the senate, the government will include in the supplementary estimates an amount to make up the difference between $2,500,000 and the full award of Commissioner Friel.

Mr. BENNETT: And with interest?

Mr. RINFRET: With interest.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence) moved:

That subsection (b) of section 2 be amended by striking out all the words after the word "claim".

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—Commissioner's report.

Mr. RINFRET: I have an amendment to suggest in connection with this section. This section refers to the appointment of the commissioner under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, and the fourth line reads:

for the purpose of inquiry and report upon claims for compensation.

As there have been several commissioners appointed, I propose that the section be amended by striking out the words "inquiry and report" in the fourth line and substituting therefor "continuing and completing an inquiry and reporting." The section will then read:

The report of the commissioner appointed under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, chapter one hundred and four of the revised statutes of Canada, 1906, and amending act, for the purpose of continuing and completing an inquiry and reporting upon claims for compensation.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ralston moves:

That section 3 be amended by striking out the words "inquiry and report" in the fourth line and substituting therefor the words "continuing and completing inquiry.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GEARY: Many claims were passed upon but not allowed. I have read the report and the evidence that was adduced and I cannot say that I would altogether agree with the action of the commissioner in regard to certain claims. Perhaps this is not the ap-

propriate place to bring the matter up, but I suggest to the minister that he consider the advisability of having an appeal in regard to certain claims.

Mr. RINFRET: I intend to move later on that a clause be inserted covering that point.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Appropriation for payment.

Mr. BENNETT: The only thing about this section is that it does not say when payment is to be made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It means right away.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Method of payment.

Mr. RINFRET: In this section it was intended in the first place not only to have a scale of payments but to limit the maximum amount to $25,000. Again, in order to avoid any confusion with what we intend to do in the supplementary estimates, I suggest that the last paragraph be struck out, as follows:

In any instance in which the amount payable under these scales would exceed $25,000, payment shall be limited to that figure.

Mr. BENNETT: I was wondering whether or not the sum of $2,500,000 might not be ample to meet all claims up to $25,000 with interest and thus the difficulty to which the minister has alluded would vanish. That is, if the $2,500,000 will pay this in full, the minister need not be bothered about paying a part. The section provides for a payment of 25 per cent on any excess of $15,000 up to $25,000. That involves a great deal of bookkeeping. Could the minister not provide that the payments be made up to a certain sum so that under this bill those payments could be made in full and there would not be a shortage? Supposing the maximum amount, instead of being $25,000, was made $20,000, because the minister is going to put in the supplementary estimates sufficient money to make the payments in full; this would obviate a great deal of bookkeeping.

Mr. RINFRET: I must admit the difficulty which is created by the way in which we have approached this question, but if this bill passes and the supplementary estimates are also put through, I think we can well consider both this bill and the resolution in the estimates as one measure. Unless I should find any technical difficulty in the matter, it is the intention of the department and of the minister in charge, when the $15,000 assessments are paid, to include the interest at once, although the interest is not provided for in this bill but will be in the supplementary estimates. It is also our intention to meet all the claims in the same way, making one payment, and not dividing it up into two or three payments.

Mr. BENNETT: But might we not deal wth the matter in this way by making section 5 read:

The custodian shall pay out of the aforesaid moneys the assessments made by the commissioner upon the following scale:—
Up to $20,000 with interest in full.

And just stop there, because the sum of $2,500,000 will cover that and the supplementary estimates will provide a sum sufficient to pay all amounts in excess of $20,000 with interest. The difficulty I see, when you get to the Auditor General, is that you have a statutory authority. My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre said you might put two authorities in the same voucher. This is a statutory enactment that directs the payment of a percentage. If you strike out the balance of the section and say: We will pay claims up to $20,000 in full with interest as reported by the commission, will the $2,500,000 cover that?

Mr. RINFRET: I do not think we could go that far. The sum of $2,500,000 will practically meet the $15,000 assessments with interest.

Mr. BENNETT: Then if so, strike the rest of the section out.

Mr. RINFRET: The interest will be computed until the date of payment.

Mr. BENNETT: I know that.

Mr. RINFRET: It may just happen that we shall be short a certain amount. That is why I propose to leave it as it was so that the $2,500,000 would assuredly cover it, but we add just a small margin to cover the difference between the maximum of $25,000 and the 10 per cent payments.

Mr. CLARK: Under the amendment that the minister has made to section 2, there will now be authority to pay interest under this bill, will there not?

Mr. RINFRET: This bill does not allow any payment of interest. That will have to be provided for in the supplementaries and mentioned in the resolution in the supplementaries.

Mr. CLARK: Then I have misunderstood the effect of the minister's amendment. Perhaps I have not got it clearly, but paragraph (b) of section 2 is struck out. When that is struck out, there is then nothing to preclude the minister from paying interest.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Only the last part of the paragraph is struck out.

Mr. RINFRET: I think I made it clear that the definition had been made for the bill, but my object in striking out the reference to interest is only to avoid confusion.

Mr. CLARK: The effect of the amendment is to strike out the words:

Exclusive of his recommendation for the payment of interest thereon.

The very moment the minister strikes out those words, there is authority under this bill to pay interest, because a portion of the commissioner's assessment consists of interest.

Mr. BENNETT: The judgment so declares.

Mr. RINFRET: That difficulty also came to my mind, but I think it will suffice that the interpretation be given in the committee as to what this definition means. It reads:

The word "assessment" means the amount allowed by the commissioner in respect of any claim.

This is the way in which the commissioner made his assesments. He stated a certain amount which he made specific, and then he said that to that amount should be added interest from such and such a date.

Mr. CLARK: Then the interest becomes a portion of the assessment. The very moment something is added, it becomes a portion of it. I suggest again that the very moment the minister strikes out the words—

Exclusive of his recommendation for the payment of interest thereon.

—the bill provides for the payment of the full assessment made by the commissioner consisting of a certain principal sum plus interest. That is the commissioner's assessment, and if these words are struck out, then under this bill we are bound to pay all the claims of $15,000 including interest. There might be a claim of $8,000 plus $7,000 interest. This would be a claim or an assessment of $15,000 which, under this bill, we would be bound to pay. There will be confusion if, with interest added to these various principal sums, the amount of $2,500,000 does not suffice to pay the total amount of the claims provided for in section 5.

Mr. RINFRET: I think this is very much a matter of interpretation. It all depends upon the meaning that is attached to the word, "amount". If I may be permitted to revert to section 2, my purpose in amending it was to avoid confusion. If we leave in the bill a definition in which are mentioned the words—

Exclusive of his recommendation for the payment of interest thereon.

—there might be confusion between the bill and the resolution in the estimates. The definition, without these words and just reading—

"Assessment" means the amount allowed by the commissioner in respect of any claim.

—is clear enough, especially if in committee the interpretation is given to it that it is meant to indicate only the amount without the interest.

Mr. CLARK: Assume that the minister is one of those to whom an award has been made; if he puts himself in the position of the claimant he will see the difficulty that might arise under the act as it now stands. If he has been awarded $8,000 in principal, plus $7,000 in interest, he will assert that the amount awarded him was $15,000, not $8,000 at all, and he will claim $15,000, and I suggest claim it rightly.

Secondly, I suggest that any interpretation put upon this bill by the committee is quite useless because that will not preclude the claimant who has been awarded the $15,000 from claiming that amount, and it will not deprive him of the right to dispute the payment of $8,000 because this committee has no right to interpret this act. It is not the body which interprets the act after we have passed it. We may express here unanimously our intention to provide that it is $8,000, but if the bill bears the construction of $15,000 the courts will award $15,000.

May I point out, in the third place, that the minister is assuming, and probably the chances are one hundred to one that he is correct, that there will be a supplementary estimate to provide for the payment of this interest, but there is no certainty that the supplementary estimate will pass this parliament; there is no certainty that it will be introduced, and if it is not introduced, then we shall have this act which will be impossible if the principal sum named in section 4 is not sufficient to take care of the claims mentioned in section 5.

Mr. BENNETT: May I offer this suggestion to the minister and to the Solicitor General sitting beside him? Amend this bill

by taking out the two and a half millions altogether, and then pass the bill, merely providing for the payment to the custodian by the minister of the awards made by the commissioner with interest, as provided in his report. Then a supplementary estimate will be all that will be needed to meet the requirements.

Mr. CANNON: That would be going beyond the scope of the resolution.

Mr. BENNETT: No, because it does not touch the resolution at all. The supplementary estimates have to be preceded by a message.

Mr. CANNON: The resolution mentioned an amount.

Mr. BENNETT: I say, drop the resolution altogether.

Mr. CANNON: If we drop the resolution, how can we pass a money bill?

Mr. BENNETT: We do not deal with money; simply say that the award shall be paid out of any moneys provided by the minister for the custodian, and bring down the amount in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why not drop the resolution and this bill altogether and bring in a new one? It could be done much more expeditiously in that way because it is a matter of agreement and consent now.

Mr. RINFRET: I think the objection taken by my hon. friend from Vancouver-Burrard is merely a technical one. He says that one of the claimants may say that he is entitled under this bill not only to the principal of his award, $8,000, but also the interest on it. I could see the difficulty if we did not intend to supplement this bill by the necessary vote in the estimates in order to meet both the award and the interest. My hon. friend says that there is no certainty that the supplementary estimates will be brought down. I am giving him the assurance that we will certainly bring them down. My hon. friend says that they might not be adopted. I wish he would give me the assurance that he and his friends will not object to the supplementary estimates.

Mr. CLARK: In reply to the minister I would draw his attention to the attitude of this opposition over a period of years in urging the government to do what we are again asking them to do. In other words, make sure that the amount will be brought down and that all the claims will be paid.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the Solicitor General will agree that it is a matter of law. If we drop this bill and the resolution, then on the supplementary estimates being introduced we will undertake, so far as we sitting here are concerned, to assist in the passing of the bill based on what you say, and the whole thing will go through and that will be the end of it.

Mr. CANNON: Suppose we did that, immediately the senate would say that we had passed our legislation in such a way as to prevent the senate from discussing it. This is a matter of some importance which the senate should be allowed to discuss, but if it is done by way of the supplementary estimates, the senate will have to pass it whether they like it or not.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the objection to dropping the resolution and the bill and bringing in a new resolution on Monday and a new bill? We could pass it in a few minutes and it would avoid the question of the supplementary estimates altogether.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Amongst others, we are trying to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite, and if they are not satisfied with this we can move that the committee rise, and not proceed any further.

Mr. CLARK: That is not what we ask at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the situation.

Mr. CLARK: Not at all. What we are asking is that it be made clear that the claims as awarded by the commissioner will surely be met under this bill; that is all. I think that if the suggestion of the hon. member for South Wellington is adopted, and the assurance is given that the claims will be paid, that would be far the simplest way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would say to mp hon. friends opposite that the government in this matter have sought to take the whole question out of the realm of political discussion. We are seeking to meet what we believe to be the general opinion of the house. If hon. gentlemen oposite are not satisfied with the method, we can move that the committee rise and report progress, and leave the matter at that. We have told the house that if this bill passes the house and passes the Senate, we will bring in a supplementary estimate making good the additional amount required together with interest. If this bill does not pass the Senate, we will not bring in the supplementary estimate. We wish this bill to pass both houses before we take further action.

Mr. BENNETT: If the Prime Minister had said that a little while ago we would not have had so much difficulty. We were endeavouring to assist the Prime Minister and trying to simplify the matter by having one payment instead of two. As section 5 now stands the Prime Minister will appreciate the difficulty. I do not think it is quite in keeping with the Prime Minister's usual attitude to suggest in the way of a threat that the committee will rise. I am quite satisfied that this legislation has as many friends in the administration as it has in this party. We are only eighty-nine of ninety in number, and their numbers are greater than ours. It is not a question of political friendship, however, at all; it is a question of dealing with this matter in a businesslike way, and the suggestion we made was made in good faith.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is a question of getting through with the business of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: The situation is complicated by reason of the government's attitude in connection with the resolution. Now, yielding to the views of the house, the method is somewhat different, and if the Prime Minister says that the government will accept responsibility for this question being settled satisfactorily, I for one am quite content.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by the Minister of National Defence that all the words in the last paragraph of section 5 be struck out, beginning with the words "In any instance" and ending with the words "to that figure."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 7—Report.

Mr. RINFRET: I have an amendment to move and as it is quite extensive I will hand a copy to the leader of the opposition and to the leader of the Progressive party. In his report Commissioner Friel points out that a certain number of claims had been assessed by Commissioner Pugsley, the former commissioner, and signed by him, and later on either not concurred in or else varied by Commissioner Friel. It has been represented that in such cases you really have the decisions of two commissioners. It seemed only equitable that the two decisions be referred to some proper authority for final adjudication. That is the purpose of the amendment which I now move:

(1) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the custodian may refer to a judge of the exchequer court of Canada any assessment or assessments set out in the report of the said commissioner which was dealt with by a previous commissioner and was not concurred in or was varied in the said report, and upon such reference the said judge of the exchequer court is empowered to review any such assessment or claim and to report thereon, and upon receipt of such report the custodian shall pay the amount so reported by the judge in each case.

(2) For the purposes of such adjudication the judge of the exchequer court may, in his discretion, rely upon, either in whole or in part, any of the evidence taken by either commissioner, or upon the conclusions of either commissioner, and may receive such other evidence by affidavit or otherwise as may be further adduced in support of such claim and otherwise fix and determine any procedure necessary or requisite in the premises.

It is proposed to refer these awards to a judge of the exchequer court for final adjudication and to devise machinery for the inquiry.

Mr. HARRIS: Would this amendment cover a case where Commissioner Friel in disallowing a claim adds this rider? I would disallow this claim as not falling within any of the categories of the annex. Before the minister answers that question I should like to put this particular case before him—

Mr. RINFRET: Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him? If I should tell him that the amendment will certainly cover a case like that, perhaps he will be satisfied.

Mr. HARRIS: In view of this particular clause which says that the attention of the government is called to the decision of Commissioner Friel's predecessor, I asked the minister if he would be good enough to let me have the decision of the late Commissioner Pugsley, and in reply he wrote me saying that the government did not feel disposed to let me have the information. I pursued the matter a little further, and the minister said it was up to parliament. I want to know, is this matter up to parliament or is it up to the government?

Mr. RINFRET: If my recollection is correct, it was a case where the late Dr. Pugsley had prepared a draft decision and initialled it, but Commissioner Friel, evidently not considering it as a final judgment, has not seen fit to embody it in his report, as he has in every case where he has differed from the final decision rendered by his predecessor. Where there has been a serious conflict of opinion between any work done by the late Dr. Pugsley and that done by

Commissioner Friel, I shall use the authority granted by this clause and give the most ample interpretation to the powers that it grants to the Secretary of State.

Mr. HARRIS: I take it then that the matter is up to the government rather than up to parliament?

Mr. RINFRET: It is one that my hon. friend can look forward to with the greatest of confidence.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I suppose if this passes the statement of claims up to $15,000 that we have received from the King's Printer will be paid immediately?

Mr. RINFRET: Oh yes, those will be paid without delay.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Those included in the King's Printer's document which we have received?

Mr. RINFRET: I do not know exactly what my hon. friend means by the King's Printer's list. Does he refer to Commissioner Friel's report?

Mr. ADSHEAD: The list containing the names of certain persons.

Mr. RINFRET: Those are the awards made by the commissioner. They will be paid at once.

Mr. GEARY: The amendment provides for cases where there has been disagreement between the late Dr. Pugsley and the commissioner subsequently appointed. But the minister has not provided for those cases where the parties are dissatisfied with the original finding by Dr. Pugsley and concurred in by Commissioner Friel. Is it intended to leave open for appeal such cases?

Mr. RINFRET: No.

Mr. GEARY: On the principle that the two commissioners concurring it is evident the adjudication must be right?

Mr. RINFRET: Perhaps my hon. friend is aware that the former commissioner, Dr. Pugsley, rendered only 280 decisions, while Commissioner Friel has passed upon 1,613 cases. In the majority of the 280 cases the decision rendered by Dr. Pugsley was confirmed by Commissioner Friel; but in 21 of the cases he has dissented from the decision given by his predecessor. It is not contemplated to allow an appeal where both commissioners have dismissed the case, or where it was heard by Commissioner Friel and dismissed.

[Mr. Rinfret.]

Mr. HARRIS: Can the minister give the house some idea as to the length of time it will take for the necessary machinery to be set up to take advantage of this particular amendment? It is not necessary to draw to the attention of the house that this matter has been before the Canadian people since 1921. It has been delayed, most unnecessarily in my opinion, particularly since this government came into power. The people who are interested in these reparation payments are becoming older, and if they have to wait much longer they will be very seriously inconvenienced. I trust the minister will put some speed on now and get results.

Mr. RINFRET: As regards the awards made by Commissioner Friel, there will be no delay after the close of the session. If the bill is adopted by both houses and the estimate passes, it is the intention of the department immediately to circularize the claimants and issue the cheques. As to those claims regarding which there is a difference of opinion, it is my intention to refer them at once to a judge of the exchequer court. How long that judge will take to dispose of them I cannot tell, but we will try to see that the matter is expedited so far as they are concerned.

Mr. HARRIS: These people were first circularized on October 17, 1921. After they have been circularized on this occasion how long will it take to get action?

Mr. RINFRET: My hon. friend is not clear as to whether he refers to the awards made by Commissioner Friel, but so far as they are concerned they will be paid in full and in that case there will be no delay. This particular section deals with cases involving a difference of opinion as between Commissioners Friel and Pugsley. These claims, as I say, will be referred at once to a judge of the exchequer court. I cannot guarantee how long it will take him to pass upon them, but they are only 21 out of some 1,600.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. RINFRET: Section 7 will now become section 8.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

On the title.

Mr. GEARY: Is it the intention of the department to allow parties to appear before that judge?

Mr. RINFRET: That has been left entirely to the judge.

Mr. GEARY: As a matter of procedure; but I would suggest to the minister that it might be well to have the parties appear.

Mr. RINFRET: Perhaps I might point out that we have taken a wide step from the initial resolution to the principle of paying awards in full with interest, together with the undertaking to refer a certain number of cases to a judge of the exchequer court.

Mr. GEARY: I am finding no fault, but I think it would be wise to let the parties appear and have the matter satisfactorily disposed of.

Mr. RINFRET: That is left to the judge.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. NEILL

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), I will now direct that the clerk read to the house a translation of the article to which the hon. member took exception.

The translation was read by the Clerk of the House as follows:

Ottawa, 20 mai.—Par le traité des pêcheries du Pacifique que le gouvernement King a négocié avec les Etats-Unis et pour lequel on demande maintenant l'approbation du Parlement, on se propose de donner aux Etats-Unis une juridiction égale à celle du Canada dans ce territoire immense de la Colombie-Britannique esquissé sur la carte ci-dessus. Ce traité a pour fin de conserver l'industrie du saumon sockeye, presque ruinée par les Etats-Unis, et placerait le bassin de la rivière Fraser sous la juridiction d'une commission conjointe internationale, —trois personnes des Etats-Unis et trois du Canada.

Ce territoire immense sur lequel le gouvernement King propose de donner aux Etats-Unis une juridiction égale à celle du Canada sur les lacs, les rivières et les améliorations à y introduire, couvre environ 100,000 milles carrés, d'une étendue égale à celles des provinces de la Nouvelle-Ecosse, du Nouveau-Brunswick et de l'Ile du Prince-Edouard, réunies, d'une étendue égale aussi à cette partie de l'Ontario située entre Ottawa à l'est, Windsor à l'ouest, Niagara Falls au sud et Sudbury au nord. Et dans ce territoire se trouve encore compris le grand port canadien du Pacifique, Vancouver, qui peut être sujet à une certaine juridiction de cette commission internationale.

Les députés de la Colombie-Britannique considèrent le traité avec une sérieuse alarme parce qu'il donne aux Etats-Unis un contrôle économique de la moité de la province. Les commissions conjointes internationales ont été désastreuses au Canada. C'est parce qu'un membre canadien de la commission internationale s'est allié aux membres américains que la diversion des eaux du St-Laurent a été rendue possible. Heureusement, ce représentant canadien a été destitué, mais non avant qu'il accomplisse un mal irrévocable. Le Bureau conjoint international des ingénieurs qui a étudié la canalisation du Saint-Laurent a recommandé que les stations génératrices de la section internationale soient placées en territoire américain. Et cette recommandation n'a été faite que parce qu'un des membres du comité canadien s'est associé à la section américaine.

On croit que le traité projeté, en donnant aux Etats-Unis une juridiction égale à la nôtre sur un territoire canadien, crée un précédent qui peut porter à l'indépendance canadienne un coup funeste. Et l'on plaide que si l'on fait ceci pour la Colombie-Britannique, la juridiction et le contrôle des Etats-Unis pourra également s'étendre à des territoires dans chaque province.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Care of patients and medical examination of pensioners, $2,600,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: As it has been customary to discuss things generally on the first item, and as the two departments are linked together, I wish to say something regarding the Department of Health. I feel like apologising for taking up the time of the house at this late date in the session, but, as I remarked the other night, in the last ten years these estimates have always appeared on the last day of the week and generally at the last hour of the day. By way of preface to the remarks I am going to make I wish to read something from the act. Section 4 of chapter 90 of the Revised Statutes of Canada is as follows:

The duties and powers of the minister administering the Department of Health shall extend to and include all matters and questions relating to the promotion or preservation of the health of the people of Canada over which the parliament of Canada has jurisdiction, and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, particularly the following matters and subjects:

(a) Cooperation with the provincial, territorial, and other health authorities with a view to the coordination of the efforts proposed or made for preserving and improving the public health, the conservation of child life and the promotion of child welfare;

(b) The establishment and maintenance of a national laboratory for public health and research work;

That is the basis upon which I wish to speak for a few moments, in order to direct attention to what might be accomplished if we had a real, live Department of Health. I think it is grossly unfair to this country that a department which is offered such opportunities should be administered in the inefficient manner of the last few years. If we were to cast our eyes eastward we would

see what has been done in Great Britain, where Mr. Stanley Baldwin picked no less a man than Mr. Neville Chamberlain to preside over the department of health, where he has done perhaps the best work of his career.

For a moment or two I would like to direct the attention of the house to the great wastage of life in this country, and I would like to preface my remarks with the statement that while it is impossible to put a valuation upon human life, just as it is impossible to put a valuation upon the services rendered by a wife and mother, still the value of the people of a country is very much in excess of the value of all industry. I shall refer to that a little later; at this point I would like to direct the attention of the house to the life expectancy in Canada as compared with other countries of the world, as follows:

	Years
New Zealand	62
Australia	58
Denmark	58
Norway	58
England	58
Canada	55–6
France	45–48
Italy	45–48
Japan	45–48

What does that mean to a country? Let us consider it in relation to the increase of wealth per year. The wealth of Canada has been increasing at the rate of about $100 per capita per year, and I think the increase in the United States is almost the same. If we could advance the life expectancy in Canada by two years, with our 9,000,000 people and figuring the increase in wealth at $100 per year per capita, we would add to the wealth of the country the huge sum of $1,800,000,000. If we could bring our standard up to 62 years, which is the life expectancy in New Zealand, the additional wealth would be very much greater, and surely that is not an unreasonable thing to expect. In that one particular, therefore, we have a loss of almost two billion dollars yearly, which is almost equal to the amount added to our national debt because of the war. I think this is one direction in which this department could demonstrate its usefulness to the great advantage of this country.

Then there are other ways in which this department could be of service. Let us consider the work which has been done by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. About fifteen years ago they started to expend $1,000,000 yearly for the preservation of the health of their policyholders. To date they have spent $15,000,000, but they claim to have saved no less than $43,000,000 in death payments because of the fact that the lives of their policyholders have been prolonged. If that result can be attained by an insurance company through the expenditure of $15,000,000, what could be done in this country by an active Department of Health? The other day I ran across another good example which may appeal to my hon. friends from Quebec. In Bedford Mines, through the expenditure of some $30,000 over a period of years, the mortality rate was reduced from 300 per thousand to 96, and this reduction was effected largely in infant mortality. That shows what can be done by well-directed efforts along this line.

Now let us consider this question in another way. According to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company an investigator examined a large number of wage earners who were receiving $2,500 a year; after going over thousands of cases he estimated the lifetime earnings of a man of that class at $41,000. His expenditure was estimated at only $13,000, which left an asset to the state of $28,000 per man. It is easy to figure out what that would mean even in a country with a population of 9,000,000 people, if the death rate could be cut down as we all know can be done.

For just a moment I would like to refer to the death rate in Canada; first I will give the infant mortality, and I would ask my hon. friends from Quebec to pay particular attention. I find that the infant mortality of Canada as compared with other countries is as follows:

Canada	94
England and Wales	69
Irish Free State	70
Northern Ireland	78
Australia	54
New Zealand	38
Switzerland	56
Netherlands	58

When we consider that this country has a wastage of 94 per thousand compared with 38 per thousand in New Zealand we can see the possibilities of a real active health organization. I would like to give the death rates of children in different cities in Canada as compared with cities in other parts of the world. In Canada the death rate per thousand living births was as follows:

Montreal	132
Toronto	71
Winnipeg	61
Vancouver	52
Ottawa	95
Quebec	148

The death rates per thousand in different cities in the old land are as follows:

London	59
Bristol	58
Manchester	86
Nottingham	84
Liverpool	95
Leeds	81

The figures by provinces are as follows:

Quebec	129
New Brunswick	96
Nova Scotia	92·3
Saskatchewan	74·5
Manitoba	72·2
Ontario	71·1
Prince Edward Island	66·6
British Columbia	60·1

I give these figures, Mr. Chairman, in order to prove the great necessity of health work. We have a terrible wastage in this country which can be corrected by a properly organized effort by the Dominion Department of Health and the provincial departments of health.

I would like to give some figures which show the decline in infant mortality in England and Wales. For the period from 1871 to 1875 the death rate per thousand births of children up to the first year of age was 153; that had been reduced to 70 in 1927. The death rate of children from the age of one to two years was reduced from 59 to 20. In this country we still have an infant mortality of some 15,000, annually. Syphilis is carrying off from 7,000 to 15,000 per year; tuberculosis accounts for 5,000; diphtheria, a purely preventable disease, accounts for something like 1,200. There is another side to the picture which is beginning to loom up, the new diseases connected with the new industries and occupations. We have carbon monoxide poisoning, but so far no department, either provincial or federal, has seen fit to consider this matter. When we look at the analyses of the different causes of death we find an astonishing increase in such diseases as cancer, nephritis and the circulatory diseases. I would like to give some figures showing the increase in deaths per 100,000 from cancer, as follows:

	1881-85	1921-25
Ages 40 to 49	36	88
Ages 50 to 59	81	213
Ages 60 to 69	128	473
Ages 70 to 79	200	816
Ages 80 and over	210	1,000

The figures are almost as startling in connection with nephritis. They are as follows:

	1881-85	1921-25
Ages 40 to 49	17	34
Ages 50 to 59	24	69
Ages 60 to 69	58	177
Ages 70 to 79	109	403
Ages 80 and over	114	740

We find the following increases in connection with the circulatory diseases:

	1881-85	1921-25
Ages 40 to 49	60	89
Ages 50 to 59	124	256
Ages 60 to 69	278	823
Ages 70 to 79	490	2,500
Ages 80 and over	430	5,730

These figures show that there is a remarkable increase in these diseases and this should have the attention of some active public health organization.

I find that the death rate from purpural sepsis has increased from 1.43 per cent in 1911 to 1.57 per cent in 1927.

Let us look at what has been done in the way of preventive medicine. Von Behring brought out his anti-diphtheric serum in 1890. In that year the death rate from diphtheria was 160 per 100,000 of population, and to-day it is down to 11. The house knows that serum was discovered by injecting the poisons of diphtheria into a horse and the anti-toxin was formed in its blood; after a sufficient quantity had formed it was bled and the serum was purified and kept in a ready condition to be administered to children or anyone who got the disease. In connection with typhoid fever it was discovered that by sterilizing the bacillus typhus and injecting it into a human being an anti-toxin could be obtained which would practically prevent the disease. That disease is practically extinct to-day. I looked up the records of twenty-four of the largest cities in the United States and I found that the death rate had fallen from 58 per 100,000 down to 8. This is a disease which could be wiped out with proper sanitation and a proper water supply. Many scientists predict that by 1930 diphtheria will be practically a disease of the past. By immunizing children who are susceptible to this disease they feel that it will be practically eliminated in four or five years.

Let us consider the venereal diseases for a moment, and in this connection I would like to quote from a report issued by Justice Hodgins in 1917. He said:

> Speaking generally the evil is so great and so underspread that nothing would be gained, but rather the reverse by attempting at once too drastic action.

The statistics available at that time show that of the admissions to the Toronto General Hospital in the first three months of that year 12 per cent showed a positive Wasserman reaction; 25 per cent of the male patients at the Toronto hospital for the insane had syphilis; and 26 per cent of the inmates of the Montreal general hospital were in the same condition. The percentage with refer-

ence to the admissions to the general hospital to-day has dropped to five, while in the case of the admissions to the Sick Children's hospital it is down to less than one per cent. That shows the result of the intensive campaign which has been carried on during the last ten years.

It might be interesting to know, as regards typhoid fever, that prior to and during the South African war, about 85 per cent of war casualities were from disease, principally typhoid fever. In the last war those figures were just about reversed, and it was estimated that from 5 to 10 per cent of the war casualities were from disease and the balance from wounds.

Let us consider for a moment the way in which life expectancy has been increased in other countries. I have under my hand the London Life table, from 1841 to 1922, and the expectancy of life according to that table has increased in males from 34·6 years to 53·8 years, and in females from 38·3 to 59·1 years. This has been brought about largely by preventive measures. If you compute the value of human life even in dollars and cents according to the large increase which has taken place in the expectancy of life, you will see what it is possible to accomplish in this country.

There is another side of the question that I should like to draw to the attention of the committee for a moment, and I should be glad if the Prime Minister would be good enough to take cognizance of the figures I am going to give. Based on the investigation of Professors Winslow and Fisher of Yale university, who with Mr. Doublin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, made in connection with the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, a complete survey of the health of the United States in regard to the prevention of accidents, sickness and death, and applying the same statistics to Canada—and I think this would be reasonable—we find that the wastage is simply enormous, unbelievable, as I shall show in a moment. These investigations showed that there was a yearly death rate in Canada of 96,000 to 100,000, forty per cent of which was claimed to be preventable. Forty per cent of 96,000 is equivalent to a waste of 38,000 deaths per annum. If you place a valuation of, say $2,500 per annum per life, we have the enormous wastage of $96,000,000. Cutting this in half to make allowance for children, we have a total economic wastage of preventable or postponable deaths of $48,000,000. This applies to preventable deaths alone.

[Mr. McGibbon.]

Applying the same principle to illness, we find that two per cent of the population are continuously ill. This means that 180,000 people are continuously ill; of these 30 per cent or 54,000 are adult males and 30 per cent, or 54,000 adult females. The ratio of employment of women to that of men is as 6 is to 20, so we get a total wastage in this way of 16,200 females and 54,000 males, or a total loss of 70,200 people continuously. Allowing 300 working days to the year, we have a total wastage of 21,060,000 days, 50 per cent of which is preventable, or in other words 10,530,000 days. If we take this at a wastage of say $3 per day from each of these workers, we have a further wastage of $31,590,000 from preventable illness. If we could just save that and apply the saving to reducing our national debt, I wonder how soon we could relieve our citizens of the burden of taxation.

But that is not all. They also found there was an inefficiency due to advanced impairment to health of some 10 to 24 per cent of the working population, while those suffering from minor illnesses range from 18 to 40 per cent. Let us take a fair average of 20 per cent. There are in Canada 3,510,000 wage earners at an average of $750 per annum, giving a total earning capacity of $2,632,500,000. On the above basis 20 per cent of these are inefficient to an extent of 25 per cent inefficiency, or a wastage of $131,625,000. I sometimes think we get into the habit of rolling millions off our tongues so easily that we lose the significance of these figures.

We have invested in hospitals $120,000,000, in sanitoria $50,000,000 and in asylums, $7,500,000, or a total of $177,500,000. The cost of upkeep of these institutions is $50,000,000 a year. Of the patients treated in these institutions 40 per cent are suffering from diseases that are preventable.

Adding all these totals, without wearying the house with the figures—and I have cut them in half—we get a total wastage from preventable death, illness, accident and disease, of about $126,530,000 per annum. I should like to direct this to the attention of the house and the committee for the consideration of the Department of Health. This opens up a possible field for active work in this country. How is this wastage to be prevented? It can be prevented in two ways which are outlined in the act which brought this department into existence, first by coordinating all the health efforts of the country, provincial, Dominion and those connected with the insurance companies, so as to reduce the death rate and the preventable illness and

accidents to the lowest possible minimum; second by increasing scientific research. It is almost inconceivable that the government would stay in power for so many years, with a Department of Health going on year after year, and never creating a department of scientific research. Scientific research is the very basis, the lifeblood of any country. For instance, the work of Pasteur in France in connection with wines, silkworms and anthrax in sheep, brought such a saving to that country that Professor Huxley said that the saving from those three discoveries made by one man would have paid off the Franco-Prussian war debt. I was reading only yesterday the life of Mark Carlton, who turned the state of Kansas into a great wheat-growing country. Away back in the nineties when they struck the wheat rust there, he took his microscope and examined the soil and the grain and travelled all over the world. Finally in Siberia he got a wheat that he brought back and started to grow in the United States, and not many years after that the United States was producing between seven and eight hundred million bushels of wheat a year. He practically put the state of Kansas on the map as a wheat-growing state.

One of the greatest tales of modern times I think is connected with the work of Doctor Gorges, the man who eliminated yellow fever. He got the idea, simply as a general practitioner, that the mosquito was responsible for transmitting yellow fever. Being a man of keen observation he noticed that the higher he went up into the mountains the fewer cases of yellow fever there were, until finally he reached an elevation where a particular kind of mosquito disappeared. The fever disappeared also. He came back and started his experiments. Some people were of the opinion that the yellow fever was due to insanitary conditions. They cleaned up the insanitary conditions, but the yellow fever prevailed just the same. Still working on his theory that the mosquito was responsible, he built some rooms and covered them with fine netting so that the mosquitoes could not get in, and he lived there. He took the clothes from the beds of people who had died of yellow fever and slept on them; he put on their clothes, and still he came out untouched by the disease. Then he took some mosquitoes and let them bite him, and in a few days he discovered that he had yellow fever. But working on that hypothesis, a remedy was found, and millions of people have been freed from that disease, and almost half a continent has been reclaimed. As was stated here the other night, the Panama canal could never have been built had this discovery not been made.

What, for instance, would a cure for cancer be worth to this country? I have just read that the death rate from cancer is increasing by leaps and bounds. This country cannot have too many men working in the unknown. The more men we have engaged in original research, the more likely we are to make discoveries of great benefit to humanity. It is only by delving into the unknown and making discoveries such as Doctor Banting made that you will achieve something that will prolong human life and make the human race happier. What, for example, has Doctor Banting's discovery been worth? Take the insurance companies. Every life that is prolonged means just that much found money for the insurance companies, and expressed in terms of dollars and cents it would no doubt run into billions of dollars in a short time.

I might go on and speak of the discovery of the use of liver extract in curing pernicious anaemia. That was discovered by Doctors Minott and Lea. All these discoveries have helped to prolong human life and have meant greater happiness and greater prosperity for mankind. That is a work that I think this department has been very lax in since it has been organized. I urged upon the minister, when he brought this department into existence, to have research work of this kind started at once, and I got his promise; but shortly after the Liberal government went out of power, and nothing along that line has been done since. If you want expressed in concrete form the results of scientific investigations, I would refer you to the evidence taken by a committee of this house some years ago on scientific and industrial research. We find that one discovery in the Mellon institute, on behalf of a baking firm in the United States, has saved them $500,000 a year. The Eastman Kodak Company has been spending millions every year on research, and they have got the business of the world. It is the same with the Dupont Powder and Paint Company. That firm stands in a place by itself to-day. I think the future of this young country with all its vast natural resources is absolutely bound up with and dependent upon industrial and scientific research. I appeal to the Minister of National Health and to the Prime Minister to-night to do something to give this young country a chance with her competitors throughout the world. We have the men, we have the natural resources, we have the opportunity. All we lack is courage on the part of the government to establish in the city of Ottawa a laboratory that will give our young men of ideas a chance to come here and engage in this all-important research work under able direction.

I have a lot more statistics here bearing on the same subjects that I might give if time permitted. The point I want to bring home is that there is no department of government in this or any other country that offers such opportunities for the creation of wealth, for the saving of waste, for bettering the welfare and increasing the happiness of our people than the Department of Health. It should be the biggest department in the government. As I have already said, Mr. Baldwin took one of the ablest men in Great Britain, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, and put him in charge of their Department of Health, where he has done the best work of his life. I hope that before another session ends we shall have in Canada a Department of Health that will be of some use to the country.

Mr. T. E. KAISER (Ontario): It is rather a strange thing that the moment a member speaks on either one of two subjects this house immediately empties itself. Those two subjects are bad whiskey and good health. Either of these subjects just melts the house away. Either will stop a riot and disperse a crowd anywhere. It is unfortunate, but it is so.

We hear a good deal about what is being done in the matter of public health in this country. We have a national Department of Health which was established in 1919. In that year this national institution first saw the light of day; it had an easy birth and the circumstances surrounding its arrival were auspicious. But under the guidance of this government, and with the kindly nutrition handed out to it by the present administration, we find that the poor baby to-day is the same weight and size, and has all the peculiar features which characterized it, as on the day of its birth. In other words, in relation to the Department of Health, the government has stood still for ten years; and what is more, it will stand still for twenty years longer unless someone comes along and wakes it up.

Is it not strange that we should have a Department of Health costing between $900,000 and $1,000,000 a year for the purpose of safeguarding the health of the people, while this government should be spending more than one half—two thirds—of that money on the heads of the department and in administration? Out of this $900,000 per annum spent by the government in the last ten years we find, in 1926, $427,000; in 1927, $393,000; in 1928, $472,000, expended on matters which by no stretch of the imagination can be regarded as conducing to public health. Most of the money comprises grants to the institution.

[Mr. McGibbon.]

The government are not spending the money in the way parliament intends that it should be spent; the amount spent on public health as such is absolutely inadequate to accomplish any results. It might as well be wasted. Look at the national budgets of other countries and you will find that in these places, in order to secure anything like a proper standard of public health, it requires an expenditure of $2.50 per capita. But what are we doing in Canada? Instead of spending anything like a reasonable proportion on public health our per capita expenditure amounts to 7½ cents. And if we take all the money spent by the Dominion, by the provinces and by the municipalities together, we find that it comes to the magnificent sum of 37½ cents per head of population. We are spending in Canada 37½ cents per head to accomplish what other countries are spending $2.50 to do. Can we ever dream of having anything like sound national health when such a parsimonious effort is put forth to that end?

It is commonly said that the Dominion government have no authority to act in the matter of public health in Canada. Medical men who have looked into the constitution know that this is not correct. In 1867 when the British North America Act was passed there was no such thing as public health in the sense that we use that term to-day. The only reference to public health was the matter of quarantine, and under section 91 of the act this was assigned to the Dominion government. We know also that matters which are not specifically assigned to any province come, under the British North America Act, within the domain of the Dominion government. Health officers and students in Canada came to the conclusion some time ago that under the constitution matters of public health should rest with the Dominion. We say, therefore, that the government have not been spending the money granted by parliament in the way that it should be spent. Under the act of 1919 it was provided that the government of the Dominion might publish literature, might disseminate propaganda, and might undertake to educate the people of the country in matters appertaining to public health. Well, they have done so, because we have here a magnificent sheet known as an abstract of current public health literature, and blazoned at the head of it is the intimation that it is issued by this government. But what has it to say with reference to public health? We find that it contains extracts from the Journal of Medical Health of the United States. It tells us how to tackle

the plague in India, how to grapple with cholera in South Africa, and so on. But there is not a word as to what should be done in Canada. It reminds me of a trip I made some fifteen years ago on the Mississippi. Someone pointed out to me one of the old fashioned boats which had plied on the river long years ago—and what did I find? There was so much space taken up by the whistle that there was no room left for the passengers, and in the front of the boat there was a magnificent leather cushioned chair for the captain. Well, we have a chair for the captain to repose in—a captain who draws $15,000 a year but has not been worth ten cents in the ten years he has been guilding the ship in this department.

I want to pay tribute to a gentleman whom we all respect in this house, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson), who gave us an excellent discourse the other evening in which he pointed out what could be accomplished in the way of scientific research. We have also heard a splendid address tonight from my hon. friend (Mr. McGibbon). I am not going to enter into the phase of the subject with which these hon. gentlemen dealt, but I want to say that the Department of National Health is condemned by every man in Canada who has ever read three lines about public health. If you want to find out what is being done in this direction you have only to take up the last journal published by those in this country who are studying the question, and every line is a condemnation of what is being done by the government. It is pointed out that if the government were alive to the situation it would move forward and do things that are being done in other countries. Why is it that France, England and the United States, acting as a federal unit, have all moved forward along really progressive lines? The United States government has divided the country into sections and over every section there is a full time health officer paid by the federal government.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. KAISER: This is one of the things we ask for. This Dominion should be divided into health sections, over every one of which should be placed a full time officer paid partly by this government, partly by the province and partly by the municipality. This is one of the things which the public health people of the Dominion are asking the government to do and it is one of the things that are absolutely necessary if we hope to obtain satisfactory results. If the minister wishes to know what can really be accomplished let him read what has been done in the province of Quebec, which has been divided in the manner I have stated. There full time men are devoting their whole time and all their energies to the work of caring for the public health. See what they have done in relation to infantile mortality and in the matter of saving the lives of women in maternal trouble. See what has been done in grappling with epidemics; it is a credit to the province. They lead the way in this regard. And we have done the same in Ontario. For fifteen years I served as a member of the provincial board of Ontario and I have travelled throughout the province, so that I think I have the right to stand here and say that I speak with some authority on this question. Fifteen years ago in Ontario fifty persons out of every one hundred thousand of the population died of typhoid. The provincial government then grappled with the question and instituted a thorough investigation. We investigated the water supply of the province and looked into the situation from every angle. The result is that we have reduced the death rate in the province, from this particular cause, from 50 to 3.5 per hundred thousand. Such facts as these are pointed out to the government; and to find them, in the face of all this, sitting dumb and motionless is to me a marvel. The people will hold them responsible and get behind those who have progressive ideas with an insistent demand that we advance.

The last issue of the Canadian Public Health Journal, word by word, line by line, page by page, makes this demand of the government; yet we see the government of Canada hanging on away at the tail end of the hunt, the people a great distance ahead of them. The medical men of the country are miles ahead of the department. We find hon. gentlemen sitting quietly by, doing nothing but smoking fifty-cent cigars and drawing $15,000 a year. As an immediate step in the direction of progress we demand that the government make a move in the apointment of a council of epidemiologists. Does the minister mean to tell this committee that if we had a council such as this, a few men who studied nothing but epidemics in Canada, who could move from one section of the country to another whenever there was an outbreak of any epidemic, very satisfactory results would not ensue? Two years ago there was a typhoid epidemic in Montreal when five hundred people were carried to the grave, while some five thousand were down in the hospitals. This cost between two and three millions. I have no hesitation in saying that if we had had in the Dominion at that

time a few men trained in the study of epidemics there would not have been ten deaths in Montreal as a result of that outbreak; the epidemic would have been successfully met. But there was not a word spoken, not a voice raised in this house, not a voice raised in Canada against it until it was found that someone was losing five or ten cents a gallon on cream or milk. As soon as people began to lose a few dollars the cry went up that something should be done. Now this obviously is discreditable; surely the health of the people should be placed above dollars and cents.

In these two particulars we charge the government with dereliction of duty. They have no conception of the task that confronts them; they do not understand the question with which they are supposed to cope. If you were to engage a few men who really appreciated the value of such measures as I have mentioned, you would see a progressive move made in the matter of public health in Canada. Let me quote something to show what is being done in England in regard to whole time officers. We read that the full time plan is in operation in England, where 351 out of some 1,200 part time officers have been replaced by full time officials in combined areas. In the United States also, since 1911, over 400 county health officers have been appointed on full time. In New York state half the cost is borne by the state. This gives you an idea of what is taking place throughout the civilized world wherever the authorities are alive to the importance of public health, wherever they place a proper value on human life, wherever they have an adequate conception as to what public health implies. In these countries public health work is divided into two great sections—one, the prevention of disease, and the other the combating of epidemics. In this regard disease and epidemics are fought pretty much as an up to date fire brigade tackles any conflagration. What should we think if we went into a large city and saw a great fire being attacked by volunteer firemen, while someone was paid a salary of $15,000 to look on at the show, occasionally to ring a bell, and once in a while to blow a whistle?

I make the charge that Canada, in the field of public health, is more backward than any other country on the face of the earth; the government are silent, they are dead. I do not hesitate to say that. There should be more activity in the department. In 1919 a council of health was created, and they come together every year, bringing scientific minds to bear upon the health problems that confront the country. Their conclusions they pass on to the Minister of National Health (Mr. King Kootenay). But the minister puts on glasses that will not read, he looks the thing over, and he says, "Oh, well, the pigeon hole is good enough for this; the Dominion cannot take action in this matter". I say, the people of Canada demand that we have some genuine national health work done by this government, and done before another year goes by. Now, I will not detain the house longer—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. KAISER: Hon. gentlemen opposite clap their hands. My hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. Young) and others know, however, that what I am saying is true. I know they do not like to hear me or anyone else refer in these terms to the government, but there are in Canada ten million people who think pretty much as I do, and I want to tell the minister that the people of the country are demanding more and more that real public health work be done by this government. You have never yet seen a city criticized for spending money to take care of the health of its people. The people will support any such expenditure, and all I ask is that Canada get in line with other countries and take a proper view of the importance of public health.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am sure we have all been greatly interested in the addresses delivered by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. McGibbon) and the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Kaiser).

Mr. McGIBBON: Not "hon." yet.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, quite honourable, I hope. Now, it is rather surprising that our friends should have made the criticism we have heard to-night and on a previous occasion. It is well known that the national department of health was brought into being in 1919. Prior to that, the services that were then set aside as proper health services for the Dominion to undertake were administered by various departments of government. I refer to the quarantine service, the medical inspection of immigrants and the treatment of sick mariners. These were the services which our constitution laid down as coming within the purview of the Dominion government. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), speaking to-day on another question, made that very plain. But we do not need to emphasize it, because if we take the act that was passed in 1919 we find that the govern-

ment of that day realized the extent to which they should go in establishing a department of health. In the act there are two clauses—it was not set out in one but in two definite sections—which limit the activities of the department. The first, section 4, provides:

> The duties and powers of the minister administering the Department of Health, shall extend to and include all matters and questions relating to the promotion or preservation of the health of the people of Canada over which the parliament of Canada has jurisdiction, and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, particularly the following matters and subjects.

I shall deal with these matters in a moment. Then there is section 7, which the parliament of that day considered necessary:

> Nothing in this act or in any regulations made hereunder shall authorize the minister or any officer of the department to exercise any jurisdiction or control over any provincial or municipal board of health or other health authority operating under the laws of any province.

Just a moment ago my good friend from Ontario complained because the Dominion government was not in a position to go into Montreal during the recent epidemic and take charge of the health situation. That argument is absolutely absurd; it was not received by members of the house and it will not be received throughout the country, because everyone knows that at all times the provinces have insisted that they have local control with regard to health as they have with regard to education and other matters.

It is rather surprising to find hon. gentlemen opposite belittling the efforts which are being made by health authorities and by those who have charge of the health of this country; listening to hon. gentlemen opposite tonight the impression might go abroad that no health measures are being carried out in Canada. That is not true; it is well known to be untrue. In each province we have live health organizations under the control of the provincial governments in addition to the municipal health organizations, and generally speaking our municipal health organizations are not inferior to those in other cities on this continent or anywhere in the world. In health matters the city of Toronto is probably as well equipped as any similar city anywhere in the world. It is true there was an outbreak of typhoid in Montreal a year or two ago, due to an infected milk supply and also to the fact that the laboratories were improperly equipped and insufficiently staffed, but now conditions are different. The hon. member for Muskoka indicated that nothing was being done in Canada and especially in Quebec, but he did not tell this committee that to-day in health matters Quebec is leading all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, he said that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They have gone ahead and established health units under their provincial law, and that is being done in other provinces throughout Canada. It is being done in my own province and in Saskatchewan and Manitoba; I do not think Ontario has adopted that system as yet. We were told that the federal government of the United States was in control in that country and had divided the country into health units, which it was subsidizing. That is not so; that is done by the state authorities as is the case in Canada. It is true that after the great flood in the Mississippi valley a year or so ago the United States government did go in and take care of the health situation during that period of disaster; it is true that since the flood health units have been established in order to assist the victims of that disaster, but generally speaking the health units throughout the United States are established by state authority, and that system is in vogue also in Great Britain and in other countries.

Now I wish to refer to the matters which parliament saw fit to place under the control of the federal Department of Health. Section 4, subsection (a) of the act states:

> Cooperation with the provincial, territorial, and other health authorities with a view to the coordination of the efforts proposed or made for preserving and improving the public health, the conservation of child life and the promotion of child welfare;

I might also read section 6:

> There shall be a Dominion council of health consisting of the deputy minister of health, who shall be chairman, the chief executive officer of the provincial department or board of health of each province, and such other persons, not to exceed five in number, as may be appointed by the governor in council, who shall hold office for three years.
>
> 2. Such Dominion council shall meet at such times and places as the minister may direct, and shall be charged with such duties and powers in respect to this act as the governor in council may prescribe.

Through this Dominion council of health which was brought into being under this act the cooperation between the provinces and the different health authorities can be and is being brought about.

Mr. BENNETT: What has been done by this council?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It has done a great deal. It has been able to bring about uniform local quarantine laws in the various provinces; it has made a study of and reported on the matter of infection and contagion; we have uniformity in many of our health laws which did not exist before, and generally this council has been of great benefit to the people of Canada. Before I finish I intend to deal with some of the particular work which has been done and to show the character of the discussions which have taken place and the action which has followed these discussions. The character of the board itself is essential; we take the chairman or secretary of the various provincial health boards—

Mr. McGIBBON: That is laid down in the act.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, and I say it is essential. In addition, five other members are selected representing various groups such as the farmer group, the labour group, the women of Canada and so on. I do not know where we could get a committee which would be better informed and better able to coordinate health efforts throughout Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: How many times have they met?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They meet usually twice a year, in the spring and fall; they have a three-day session, for which the agenda is properly prepared and very thoroughly discussed. The sole object of the formation of this Dominion council was to bring about cooperation with the provinces and other health authorities, as specified in the act. The Department of Health cannot, nor can the Dominion Council of Health, lay down any authoritative rule or regulation for the control of these various health bodies; it is well understood that members of the Dominion council can only report back to their governments, who must put through the legislation.

Now I might mention some of the subjects which have been under discussion from time to time: Maternal mortality; community hospitals; quarantine regulations; vaccination and quarantine; malignant growths; oral hygiene; carbon monoxide poisoning; trachoma among Indians; health therapeutics and home nursing; diphtheria, scarlet fever and measles; control of respiratory diseases; cyanide disinfection of ships; institutional treatment for drug addicts and so on.

Mr. McGIBBON: Can the minister tell us what practical results have come about?

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I told my hon. friend that the quarantine laws throughout Canada have been made uniform and there has been a coordination, generally speaking, of the health laws as between the different provinces. Carbon monoxide poisoning has been discussed but there is no authority in the Dominion council, any more than there is in this parliament, to say to the people of Canada, "This is what we will do for carbon monoxide poisoning or this is what we will do for typhoid."

Mr. BENNETT: The province of Alberta enacted legislation at the last session.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is quite true, but my hon. friend cannot claim for a moment that this committee, composed as it was and with an agenda of this kind, did not produce some good after three days of discussion.

Mr. McGIBBON: The trouble is that we cannot see it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend seemed to think that the establishment and maintenance of a national laboratory for public health and research work should be the whole thing; that the Health department should be an incident to that section and not that section an incident to the Health department.

Mr. McGIBBON: I did not say that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is the way the hon. member has talked.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is the biggest thing in the department.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The establishment of that laboratory for public health and research work is an important thing, but the department is doing other work which is not being done elsewhere in Canada. These various services were within other departments and we have established research laboratories and testing laboratories to deal with all questions relating to our food products. The best of chemists procurable have been employed and the work being done is equal to that being carried out in any laboratory of like character in the world.

Mr. BENNETT: The Excise department used to do that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They did, but we do not think that they did it as well as we are doing it at the present time. We have very excellent men in Doctor Harris and Mr. Lancaster. They are recognized authorities on this subject and if anyone would take the time to go through these laboratories and see the class of work which is being done in re-

lation to our food and drug products, he would realize the class of research work which is being carried on.

Mr. McGIBBON: It has always been done.

Mr. BENNETT: The Excise department used to do it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend speaks of the United States with some apparent appreciation of their greatness; does he know that it is only within the last few years that that great country has established a laboratory of health research.

Mr. BENNETT: Doctor Wiley has been doing the food work for over fifteen years.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He has been doing it for years and doing it very effectively. Previous to the establishment of a health laboratory in Canada very little of that work had been done.

I will have something further to say before the discussion in regard to public health and research work closes. It would seem to my hon. friend that the establishment of a laboratory such as he speaks of requires only the expenditure of money. Money is about the least requirement for a laboratory of that character; personnel is the main and important one.

Mr. McGIBBON: The government has not got it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): During the last one hundred years there have been only a few men with the talent for research who have made great discoveries. It is hard to say just where we could get the research men to go into a laboratory of that kind; we certainly would not get them by putting applications through the Civil Service Commission asking for men to apply for positions in a research laboratory. In the development of the laboratory work which is now being done we hope to train the men who will do the research work of the future.

The government is not opposed in any way to a laboratory for health research, and it is well known to parliament and to Canada that the government is giving considerable thought to research along other lines. Buildings are being constructed and it is hoped that we will soon have our own laboratories and our own personnel for the research work of the Health department, and I believe that some day we will be able to create a laboratory and do the work which my hon. friend is desirous that we should rush into at once.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister must be careful and not duplicate the work which is being done in the Connaught laboratories, for instance, and other places of that kind.

78594—179½

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This class of research work has not been done, as a rule, by governments. The work of Pasteur and of other great scientists has been carried on under very unfavourable conditions. Work of that character is being done in laboratories such as those of the Rockefeller institute and of our universities. Men are continually in training and the faculty knows the men who have the proper qualifications for research work and they endeavour to retain those men. It is well known that the Rockefeller institute does not go to the universities with a view to taking that class of men away, because they know that such a procedure is resented. Where they find a man with those qualifications they arrange with the university authorities to relieve him of some of his other duties which he may be doing within the university.

Mr. BENNETT: They give him a fellowship.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He is permitted to devote his entire time to the problem he may be studying.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned until 11 a.m. Monday May 27, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Monday, May 27, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PENNY BANK ACT AMENDMENT

Hon J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved:

That the order for the second reading of Bill No. 297 (Letter A8 of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to amend the Penny Bank Act" be transferred on the order paper from private bills to government orders as said bill is a government measure and not a private bill.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATE ON IMMIGRATION POLICY

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Pursuant to notice I desire to move:

That the debate on the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. McRae) to the motion for Mr. Speaker to leave the chair for the house to resolve itself again into committee of supply be resumed whenever the said motion is made by a member of the government.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

On the motion of Mr. Fafard for Mr. Morin (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville), the seventh report of the select standing committee on standing orders was concurred in.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

On the motion of Mr. C. G. Power (Quebec South) the fourth report of the special committee appointed to consider the Dominion Elections Act and the Corrupt Practices Inquiry Act was concurred in.

PEACE RIVER RAILWAY OUTLET

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals): I desire to table a report by the engineers and surveyors of the department with respect to certain surveys made in the Peace River district. This report was asked for by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy).

PENSION PAYMENTS

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): The hon. member for Kingston City (Mr. Ross) on the 22nd of May referred to the production of an order in council for which he said he had asked. I cannot find any record of his having asked for it before, and I have consulted the Department of the Secretary of State. So far as I have been able to ascertain, no motion for a return has appeared in the votes and proceedings, but perhaps it will serve my hon. friend's purpose if I send a copy of the order in council across to him.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Thank you. It was a verbal request that I had made of the Minister of Pensions (Mr. King).

NATURAL RESOURCES OF WESTERN PROVINCES

ADMINISTRATION OF WATERPOWERS IN ALBERTA, SASKATCHEWAN AND MANITOBA

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 311, respecting waterpower in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This bill is being introduced in response to the resolution of the house asking that the administration of the waterpowers of these three provinces be undertaken by the provincial governments. I shall make a more extended explanation on the second reading of the bill, but I might just say here that the resolution requested that the Waterpowers Act under which the British Columbia government administers the waterpowers in the railway belt and Peace River block be applied in the administration of the waterpowers of the three prairie provinces. We find this rather difficult. We are just asking authority to deal with the provinces, and we will embody at the same time all the provisions of the British Columbia Waterpowers Act that will apply to the provincial governments, owing to the peculiar situation that exists between the federal government and the provinces.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. A. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Might I ask the Minister of the Interior a question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is not debatable on the first reading.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 312 to amend the Supreme Court Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Supreme Court Act a judge having heard a case, being absent when the judgment is delivered, may hand his notes to one of the judges who is present and who is delivering the judgment on his behalf, and these notes may form part of the record. The present bill is for the purpose of extending these provisions to a judge who has resigned or who has retired under the new age limit provision put in the statute two years ago.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 300, for the relief of Stella Pearl Duncan—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 302, for the relief of Hurley Alexander Fummerton—Mr. Thorson.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

NEW BRUNSWICK HAY CROP AND MARKETS

Mr. PRICE:

1. What tonnage of hay is available for market purposes in the province of New Brunswick?
2. Has the department any information concerning the demand for hay in the markets of Great Britain?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. No statistics available. From the 1928 crop of 796,000 tons probably 200,000 tons available for market of which it is estimated less than 10 per cent is still in producers hands. Seed branch inspectors report that bulk of hay unmarketed is of inferior quality.

2. Imports of hay into the United Kingdom are reported as 29,371 tons for the calendar year 1923; 13,187 tons for 1924; 23,566 tons for 1925; 23,427 tons for 1926; 43,099 tons for 1927. Canadian exports to the United Kingdom were 23,775 tons for the fiscal year 1923-24; 21,837 tons for 1924-25; 36,317 tons for 1925-26; 20,110 tons for 1926-27; 58,400 tons for 1927-28.

There is a good demand for hay in the British market at the present time. Stocks in farmers hands are reported to be low with early spring weather unfavourable to the present season's crop. Prices offered for hay in the British market are usually low and, in the past, have not been such as to attract the best grades of Canadian hay to the British market in any great quantity. Most shipments from Canada to the United Kingdom are made from Montreal while that port remains open.

HISTORIC SITES—ANNAPOLIS ROYAL

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Has the government been requested to acquire the site of the first fort and habitation, built in 1605 by Champlain and his associates, near Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia?

2. Is the money required for the restoration of this fort and habitation, in accordance with drawings left by Champlain, available from other than governmental sources?

3. What persons and what historical and tourist associations have requested that the government assist in this project?

4. What action has been taken or is contemplated by the government?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. Yes.

2. The president of the Annapolis Royal Historical Association advises he has an offer of $10,000 in aid of the proposal.

3. The Historical Association of Annapolis Royal.

4. None.

GUS CARRIER—PRINCE ALBERT PENITENTIARY

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Vancouver-Burrard) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to Gus Carrier, Prince Albert penitentiary, from January 1, 1925, to date.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): When this matter came up the first time I said that there were objections to tabling the documents, some of them in any event. The matter is under consideration by the department. As a matter of fact, I expect a report from an officer whom I have instructed to look into this case. The whole record consists of confidential documents, exchanged between the officers of the penitentiary branch and I do not think that, under the practice, these documents should be tabled. However, I think that in a couple of days I will be able to tell my hon. friend the result of the investigation.

Mr. CLARK: We will let it stand then.

Motion stands.

PRIVATE BILLS

EVA ALEXANDER GRAYSON SMITH

On the order to go into committee on Bill No. 214, for the relief of Eva Alexander Grayson Smith:

Mr. HEAPS: My colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) asked me to say on his behalf that members in whose names private bills stand should be in the house when motions are made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not catch what the hon. member said. There is objection?

Mr. HEAPS: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has asked me to say on his behalf that the members should be in the house when motions are moved.

Mr. GEARY: The member for Winnipeg North Centre cannot be heard, he is not in the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Both sponsors and objectors ought to be here.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. McPhee) is unavoidably absent, and does not expect to be present this session.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances I would say by unanimous consent, Mr. Young (Saskatoon), for Mr. McPhee, moves, seconded by Mr. McIntosh, that the house go into committee on Bill No. 214, for the relief of Eva Alexandra Grayson Smith.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

HENRY FELDMAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 247, for the relief of Henry Feldman—Mr. Jacobs—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the sponsor of the bill in the house? If not, I object to this bill going through.

The CHAIRMAN: Stands.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 188, for the relief of Marie Rose Beffre Baer.—Mr. Arthurs.

On division.

Bill No. 201, for the relief of Ethel Evelyn Farrow.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 210, for the relief of John Alfred Neary.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 211, for the relief of Charles Storey.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 215, for the relief of Ernest Gillespie Simpson.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 216, for the relief of Laura Grace Osborne Lea.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 217, for the relief of Gertrude Helena Martin.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 218, for the relief of Laura Warren, —Mr. Speakman.

Bill No. 219, for the relief of Ethel Elizabeth Kelley.—Mr. Edwards (Waterloo).

Bill No. 220, for the relief of Andrew Ralph Wilson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 221, for the relief of Marion Jane Stewart.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 222, for the relief of Mildred Muriel Lange.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 223, for the relief of Linda Lydia Snowdon Pascoe.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 224, for the relief of John Carbery Hickman.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 225, for the relief of Lydia Alice Hinch.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 226, for the relief of Allan Plant. —Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 227, for the relief of Pansy Jean Van Luven.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 228, for the relief of William Treslove.—Mr. Thorson.

Bill No. 229, for the relief of Annie Letticia Smith.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 230, for the relief of Frederick Herman Schelke.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 231, for the relief of Jennie White. —Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 232, for the relief of Alma Berlinda Swayne.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 233, for the relief of Gladys Evelyn Lawrence.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 234, for the relief of Daniel Ray Bouvier.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 235, for the relief of Edyth Viola Beacock.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 236, for the relief of Bertha Nichols. —Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 237, for the relief of George Nelson Brown.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 238, for the relief of Albert Victor Walter Holman Homan.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 239, for the relief of James Duncan Gerard.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 240, for the relief of Frances Vera Carter Van Luven.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 241, for the relief of Violet Haney. —Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 242, for the relief of James Thompson Clark.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 243, for the relief of James Collingwood Darroch.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 244, for the relief of Ross James Smalley.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 245, for the relief of Alexander James Purse.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 246, for the relief of Wilfred Keith Black.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 248, for the relief of Fanny Green Fuchs Webber.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 249, for the relief of Henry Lawrence Jones.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 256, for the relief of Dean William Moncrieff.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 257, for the relief of William John Brett.—Mr. Heaps.

Bill No. 259, for the relief of Grace Viola Byers.—Mr. Hay.

Bill No. 260, for the relief of Mildred Soden. —Mr. Hay.

Bill No. 261, for the relief of Mabel Graham. —Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 262, for the relief of Velma Stella Seadon.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 263, for the relief of Emma O'Grady. —Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 264, for the relief of Edna Marguerite Stroud Robinson.—Mr. Cahan.

Bill No. 265, for the relief of Gordon Hanna. —Mr. Rowe.

Bill No. 266, for the relief of Joseph Richardson.—Mr. McPhee.

Bill No. 269, for the relief of Angus John Archibald Blaine.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 270, for the relief of Thomas Horace Sillery.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 271, for the relief of George Melville Fulton.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 272, for the relief of Gladys Elizabeth Boyd.—Mr. Stinson.

Bill No. 274, for the relief of Annie Fraser Rice.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 275, for the relief of Clarence Spurgeon White.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 276, for the relief of Gertrude Georgeanna Anderson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 277, for the relief of Lloyd Edward Angel.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 284, respecting a certain patent of Cobb Connector Company.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 288, for the relief of George Stanley Warner.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 289, for the relief of Vincenzina Gramigna.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 292, for the relief of Kenneth Evan Thompson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 293, for the relief of Thomas Matthews Moland.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 294, for the relief of Andrew Townsley Hirsch.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

HURTEAU PATENT

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Antigonish-Guysborough) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 79, respecting a certain patent of Jean Baptiste Hurteau.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

THE NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY COMPANY

Mr. A. E. BOURGEOIS (Kent, N.B.) moved the second reading of Bill No. 282, respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.

Mr. SPEAKER: This bill will have to be referred to the committee on standing orders as the petition concerning same is not in order.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the select standing committee on standing orders.

CENTRAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. M. F. HEPBURN (West Elgin; for Mr. Lang) moved the second reading of Bill No. 283, respecting Central Finance Corporation.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the sponsor of this bill kindly explain?

Mr. HEPBURN: Last year the Central Finance Corporation was given a charter by this parliament. This year it is asking for certain amendments. Unfortunately the sponsor of the bill is not present. The fact that the bill has passed the senate would indicate that there was certain merit to it. All I ask is that it be sent to the banking and commerce committee.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): The officers of my department have gone over this bill and they find no objection to it. As my hon. friend has stated, a slight amendment has been made by the banking and commerce committee of the senate. It just adds certain clauses regarding chattel mortgages.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the select standing committee on banking and commerce.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 255, for the relief of Marion Rose Harrison.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 258, for the relief of Robert Wilson Reoch.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 267, for the relief of William Edward King.—Mr. Bell (Hamilton), for Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 268, for the relief of John Wilson Pickering.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 273, for the relief of Wallace Wellington Corkum.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 280, respecting Alliance Nationale.—Mr. Mercier (Laurier-Outremont).

Bill No. 286, for the relief of Marion Annie Terry.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 287, for the relief of Frank Milsom Ruggles.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 290, for the relief of Joseph Edwin Wood.—Mr. Howden.

Bill No. 291, for the relief of Dora Chearnley Chearnley.—Mr. Howden.

Bill No. 295, for the relief of William Edgar Baird.—Mr. McGibbon for Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 296, for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 299, for the relief of Edith Laura Hewitt.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 301, for the relief of Bertha Jane Phelan.—Mr. Stevens for Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 303, for the relief of Roland Emory Anderson.—Mr. Grimmer for Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 304, for the relief of Olive Marion Gerrard.—Mr. Bell (St. John) for Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 305, for the relief of John Beck.—Mr. Bell (St. John) for Mr. Kaiser.

Bill No. 306, for the relief of Ruth Leonard Wiser.—Mr. Rowe.

Bill No. 307, for the relief of George King.—Mr. Harris for Mr. Bowen.

Bill No. 309, respecting The Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Dominion of Canada General Insurance Company.—Mr. Geary.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE PROSECUTIONS —MR. HARRY BRONFMAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): On May 5th an order of the house was passed for the production of papers regarding the prosecution of Harry Bronfman. The papers that were brought down refer only to the Department of National Revenue and the evidence on which the investigating commission found a prima facie case against Harry Bronfman. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) informed the house that the other papers were confidential and could not be furnished. Will the Minister of Justice now furnish those papers, or will he say why the crown was not in a position to make out a good case at law, to use his own words in answer to the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine)?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): As the hon. gentleman says, the return was prepared by the Department of National Revenue, and apparently they tabled everything except the legal opinions sent to that department by the Deputy Minister of Justice. Those legal opinions, under the practice that has always prevailed, are as a matter of fact private documents and are never made public. My hon. friend the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) tells me that another hon. member, I think the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell), asked for the same papers, and the minister communicated them to him personally and he was satisfied. Perhaps my hon. friend from Rosetown will be satisfied if the Minister of National Revenue shows him the report of the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. EVANS: I do not think that that would satisfy me because it is only the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Justice has already given his decision in the matter. What we want to know is why the crown was not in a position to make out a good case at law.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That will be indicated in the opinion.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The question which the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) has asked is not in form just what I proposed to ask the minister, having read in Hansard the reply he gave the other day, namely, that the crown in right of the Dominion had concluded that there was not sufficient evidence on which to predicate a prosecution being taken against a certain person.

My understanding is that that is a matter that must rest with the provincial authorities. Time and time again the Dominion government has declined to exercise the power because it can exercise it only through the attorney general's department in the respective provinces. For instance, the crown in right of the Dominion, cannot prosecute a case in the provinces. The crown can assist by having somebody act with the attorney general of the province, but it is perfectly obvious that the crown in right of the Dominion cannot carry on the prosecution. I could not help overhearing a remark on the other side as to the Saskatchewan election, but this has nothing whatever to do with the Saskatchewan election. In connection with prosecutions under the Combines Act in regard to the fruit industry, counsel for the Dominion came into the provinces, and the only method by which the prosecution was carried on was by the indictment being preferred through the department of the attorney general of the province. Counsel for the Dominion assisted or acted on behalf of the provincial authorities in carrying forward the prosecution. It has never been competent, in my judgment, for this Dominion or for the Minister of Justice to determine whether or not proceedings should be taken against anybody. That rests with the provincial authorities, because the administration of justice rests with them only, and all the power in this parliament could not enter a nolle prosequi against an individual in connection with criminal proceedings. That must come from the attorney general of the province If my memory serves me—I intended to look it up, but as my hon. friend from Rosetown has brought the question up, I may now state my recollection—Sir John Thompson considered this point very carefully at one time in connection with certain prosecutions that arose out of the McGreevy-Connolly difficulties, and the conclusions that were arrived at then were approved by such eminent jurists as the Hon. David Mills and Mr. afterwards, Sir Louis Davies. I am speaking wholly from memory and subject to correction, but my memory is that the principle is there emphatically laid down that there is no power in the Dominion to declare that a prosecution shall or shall not be taken against any alleged offender against the law, but that power rests in the attorney general of the province, the provincial authorities alone being the power charged with the administration of criminal justice. Even although the Minister of Justice thought that the case in question was not a good case for criminal prosecution and so

advised the Department of National Revenue, the duty of the department is to transmit the documents to the attorneys general in the respective provinces affected, and have the appropriate attorneys general take such proceedings as may be necessary, first determining either not to prosecute or to proceed with the case. I dare say that my friend the Minister of Justice and certainly the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will remember that the former member for South York (Mr. Maclean), always urged that there should be power in this parliament under our constitution, as there is in the United States, for the federal prosecuting officers and federal marshals to prosecute and carry on proceedings in the several courts for the purpose of enforcing justice. We have not that power under our constitution. He used to point out with a great wealth of learning that the effect of that lack of power was to render the enforcement of many of our federal statutes ineffective and inefficient, and he suggested from time to time that our constitution should be so amended as to provide beyond peradventure that this Dominion could itself institute and carry forward criminal proceedings. Certainly the federal government has no power to enter a nolle prosequi and no officer of our Dominion, the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice, can discontinue criminal proceedings or, in the sense in which the word is properly used, initiate or continue them in the criminal courts of the provinces.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I quite agree with my hon. friend that there is no power on the part of this government to file a nolle prosequi, but there is power to refrain from laying a charge—

Mr. BENNETT: Oh yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is exactly what has been done in this case. The officers of the Department of Justice, after having received the evidence taken before the royal commission, came to the conclusion that in law we had not a good case against Bronfman, and the Department of National Revenue was so advised.

As far as the attorney general of the province is concerned I quite agree, too, that all indictments must be proffered by the attorney general, but surely there must be somebody to initiate something. Especially when it comes from the federal authorities, the attorney general of the province never acts unless some federal officer lays a complaint against somebody, and then it becomes the duty of the attorney general to prosecute. But when the federal authorities come to the conclusion that they cannot prosecute and do not lay any complaint or charge against the man before the provincial authorities, I do not think the provincial authorities can be blamed for not prosecuting.

Mr. EVANS: Then am I to understand that the whole responsibility rests on the Justice department at Ottawa?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Responsibility only so far as I have indicated. When a legal opinion is asked of the Department of Justice by any of the departments of the government, certainly we are responsible for the answer, but that is all.

Mr. BENNETT: The value of that opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice is only this, that it expresses the view of a responsible minister of the crown, a federal minister, that such a prosecution would not succeed, but it cannot in any sense stay or bind or limit or restrict the duty of the attorney general of the province to enforce the laws of the country if charges are brought before the court for that purpose.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If charges are brought. May I add that any citizen of Canada can lay a complaint if anybody is not satisfied. If my hon. friend from Rosetown is not satisfied, he can lay a complaint himself.

Mr. EVANS: Did not the commission itself lay a charge?

Mr. LAPOINTE: They sent on the facts.

PENNY BANK ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 297, to amend the Penny Bank Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On Section 1, subsection 2—Withdrawals for investment on other approved securities.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the general purpose of this bill?

Mr. ROBB: Penny banks are purely philanthropic in purpose. The Penny Bank of Ontario serves a school population of 170,000 children in 360 schools in 85 municipalities throughout the country, all the chartered banks acting as local agents of the Penny Bank. Under the charter as they have it now, Mr. Chairman, they may invest their funds only in Dominion of Canada securities. This bill is to widen their powers so that they may invest in Dominion of Canada

guaranteed securities, or securities of, or guaranteed by, any province of Canada, or of the government of the United Kingdom, or of any municipal corporation in Canada, including debentures issued for public school purposes or guaranteed by any such municipal corporation, as the minister may approve. The board may also invest, to an amount not exceeding 50 per cent of the funds at the credit of the bank as aforesaid, in first mortgages on improved real estate in the Dominion of Canada not exceeding 50 per cent of the value thereof.

Mr. SPENCER: I would like to ask the Minister of Finance how this bank differs from any other bank; how is it able to use the word "bank" which is more or less of a monopoly?

Mr. ROBB: I have just given my hon. friend and the house the information as to their loaning privileges. Heretofore, they have only been able to invest money in Dominion government securities. Many of those securities will mature shortly. They desire now to widen their powers so that they may invest in guaranteed securities of the Dominion of Canada, in guaranteed securities of the provinces, or of the United Kingdom, or any of the municipalities, and an amount not to exceed 50 per cent may be invested in first mortgages on improved real estate in the Dominion of Canada subject to the approval of the Minister of Finance. It is purely a philanthropic organization. There are no shareholders and the directors receive no fees.

Mr. BENNETT: What are the resources at the moment?

Mr. ROBB: They now have $1,250,000 in round figures.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the minister think it sound to permit the investment of any part of that money in mortgages?

Mr. ROBB: Well, not exceeding 50 per cent of the value, and it is subject to the approval of the minister.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the very point I am making, because it must be clear to the Minister of Finance that that is making the Dominion government liable for the mortgage. That is the real truth about it.

Mr. ROBB: As my hon. friend knows, you could not proceed with that argument very far, because all the life insurance companies invest funds in mortgages, subject to the approval of the treasury board.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, but not to this extent. The banks are precluded from making loans on real estate. I only put it to the minister, if he does not think it desirable to eliminate that for the reason that it suggests a moral obligation on the part of the minister to become responsible for the validity and sufficiency of those loans, and I do not think that is quite sound.

Mr. ROBB: I think there is very much in what my hon. friend says. I move to strike out from line 20 the words:

> The board may also invest, to an amount not exceeding 50 per cent of the funds at the credit of the bank as aforesaid, in first mortgages on improved real estate in the Dominion of Canada, not exceeding 50 per cent of the value thereof.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That eliminates the right to loan on mortgages.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection 4—Securities deposited with minister; proceeds credited to bank.

Mr. GARDINER: I suggest that subsection 4 be amended also because that has reference to mortgages.

Mr. ROBB: I move to strike out the words in the second line "other than mortgages."

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

Section agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER: Under what particular department does this bank come? Does it come under the supervision of the superintendent of insurance, or under that of the general inspector of banks?

Mr. ROBB: I should say the inspector of banks. It was to the inspector of banks that I referred their application for consideration.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONTREAL TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 254, respecting the construction by the Canadian National Railway Company of certain terminal facilities with grade separation and other works at and in the vicinity of the city of Montreal.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I would like that to stand if possible. There is certain information I desire and I propose to make some observations in connection with this bill when I get that information. We should think very carefully about certain matters connected with the bill, and I propose possibly to offer an amendment in the way of a section to be added. As this bill was before the committee for a few hours the other day, and involves an enormous sum of money, I think we should proceed carefully with it.

Mr. DUNNING: I have no objection to letting it stand, but perhaps it would facilitate matters if my hon. friend would mention the points touching which he wishes information. If he does so I shall be glad, if possible, to supply that information.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well, we can go into committee.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 2—Power to construct and build works described in the schedule.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister will recall that by statute we validated an agreement made between the Canadian Northern Terminal Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company, whereby this country became obligated, as conditions now are, to pay a certain annual sum in interest and sinking fund with respect to securities involved in the construction of the old Canadian Northern terminal. I have not had an opportunity to investigate the matter, but I was in the house when it went through and I took occasion then to go into the question with a good deal of care. That is why I suggest that it would be well for us to look into the matter thoroughly; personally I should like to find out, first of all, what annual charge there is now against Canada in connection with the construction of the old terminal—that is, the tunnel terminal. It involves the payment of a fixed sum for a certain number of years by way of rental, being equivalent to interest and sinking fund on securities issued for the purpose of constructing the terminal. Of course, I am speaking now only from memory; I have not had a chance to verify the facts. The other day I attended a meeting of the railway committee and I may observe that I can find no record of the proceedings. I thought that minutes of that meeting were being taken, but so far as I can find out, there was no shorthand report of it. Is that correct?

Mr. DUNNING: I do not know of any, no.

Mr. BENNETT: Two or three observations were then made which in my judgment should be carefully considered. One was that at the end of ten years the property would pay 6 per cent on investments. Some of the members of the committee thought that meant the whole terminal investment; obviously all that was meant was as respects the passenger station. I spoke to one of the directors of the system afterwards and he told me that this interpretation which I placed upon the matter was correct. There are no buildings contemplated by this bill apart from terminal buildings as such, and any buildings which would yield revenue, such as comes from the New York Central properties like the Biltmore hotel, for example, would have to be provided for by private capital or from the resources of the public. Whit respect to this matter I should like to have some more definite idea. I listened also to the estimates that were given as to cost of construction, but they were so vague and general that I decided to ask the minister—not being a member of the committee I could not discuss the matter there—whether he would be able to give us a more detailed idea of just what was involved.

Lastly, it apparently is contemplated that we should continue the Bonaventure station. A high level construction from that station would carry the rails into St. Henri to connect with the inner belt line, if I may use that term; because the system contemplates two belt lines, an outer and an inner, which of course is something in the nature of the scheme that now prevails in England with respect to the Metropolitan—an inner and an outer belt line. At one time the old Bonaventure street station was to be abandoned; that is how I understood the plans, as I could gather them.

Mr. DUNNING: It still is, as a station.

Mr. BENNETT: But it is not being abandoned, in this sense, that it is now being utilized under the new scheme, and there will be an enormous expenditure in connection with carrying the rails at high level from that station through St. Henri. That was the impression I formed, listening the other day to the explanation. Is it correct?

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is under some misapprehension which I shall clear up.

Mr. BENNETT: At any rate that was what I gathered. I gathered further that this was because of the recommendations made by Mr. Palmer. My understanding was that the first plans prepared by the Canadian National engineers did not contemplate that, but that the recommendations of Mr. Palmer contem-

plated the connecting up of the tunnel lines with the Bonaventure street station, by means of high level rails from Bonaventure to St. Henri, thereby making that a circle of the inner belt line—the inner circle, as they call it in England. I could not hear very well all that was said, but that was what I gathered would be the effect of the proposal. I could hear the answers given to some questions asked by the hon. member for St. Henri (Mr. Mercier), but I could not catch the questions themselves. Perhaps the minister would give us some information in this regard.

Some observations were made also with respect to other reports which, I understood, had been made by engineers employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I suggest that these reports be made available to hon. members who may wish to consult them. I could not gather what the names of the engineers were, but I thought one was Smith. I made inquiries of one of the Canadian Pacific Railway representatives and he informed me that such a report had been made, but I have not seen it, and I fancy that possibly the minister will let us have access to it.

I wish to be frank with the minister. Apparently the state of public opinion in this country is pretty much what it was prior to 1914; we are willing to spend money regardless of where it comes from or where it may lead us to. Twenty-one years ago this fall I ventured to express rather a strong opinion with respect to railway expenditures in Canada, and I am bound to say that I received little support at that time; but ten years later everyone said I had been right. Now I am not suggesting that I am right in this instance inasmuch as I have not arrived at any definite conclusion, but I do desire to point out to the committee—at least I shall do so on the third reading of the bill—where I think this leads to, and how serious it is that we should involve ourselves in the expenditure of such enormous amounts without having before us more detailed information as to the causes that necessitate these expenditures. As I have said, I speak now only what occurs to me at the moment, but both the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Alberta were called upon, under guarantee in connection with the old roads, to pay money, and the guarantees in those cases amounted to only $13,000 a mile.

Mr. DUNNING: Fifteen thousand.

Mr. BENNETT: Fifteen thousand in Saskatchewan and thirteen thousand on some lines in Alberta. And when it is recalled that the interest rate was low, that money was cheap, and that they did not earn that much money, it becomes of considerable importance that we regard this not as an isolated transaction but in relation to the whole problem; for I am firmly of the opinion that terminals must be provided in Montreal. It is discreditable to the Dominion that the great system of railways which it owns should not have better terminals than it has now in Montreal; they are hardly worthy of the name terminals at Montreal.

Mr. DUNNING: They are not, in fact.

Mr. BENNETT: No. I have frequently urged on the powers that be the necessity of providing something better in this regard, but I must say that never in the wildest flights of imagination did I contemplate a sum of money so vast as that provided in this bill; nor did I think it possible that we should ever reach the stage where parliament would be willing to commit itself to so vast an expenditure without at least a few more safeguards. It was with these considerations in mind that I desired to look into the situation more fully than I have done. I am speaking, again, from memory—and my memory may not serve me correctly, because as one gets older ones memory does not—but I recall distinctly the circumstances in connection with that first terminal bill, and the expenditures made under it, and I think it might assist me in arriving at conclusions, if the minister has other reports of the engineers, to be able to read those reports during the evening. In the meantime, we could go on with other sections of the bill. If the facts are as I think, I have a suggestion to make with regard to an amendment which might be made to this bill.

Mr. DUNNING: In connection with the tunnel?

Mr. BENNETT: No, in connection with the expenditure. That is predicated entirely upon my being able to satisfy myself about certain facts, because anxious as I am that there should be a terminal at Montreal that will adequately meet every demand which may be made by traffic both for the present and for the future as far as we can reasonably foresee, I am still more anxious that we should not bring about a condition such as followed the vast expenditures of what were really public moneys in this country, the guaranteed securities under the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific railway schemes. If the minister has not these reports I may be able

to obtain them from other sources, although I have not sought to do so, in order to ascertain just what has been said about these terminals.

Mr. DUNNING: Let me say at once that in a matter of such importance and such magnitude as that dealt with by the present bill, I certainly do not want to rush matters and I will undertake to leave the bill in committee until such information as may be desired by any member can be secured. As my hon. friend has said, the proceedings before the railway committee, while they provided a wealth of material, could only deal with specific questions arising in the minds of individuals, if those questions were asked. I am only sorry that he did not avail himself of the privilege which was accorded several other members of this house, who were not members of the committee, but who did ask several questions.

Mr. BENNETT: The room was crowded; delegations were present from Montreal, and I did not desire to do so.

Mr. DUNNING: I can quite understand that attitude. Now, with regard to the magnitude of this proposal, we must bear in mind the present situation in Montreal as far as the Canadian National Railways are concerned. I think it can be said that we are starting to deal with the problem in Montreal from a much more difficult standpoint than existed in Toronto; we are under very considerably greater handicaps in trying to develop adequate terminal facilities in Montreal than was the case when the start was made in Toronto, and I think hon. members from Toronto will agree that to say the least the situation there was bad enough. In that connection I might point out that the total estimated aggregate expenditure at Toronto by all parties, is $33,000,000; that is the complete layout, including the expenditure by all companies, but that only deals with the waterfront and does not include the expenditure by the railway companies individually outside that area. These terminal schemes do cost a lot of money.

Mr. GEARY: Of course, that expenditure was largely occasioned by the separation of grades.

Mr. DUNNING: That is also the case in this connection.

Mr. GEARY: But not to the same extent.

Mr. DUNNING: If my memory serves me, we are eliminating over 100 grade crossings by this terminal scheme in Montreal. However, be that as it may, it must be remembered that in Montreal we now have three separate passenger terminals and three separate freight yards, and you cannot get from one to the other by rail except by going around about one hundred miles. The importance of improvement immediately strikes one when these facts are brought out.

Mr. BENNETT: Is not that statement just a little strong, with regard to the three separate terminals?

Mr. DUNNING: Out to Joliette.

Mr. BENNETT: You said you must travel over one hundred miles to get from one station to another.

Mr. DUNNING: In order to deliver anything from the Moreau street station to the Turcotte station or the Bonaventure station requires a journey of over one hundred miles at present; that is, out to Joliette. That is the instance I had in mind. It would be a little shorter to get to the tunnel station, but of course at present there is no freight yard at the tunnel.

With respect to the matter of grade separation west of Bonaventure station, apparently my hon. friend was under the impression that if provision were not made for an inner and outer belt line, that grade separation might not be needed. In that regard I want to assure him that of all the alternative plans which have been developed, none has been brought forward which does not involve the continuous use of the Bonaventure terminal as a freight terminal, and for many years past the great burden of the complaint in Montreal has been the number of grade crossings west of Bonaventure. Grade separation being necessary in any event to accommodate the freight terminal, as I understand it, the suggestion was made that we might use one or two of the tracks coming in over the separated grade in order to develop suburban inner and outer circles which would serve the large outlying suburban sections of Montreal. Comparatively little extra expense would be involved; the utilization of the existing tracks coming into the freight yards is all that is necessary to accomplish it and give a connection from Bonaventure to the tunnel station. As I understand Mr. Palmer's report, he did not recommend that connection; I am relying on memory at the moment in making that statement, but he did recommend an inner and outer belt line system nearer the river than via Bonaventure. That is to say, under Mr. Palmer's scheme as I recall it, the inner belt suburban line would follow up the

harbour tracks from the tunnel station to the harbour, then turn west through the yards and up on the south side of the Bonaventure tracks, joining them in the neighbourhood of St. Henri.

Mr. BENNETT: A very large expenditure was intended to connect the tunnel station with the harbour and with Bonaventure.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, and in that connection I might point out that the original tunnel scheme of the Canadian Northern contemplated such connection from the tunnel station to the harbour tracks; in fact the Canadian Northern did acquire quite a bit of property for right of way down there, which the Canadian National inherited.

Now, with respect to the obligations of the country in regard to the tunnel station, I will gladly get for my hon. friend such information as we have with regard to the present standing of that obligation, but I am sure that any existing obligation is now a part of the general Canadian National obligation in that connection.

Mr. BENNETT: This is covered by a special statute. I could send out and get it, but since the meeting of the committee I have not had an opportunity to do so. My hon. friend will remember that we passed a statute validating an agreement made between the tunnel company of the Canadian Northern and the railway by which, if my memory serves me right, the rental to be paid by the Canadian Northern represented the interest on the terminal securities plus provision for a sinking fund. I thought perhaps the minister would have the information before him, but I can send for it.

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry I have not it here, but I will be glad to get it and see what bearing it has on the situation, if any.

Mr. BENNETT: It means a fixed charge on terminal facilities.

Mr. DUNNING: In any case that still exists and is part of the Canadian National obligation, and whatever we do in Montreal I am afraid it would not affect the monetary situation with respect to that obligation. However, I will be glad to look into that matter and leave the bill in committee in order that we may have an opportunity to examine all phases of the question.

With regard to the engineering inquiry which has been going on for years, I can only say that certainly the government has not pressed this matter unduly. The position of the minister throughout my experience, and I believe former ministers had the same view, has been that, with regard to a project of this magnitude, every possible investigation should be made before deciding on a course of action. It is only because the situation has now reached the stage of acuteness which, to my mind, forbids any further postponement, that the government determined to bring the matter forward this year. In connection with great engineering enterprises the minister is naturally a layman and must rely upon a commonsense examination by himself and his officers of the reports of the experts and engineers who have made years of study of the problem involved.

Mr. McGIBBON: How about the policy?

Mr. DUNNING: The minister and the government must take the responsibility, and do take the responsibility with regard to policy. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) was not making any complaint about the policy; he was questioning rather whether we could not at this time solve the problem with a smaller expenditure.

Mr. BENNETT: That is right.

Mr. DUNNING: In the matter of policy, I think he will agree with me that the Canadian National system must have adequate terminal facilities in the city of Montreal.

Mr. BENNETT: I agree with that view.

Mr. DUNNING: The Canadian National has not only inadequate terminals in Montreal at the present time, but they are well-night impossible from the point of view of the handling of traffic. During my personal study of this matter one thing struck me with much force in connection with the experience of great cities in their dealing with terminal problems; I found that that in no single case had the plan been sufficiently broad and sufficiently large. It developed time after time in American cities that the most generous plan, apparently extravagant plan, proved to be inadequate by the time it was carried out, due to the growth of traffic in great terminals. Within the last few months I was told by an officer of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company that the new Pennsylvania terminal in the city of New York, upon which over $100,000,000 was expended, was too small the day it was finished and that further expenditures had to be made because of factors which could not possibly be taken into account at the time the terminal was devised. It has been found necessary to make changes in connection with

the Toronto terminal, but in that connection there would be the factor of the lengthened number of years which have intervened since the work was commenced.

Mr. BENNETT: There was dead interest for nearly ten years.

Mr. DUNNING: But in addition to that, a greater expenditure has been found necessary than was originally contemplated would have to be made. Montreal is not only a great city to-day, but it is apparently destined to be very much greater than it is at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT: Ten per cent of all the people of Canada live on the island.

Mr. DUNNING: There is a very large population there. I will say quite frankly that I have been looking for criticisms based upon the inadequacy of this scheme and a criticism based upon the engineers' failure to envisage a Montreal sufficiently large. With regard to the reports made to the other railway company, I am not in position to speak. The Canadian Pacific management have supplied me with copies of the reports submitted to them. This was a matter of courtesy and I appreciate it very much and the study of those plans has been very useful to me. I will be very glad to let my hon. friend see what I have in that connection.

Mr. BENNETT: I will be greatly obliged.

Mr. DUNNING: It will be understood that just as the Canadian National approached this matter from the point of view of the interests of the Canadian National, the Canadian Pacific approaches it from the point of view of the best interests of the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. BENNETT: I approached the matter from the standpoint of one who has to do with both, and whether or not there could be a joint terminal. Toronto has a joint terminal which provides for the old Grand Trunk, the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railways.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member will appreciate that there is nothing in the scheme now being propounded by the Canadian National which would prevent it being used for a union terminal should the parties agree upon that scheme at any time in the future. I do not think I will be giving away any secrets when I say that the Canadian Pacific very naturally think that the Windsor street station would provide more suitable union terminal facilities than the tunnel station of the Canadian National; the Canadian National believe that the tunnel station would make a more suitable union station than the Windsor street station. I cannot pretend that there is any agreement between the two companies on that point, but the railway companies are agreeing with respect to other points having to do with the broader matter of terminal facilities such as economies and joint facilities at various places in and around the city of Montreal; a degree of cooperation which I am satisfied will increase as time passes. There still remains that broad difference between them; both are agreeable to union station facilities but both believe that the best facilities are provided by the stations which they own at the present time. The Canadian Pacific would be quite willing to negotiate for union terminal facilties at the Windsor street station.

Mr. MATTHEWS: How much money would that take?

Mr. DUNNING: The Canadian National would be willing to negotiate for union terminal facilities at the tunnel station; each railway company is convinced that the scheme which they suggest would make for the best interests of their particular railway system.

Mr. MATTHEWS: If the Canadian Pacific view were adopted what would be the saving in expenditure?

Mr. DUNNING: That question did not arise because the Canadian National were able to demonstrate to me that such a terminal would not be adequate or satisfactory for their purposes.

Mr. MATTHEWS: The Canadian Pacific would have such a scheme in contemplation before they would make a suggestion of that character?

Mr. DUNNING: I am not aware that any concrete suggestion was made.

Mr. MATTHEWS: You say that they hold that view.

Mr. DUNNING: It was rather a matter of conference between the parties at my request in order that it might be determined whether or not the best interests of the city of Montreal and the best interests of both railway systems would be better served by a union terminal. There has been a good deal of argument as to whether or not union terminal facilities would be better for the city of Montreal, and I have no doubt that both railway companies went thoroughly into the matter, but, as I say, neither one is agreed as to the economic practicability from their point of view of going into the other's union terminal.

Mr. McGIBBON: In view of the statement made by the Minister of Railways, should not the government obtain the assistance of competent authorities in order that that question may be decided before such a huge expenditure is made?

Mr. DUNNING: Because of the great importance of the issues involved, the government made arrangements to secure the services of Mr. Palmer. The government wanted the problem to be considered in an unbiased way, taking into account the viewpoints of both railway companies and the viewpoint of the people to be served. Mr. Palmer's report has been published and every member of the house has been supplied with a copy. I would point out to the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) that if the government were of the opinion that the tunnel station should be used as a union terminal by both railways. there is no power by which the minister or the government could enforce that view with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am very doubtful whether it would be wise to place such power in the hands of any minister or any government. The Canadian Pacific is spending its shareholders' money and must be allowed a reasonable latitude to decide for itself what is best in connection with a matter of that kind.

As to the other point, why should we not compel the Canadian National to go into the Canadian Pacific terminal—

Mr. McGIBBON: I did not ask that.

Mr. DUNNING: No, but I am looking at the question from both sides. My hon. friend asked why the minister did not insist upon a union terminal.

Mr. McGIBBON: No; I asked why the government did not investigate the matter on behalf of the people of Canada.

Mr. DUNNING: My reply to that is that the government did investigate. There is no doubt parliament could, if it so desired, force the Canadian National into the Canadian Pacific terminal or into a Canadian Pacific union terminal, but in that regard I doubt very much the wisdom of the government or of parliament overriding the unanimous opinion or judgment, based upon years of study, of the responsible officers of the Canadian National railway system. In other words, I take, in a matter of this kind, the same view of the position of one railway as I do of that of the other. It is very difficult for those of us who are not technical railroad experts to do other than to ensure that the fullest and most independent inquiry possible has been made and then to take the advice of the responsible officers of the railway system in regard to the solution of the problem.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Did I understand the minister to say that he had outside opinion and advice in regard to the Canadian Pacific matter?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, Mr. Palmer's report which has been printed and distributed amongst the members.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Mr. Palmer's report is the one to which the minister refers?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. As to the other reports secured by the Canadian Pacific, I am quite sure if I do not have them, I can get them.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Palmer's report is the only one the government secured?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, from outside sources.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I mean.

Mr. DUNNING: I may say that the business of securing reports from outside authorities is rather difficult when we have in Canada just two great railway corporations. It is hard to get within Canada eminent opinion which is not associated with one or other of the two great systems.

Mr. BENNETT: It cannot be done.

Mr. DUNNING: It is also difficult to secure that advice from the United States for reasons that will occur to my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT: It occurred to me, while I was listening to the minister, that it is possible to get expert opinion from the United States. I recall the following terminals: the St. Louis terminal, the Washington terminal. There are certainly three great railway terminals in Chicago, and there is the St. Paul terminal through which every train that goes in or out of St. Paul passes. I think there is a train in and out of that terminal every four minutes of every day in the year.

Mr. MATTHEWS: There is a new terminal in Cleveland.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And a new one in Buffalo.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS: I wonder if the minister would give some explanation of section 2 and its relation to section 7, for the two

sections are very closely related, having in mind at the moment simply the power of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Section 7, to which I must go to interpret what I am going to say in regard to section 2, provides for two powers that shall exercise the right of approval of plans. It reads:

The general plan or plans of the said works and amendments or additions to such general plan at any time made, shall, on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be subject to the approval of the governor in council.

Then next:

Detail plans affecting any canal or other property controlled by the Department of Railways and Canals shall be subject to the approval of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Then come these words:

Detail plans of crossings of railways and crossings by the railway of streets or highways shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

And lastly:

Detail plans affecting the property of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal shall be subject to the approval of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I am for the moment concerned only as to the power of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I have not under my hand the section of the Railway Act, but the minister may be able to direct me to it. I understand that under the general act the board now has power not only with regard to approving plans of crossings of railway on streets and other railways, but has power also over station locations. That is exempted by the phraseology of this bill. For instance, in section 2 we are giving power to construct terminal stations, local stations, station grounds, yards, and so forth, and all these plans are subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners, including highway crossings. I would ask, in the second place, if it is clear in this bill, and if so where, that the Board of Railway Commissioners have the power to pass upon a division of cost where the question of grade construction arises.

Mr. DUNNING: First let me send to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition the report made to the Canadian Pacific Railway by C. E. Smith and Company, consulting engineers, St. Louis. It is a report on level crossings construction and railway passenger terminals in the city of Montreal, made in the month of March, 1928. My hon. friend also spoke of some other report.

Mr. BENNETT: I was only speaking of what I saw in the paper.

Mr. DUNNING: I believe there is another report, and we will look that up if my hon. friend desires it.

Mr. CAHAN: I understand that the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway was submitted and filed with the Board of Railway Commissioners. Is this the particular report so submitted?

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot say whether this particular report was submitted to the board. I cannot think of any reason why it should be, but it is available.

With reference to the questions raised by my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre, they really relate to section 7 rather than to section 2, as he indicated. We must bear in mind in considering bills of this character that we are acting in two capacities. We are acting as the shareholders of an enterprise, authorizing capital expenditure by that enterprise.

Mr. CAHAN: Who are the shareholders?

Mr. DUNNING: We represent them.

Mr. CAHAN: I think we represent a very large body of electors, but not necessarily are we the representatives of the shareholders.

Mr. DUNNING: Perhaps I can only answer my hon. friend's interjection in a negative way. If we do not represent the shareholders, they have no representation. We are the only body under the law which can occupy the position of the shareholders of an ordinary company in relation to this particular company. We are the only body which can authorize capital expenditures which in the case of an ordinary company would be authorized by the shareholders.

Mr. CAHAN: That is better.

Mr. DUNNING: We are acting in that capacity, and of course we not only have responsibility for this enterprise but must consider also the general transportation interests of the Dominion in enacting legislation.

Section 7 in no particular departs from the practice with respect to the Canadian National enterprise generally in so far as control by the Board of Railway Commissioners is concerned. Under the general legislation creating the Canadian National Railways, the company at the present time does not go to the board for approval of their route maps, but it goes instead to the Minister of Railways. That has been the position since the company was created and is a part of its fundamental legislation.

Mr. STEVENS: Except in so far as the location of stations is concerned.

Mr. DUNNING: There is no exception even in that regard. In that connection may I point out that the place where the Canadian National purposes putting a station in Montreal is already the site of a railway station? They are not proposing to build a station where none now exists, but a larger station on the site of an existing station. For that reason it was not deemed necessary to set out that the Board of Railway Commissioners should pass on the station location. The whole matter was given very considerable thought both by the legal staff of the Canadian National and by the departmental legal staff, and the reason for section 7 being in its present form is, first, to safeguard this institution, parliament, as representing the shareholders in the matter of controlling the management in the expenditure of a large sum of money; second, to have the same provision with respect to the crossing of canals as would exist in connection with any similar legislation affecting any other railway; third, the same provision respecting the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners as exists with respect to any other Canadian National enterprise; and fourth, to deal with the harbour commissioners in the only way in which the harbour commissioners can be dealt with so far as ministerial approval is concerned. That is the only answer I think I can give.

Mr. GEARY: I am afraid I shall have to differ a little with the Minister of Railways. As far as I can see it, this section 7 introduces something entirely new in regard to one of the matters covered by it, and that is in regard to the separation of grades, the crossing under or over a highway or a railway. True it is that in 1919 when the act was passed it contained a provision, section 23, which exempted, in effect, the Canadian National Railways from the provisions in regard to the location of stations, for instance. That section says:

> With the approval of the governor in council and upon any location sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the company may from time to time construct and operate railway lines, branches and extensions, or railway facilities or properties of any description—

So that probably the minister is justified in the statement that so far as location of structure or facilities, such as a station, is concerned, the Board of Railway Commissioners may be said to have been left out to some extent.

[Mr. Dunning.]

I do not know the reason for putting it in; possibly it was because the Canadian National Railways was a publicly owned enterprise, but the section was put in the act. Section 13 says:

> All the provisions of the Railway Act (excepting those provisions which are inconsistent with this act, and excepting also the provisions of the Railway Act relating to the location of lines of railway—

Mr. DUNNING: That is the only exception.

Mr. GEARY: That is the point to which the minister was referring, that you were not, as a privately owned railway, required to submit your location, or right of way, plan. The right was given to the governor in council to determine or approve the location but that does not apply to railway and highway crossing plans.

Mr. DUNNING: Quite right.

Mr. GEARY: The governor in council may not approve under the act. The practice of the railway board is to hear the application and distribute the costs in regard to separation of grades, amongst the parties interested or affected. It may be a municipality or a street railway. That provision, Mr. Chairman, still applies to the Canadian National Railways. Under this section 7 no question of location of subway, or of under crossing or over crossing, or of the distribution of costs of such works is referred to the Board of Railway Commissioners; it is only the detailed plans of the crossing that shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I think the bill goes too far in that respect. I think it may be very soundly argued that when you come to a highway crossing determined upon by the railway, or by the railway in conjunction with the municipality, the Board of Railway Commissioners are concerned not with who shall bear the cost of it but simply and solely with the detailed plan. I think that is a change in the practice which should be considered very carefully. To begin with, as I understood and read the plans, and noted the models in the railway committee room they provide for certain level crossings and certain streets to be closed, and that without, nominally at all events, the approval or consent of the city of Montreal; it may be that the parties have got together and have said those are the ones we shall apply for. It seems to me that questions respecting the closing of streets and the diversion of traffic come solely within the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners and that any plan touching the separation of grades that we approve here

at the moment should not be final. Each case should be taken up separately before the Board of Railway Commissioners, or all of them, so that the general plans may be left out, and the railway commisioners in approving satisfactory locations, must determine who is to bear the cost. If you go to the board, as is the usual practice, and have the costs distributed between the parties interested or affected, and if either party is dissatisfied there is an appeal to the governor in council; but the governor in council will not as a rule, unless there is some principle involved, upset the judgment of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

You are reversing the procedure; you are saying the governor in council shall determine all these matters, but that the governor in council, may of course, refer them to the Board of Railway Commissioners. However, "may" does not mean that you are necessarily bound to refer to them. Under the language of the section I think you have taken from the Board of Railway Commissioners a function which from the beginning has been exercised in regard to the Canadian National Railways and which should be exercised in connection with this great work in the city of Montreal.

Mr. DUNNING: Mr. Chairman, it would probably facilitate matters if we dealt with the sections when we came to them, but I should like to answer my hon. friend now, and to say that generally I agree with him in his contention as to what should be the function of the Board of Railway Commissioners with respect to grade crossings in a scheme like this. The only difficulty I have is as to the legal interpretation of what has been put in this bill. The point was raised, I think by my hon. friend himself in the railway committee, and as a consequence of his having been kind enough to raise it there I have, of course, taken it up very thoroughly with the law officers in order to discover whether this bill does what my hon. friend fears in that regard. The answer that is given to me is this, that with respect to all the general powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners in relation to legal crossings and grade separations, as contained in the Railway Act, this bill does not interfere but that section 7 deals with the approval of plans. It must be remembered that this whole bill is an enabling bill. Section 2 ends with the words:

—and a short description whereof for the information of parliament but not intended to be exhaustive, being set out in the schedule hereto.

Section 7 is intended to provide the machinery whereby the actual details of the general plan set out in the schedule shall be approved. The Board of Railway Commissioners, according to my legal advice, will have just the same powers with respect to the level crossings and grade separations contemplated under this scheme as they have with respect to the same matters in connection with any other railway project anywhere in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not provided in the Bill.

Mr. GEARY: With the greatest respect, I differ with the law officers who have advised my hon. friend. By implication at least this excludes the very matters which the Board of Railway Commissioners would ordinarily deal with. I think there is an implication there, and a strong one. It is suggested to me that that is the intention of the Canadian National Railways—I am not speaking as though it were any wicked intention—but that it is the intention of the company under the bill to have an arrangement with the city of Montreal as to whether each one of these streets shall be separated as to grades and how the cost is to be borne between the railway company and the city.

Mr. DUNNING: It is the intention of the railway company and the government to have the grade separation matter dealt with in exactly the same way as any other grade separation is dealt with by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. GEARY: Of course, my hon. friend's assurance carries with it, so far as I am concerned, the conviction that that is what will be done. But I think he should put it within the four corners of the act so clearly that there would be no mistake, and I do suggest, with all possible respect to those who have advised him, that perhaps they may not all have looked at the matter from the point of view from which I venture now to present it to the minister.

Mr. DUNNING: The matter is so important that I shall certainly not take the bill out of committee without affording an opportunity for further consideration of that point. Frankly, however, I wish it had been pressed a little further in the railway committee, for the reason that the vice president, in charge of legal affairs of the Canadian National, was there and answered that very point—and answered it substantially in the language which I have used to-day.

Mr. BENNETT: Not so emphatically.

Mr. DUNNING: I expect to get straightforward advice from the legal officers and I believe I do get it; and my advice is that the bill carries out the intention of the railway as well as of the minister. However, I intend, in view of my hon. friend's representations, to make doubly sure of that.

Mr. GEARY: You have one hundred grade crossings separated.

Mr. DUNNING: Eighty-one. When we come to section 7 I shall be prepared to let it stand if that is deemed necessary.

Mr. BENNETT: In support of the contention made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens)) and the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Geary) may I direct attention to these words in section 2:

> The governor in council may provide for the construction and completion by the Canadian National Railway Company (hereinafter called "the company") of—

Then the terminals are described.

> —for any purpose. . . . and improvements, works, plant, apparatus and appliances for the movement, handling or convenient accommodation of every kind of traffic, also street and highway diversions and widenings, new streets and highways, subway and overhead streets, and also approaches, lanes, alleyways, and other means of passage.

Then follows the description. Now that section as it stands excludes the power of any authority in the world other than the governor in council—absolutely. I think my hon. friend will agree with that; because after all in the construing of a legal document the first principle is that it must be read in its ordinary, commonplace, everyday significance. And that is clear from section 2. At this point I would put this to the minister: I wonder if he thinks it is sound to provide that the governor in council should have control of this whole expenditure. The very opening words of that section are at variance with every principle under which we have heretofore conducted our business. When we vote money for branch lines we authorize the construction of a branch line by the railway company, we guarantee the securities, and they spend the money. Now this leaves it with the governor in council, and in the course of the little consideration I have been able to give to the matter one thought has been in my mind. I will mention it now to the minister. Should we not add to the statute a provision that this act shall come into force on proclamation after approval has been secured from the Board of Railway Commissioners with respect to general plans and matters of that sort? In other words, I think the minister actually desires to lift this matter out of the realm of politics. But the governor in council is a political body, as the minister will agree, being composed of the government and the government only. Before this vast expenditure is undertaken should there not be, therefore, some body not the government that will approve of the scheme for the government? For, notwithstanding the general observation that has been made, the only representation which the shareholders have here is the representation provided by this parliament; there can be no dealing with the affairs of the railway, from the standpoint of the shareholders, except it be by this parliament; and for the purpose of the statute parliament becomes the governor in council. That is what I had in mind when speaking this morning. There are involved in this matter a large number of questions arising out of that principle, and the first question that presents itself is this: What is the relation of the Board of Railway Commissioners to this enterprise? I want to assure the minister that the vice president in charge of legal matters connected with the Canadian National Railways does not believe much in having the railway commission interfere in any way with what he or his officials wish to do. I think my hon. friend will recall an answer he gave, the sense of which was, "We do not use the railway commission."

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is not saying that I said that?

Mr. BENNETT: No, but the officer to whom I am referring. And he did not make that statement in any offensive sense; he was simply contending that under the provisions of the statute of 1919 it was not necessary for him to consult the commission as though the railway had been the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Northern. Which is perfectly true. The statute of 1919 gives exceptional rights and privileges to this railway as distinguished from privately owned enterprises. That is abundantly clear. The hon. member for South Toronto has made so clear the position with respect to crossings that I will not say more than this—and the minister will agree with me; I am merely amplifying what was said by my learned and hon. friend from South Toronto: If this matter rests in the first instance with the governor in council, and that political authority alone is to determine what contribution shall be made by the railway and by the municipality, then of course we are creating a situation which will be fraught with grave difficulty.

Mr. DUNNING: Does my hon. friend think that the minister would want to be in that position? Surely not.

Mr. BENNETT: I am endeavouring to suggest to the minister a method by which he will be certain he will not be in that position; that is the whole purpose of my rising. As it stands, this would be an exception to any other city similarly situated. For instance, Toronto was compelled in connection with its grade separations to pay one third, the Canadian Pacific one-third and the other party one-third. So I am informed by my hon. friend from South Toronto, who was interested on behalf of the corporation. Now we come to a very large number of grade separations here. The deputy minister estimates the number at eighty, but judging from what the president said the other day, that number may be greatly exceeded.

Mr. DUNNING: Ultimately, yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes; and under these circumstances I can only urge upon the minister the desirability of providing in this measure beyond peradventure that the matter of grade separations shall be dealt with by the Board of Railway Commissioners so far as respects the adjusting of contributions to be made by the railway and the municipality. To do otherwise is to make an invidious distinction; to do otherwise is to discriminate in favour of this railway as against others and in favour of this city as against other municipalities not so fortunately situated. In other words, it is my desire that this legislation should make it clear that the matter is not in any sense to be adjusted by a political authority but by that authority which has been set up by law and which was at one time a much more important body in public esteem than it now is. Certainly, as section 2 reads, with the succeeding sections, the Board of Railway Commissioners will have no more authority to deal with this matter than some other body not named at all. The language is not adequate, and after listening to the addresses the other day I certainly came away with the clear impression that it was not the intention of the management of the railway system that the Board of Railway Commissioners should have anything to do with the matter except in so far as is mentioned in section 7. This is all I have to say in connection with this important matter, apart from what I desire to allude to in connection with the terminals. I had occasion during the recess to look up the statutes since 1914 and I find that there was involved the payment of about $600,000 as an initial instalment. What I was endeavouring to find out was what the payments now were.

Mr. DUNNINIG: With respect to the earlier portion of my hon. friend's remarks I can only repeat what I have previously said: It never was my intention, and I am assured it never was the intention of the railway, that grade separations in the Montreal scheme should be dealt with any way different from that in which grade separations elsewhere are dealt with. I have already said I will be glad to allow section 7 or any other relevant section to stand in order to again take up that matter with the legal officers. Really the dispute which has arisen is not a dispute between my hon. friends opposite and myself; I agree entirely that the intention which has been expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite should be embodied in the law. The quarrel is rather between lawyers, as to whether or not the bill, considered in conjunction with the railway act, does now create that condition. I can just give my hon. friends the assurance that the relevant sections will be held up until I have a further opportunity to take legal advice on the matter. I am quite clear as to the intention both of myself and of the officers of the company, but will consider the matter further. Now, with regard to the other question regarding the bonds issued with respect to the Canadian Northern Railway Company, I find that a statute was passed on June 12, 1914, but that only a small amount of the bonds in question ever were issued. The principal outstanding at present is shown at page 29 of this year's annual report of the Canadian National Railway system, and amounts to only $1,501,000. Apparently it proved difficult or impossible for the old Canadian Northern to finance in the manner contemplated by this bill, and the necessary money apparently was secured from other sources. I am now having inquiries made as to where the money did come from. My own impression is that the money used in the Canadian Northern tunnel terminal construction at Montreal came primarily from government advances subsequently made to the old Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Mr. BENNETT: This statute was passed in 1914, and during that session they got $45,000,000.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, and the total amount of debentures issued and presently outstanding under this statute is $1,501,000. Obviously

that is a very small portion of the expenditure which I believe was made by the old Canadian Northern, which I understand amounted to £2,500,000.

Mr. BENNETT: But that is covered by securities in some form.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. I think my hon. friend, through his previous studies, is somewhat familiar with the tangle of old Canadian Northern finances. I am now having inquiries made to find out from what sources the money necessary for that expenditure was derived, but only $1,501,000 of securities were issued under that statute, and they appear in the Canadian National statement as part of the funded debt of the railway.

Mr. HEAPS: There is just one matter on which I would like a little information. I agree with what the leader of the opposition has just stated in regard to putting more power into the hands of the railway commission. With regard to this new terminal I would like to ask whether the city of Montreal, through the city council, approved of the plans as we saw them in the railway committee last Thursday.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, the city has given its approval.

Mr. HEAPS: There has been no opposition from any section of Montreal?

Mr. DUNNING: I think I can say that the only objection has come from individuals or institutions which are interested in the development of some alternative plan. For instance, there appeared before the committee a number of gentlemen promoting what was called the Montreal tunnel terminal scheme, which was an entirely different plan and a privately owned project which was finally withdrawn. I know of no organized opposition of any kind from any source in the city of Montreal. It must be remembered that this scheme was not evolved over night; a great many interests in Montreal, including different city councils from time to time and representative public bodies of all kinds, have been engaged in discussions with the Canadian National for years past with regard to this matter. Gradually difficulties have been ironed out, and I may say that as minister I told the Canadian National authorities that they would be very wise to attempt to eliminate by discussion, by reasoning and by meeting opposition, all these problems before they came to parliament at all. I must congratulate the management of the Canadian National railways on the extent to which they apparently have met the needs and the wishes of the citizens of Montreal.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Perhaps this question is not altogether relevant, but I would like to ask the minister if any arrangements have been made by the department with regard to the laying out of the yards at Fort Churchill?

Mr. DUNNING: I wish my hon. friend would deal with Fort Churchill when I get to Fort Churchill in the estimates. This bill refers entirely to Montreal, and I assure my hon. friend that my ability to keep information in my head is restricted to the matter before the house, when the matter is as large and important as this question. At the moment I am prepared for Montreal, and to be quite frank I am not prepared for Fort Churchill, but I will be glad to give that information when the estimates are up.

Mr. STEVENS: Coming back to the point we were discussing, together with other hon. members who have spoken I appreciate the frankness of the minister's statement of his understanding and intention, but I would also direct his attention to section 8 of the bill, and I would suggest that sections 7, 8 and 2 should stand. Section 8 is as follows:

> Where streets or highways are affected by the works but are not crossed by the company's tracks or diverted incidental to any such crossing, the company may with the approval of the governor in council enter into agreements, where desirable, with the city of Montreal or any other municipalities with respect thereto, or with respect to the opening of new streets, the closing of existing streets and ways, to the making of diversions or widenings, and the making of sub-streets, subways or overhead facilities in connection with the said works and the apportionment of the cost thereof.

That makes it specifically a matter for agreement between the governor in council and the city of Montreal.

Mr. DUNNING: No, for agreement between the company and the city of Montreal, with the approval of the government.

Mr. STEVENS: My point is, and has been, that these are matters which should be subject to reference to the Board of Railway Commissioners, because the adjustment or apportionment of the cost thereof is peculiarly and specially a duty of that board.

Mr. DUNNING: Surely my hon. friend is mistaken. If the Canadian Pacific Railway were doing the exact thing contemplated in section 8 they would not have to go to the Board of Railway Commissioners, because no crossing of the railway by a highway or of a highway by a railway is involved. Section 8 is in this bill because the Railway Act does not contain authority for the Board of Railway Commissioners to deal with such matters.

Mr. STEVENS: It goes on to say:

—the making of sub-streets, subways and overhead facilities—

Mr. DUNNING: But it is all qualified by the first sentence:

Where streets or highways are affected by the works but are not crossed by the company's tracks or diverted incidental to any such crossing—

That is the whole point.

Mr. STEVENS: If it is limited in that way perhaps that section would not be affected, but sections 2 and 7 are those to which I have referred already, and I think they should stand until this point is made quite clear, and I think it should be drafted so that there can be no question about it, particularly having reference to the power of the Board of Railway Commissioners to apportion the cost, whatever that may be.

Mr. DUNNING: I am willing to let sections 2 and 7 stand, as I indicated some time ago.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George directed my attention just now to section 259 of the Railway Act as possibly the section upon which the minister and his legal advisers rely:

Notwithstanding anything in this act, or in any other act, the board may, subject to the provisions of the next following section of this act, order what portion, if any, of cost is to be borne respectively by the company, municipal or other corporation, or person in respect of any order made by the board, under any of the last three preceding sections, and such order shall be binding on and enforceable against any railway company, municipal or other corporation or person named in such order.

The difficulty is that the three preceding sections do not in their entirety refer to this enterprise by reason of the special exceptions made in connection with the Canadian National undertakings, and it is in order to prevent any possible difficulty arising hereafter in the interpretation by the courts or otherwise that we suggest the desirability of carrying into effect the very clear statement made by the minister

Mr. DUNNING: The question is purely a matter of language and I shall be glad to have it considered. I always endeavour not to get between lawyers when they are arguing about matters of language; I am quite clear as to the intention and wanted to have that intention expressed.

Section stands.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4—Nature and form of securities.

Mr. DUNNING: That is the standard section which appears in similar acts.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Tenders.

Mr. BENNETT: What has been the practice of the company in connection with matters of this kind?

Mr. DUNNING: The practice has been just exactly as is outlined in section 5. This section is similar to the section which we endeavour to incorporate in every act providing for the sale of Canadian National securities for specific works and for the carrying out of the works themselves.

Mr. BENNETT: I wanted to know how it works out in practice; how do the tenders work out?

Mr. DUNNING: My understanding is that there is no difficulty about it. In the case of bonds, it is necessary sometimes when competitive bids are secured to do a little negotiating; my hon. friend knows what can happen in connection with tenders for bonds. With regard to competitive bids or tenders for work generally, there is no question but that the management desires to adopt in every case, except in very rare instances where it is not practicable, the principle of competitive tenders, and I have no hesitation in saying that this works out very satisfactorily.

Mr. BENNETT: The only point there is that the company would call for tenders for the securities; why not the governor in council or the Minister of Finance to whom the money will come? The company really has nothing to do with that at all, because it is the country which is raising the money. In this particular bill you will observe that you have the governor in council in one instance, the company in another and the Minister of Finance in another. Why should not the Minister of Finance be the person who calls for the sale of these securities, in view of the provisions contained in the other two sections?

Mr. GEARY: I asked a question of Sir Henry Thornton in the committee, as to why the governor in council should not, where a tender is rejected, decide on whether a contract by day labour or otherwise should be entered into. To my very great surprise I was given the answer that in three cases only had it been found necessary to depart from

the lowest tender. If there have been three cases only during Sir Henry's time, it would not be very much trouble to the governor in council to take care of that matter. In some cases the work must be done by day labour and in other cases it is necessary to go to the contractors and offer the work at day labour or at a lower price than that contained in the tender; but in view of Sir Henry's answer I think the governor in council might very well take over this responsibility.

Mr. DUNNING: Frankly, I do not like imposing upon a management which has by law free control over very large matters, conditions which appear to indicate that we have not confidence in them with respect to very small matters.

Mr. GEARY: I think there is a good deal of strength in what the minister says.

Mr. DUNNING: As to the answer which Sir Henry Thornton gave to my hon. friend with respect to the small number of tenders accepted by the management which were other than the lowest tenders, I cannot speak on that matter as no report is necessary. I could call for a report, but I venture to say that Sir Henry Thornton himself would find it difficult, in view of the multitudinous matters for which tenders are called, to give an answer offhand. I feel sure that there must have been a misunderstanding between my hon. friend and Sir Henry as to the purport of the question which he was answering, because it would be unreasonable to expect that in such large undertakings, involving tens of thousands of transactions, there would be only three cases of that nature.

Mr. GEARY: At all events, we threshed it out in committee.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Proceeds of securities deposited to credit of Minister of Finance in trust for company.

Mr. RYCKMAN: It is a well known fact that bonds guaranteed by the Dominion government will not sell at as favourable a price as a direct obligation of the Dominion government. In provincial undertakings guaranteed by the province the spread is often as much as a quarter a half a point. Why could not advantage be taken of this well known situation in a matter involving such a large sum of money, where every cent will count? It is a way of saving public money.

[Mr. Geary.]

Mr. DUNNING: The public interested in the ownership of bonds of this character is steadily learning the intrinsic value of Canadian National bonds guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada, and any disparity such as my hon. friend referred to would be difficult to demonstrate in recent cases. I am familiar with the general rule to which he referred, but there are exceptions to it which occur even in the provincial field. I am not disagreeing with what the hon. member has said as to the difference in value of provincial securities and securities guaranteed by the province, but there does not appear to be the difference between Dominion guaranteed securities and direct Dominion securities. I would point out that it is well to have the Canadian National, in connection with its future financial structure, in the position of a company obligated to pay the moneys involved in making capital expenditures which relate directly to the company. In the reorganization of the capital structure which we hope to deal with at the next session of parliament, the Canadian National capital structure will have to be represented by obligations of the company in some for or other, very largely obligations to the public, and I think that as a matter of policy we should deal with these obligations as being obligations of the railway to the public rather than to the government. Our railway debt should be considered as being allocated to and expended for the railways, and should be treated as a railway obligation and not as an obligation of the country. That does not mean that I am under any delusions that any of these securities will not, in fact, be finally payable by the Dominion of Canada if the railway company itself should not pay. Of course, everyone recognizes that. Indeed, I will go further and say that so long as the Dominion of Canada owns these railways, any security issued by the railway company while it is owned by the Dominion would be the responsibility of the Dominion. We cannot escape the moral obligation involved. Putting the guarantee on the bonds places it beyond peradventure of doubt to the purchaser that the Dominion is behind the securities. There might be an element of doubt if no guarantee were given in specific terms, but in my opinion the obligation would exist so long as the railways were controlled by the Dominion.

Mr. BENNETT: May I direct the attention of the minister to section 6? This section

contemplates the expenditure of money on property belonging to several companies, but these are the closing words:

Upon the property owned or taken by His Majesty, the King in the right of the Dominion of Canada.

Surely it is intended that not the Dominion of Canada but rather the railway company should own the property.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that a well drawn section?

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend will look at the subsequent sections, for instance section 9 and so forth, I think they will be found to cover that.

Mr. BENNETT: I appreciate that, but it does not clarify this section. These are lands on which you may spend your money and still they are described as lands that may be owned by half a dozen companies. The section reads:

With the approval of the governor in council evidenced by the approval of plans under the provisions of section 7 of this act, upon the property owned or taken by His Majesty the King in the right of the Dominion of Canada.

If the minister will refer to the very first words of section 2, this whole matter is one in which the governor in council is doing the providing. In other words, instead of this being in any sense an enterprise in which somebody else assists in giving direction, it is purely a political matter.

Mr. DUNNING: Oh, no.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend cannot get away from the first few words of section 2. The whole matter of the expenditure of $50,000,000 is purely a political enterprise and so stated. Section 2 commences:

The governor in council may provide—

Mr. DUNNING: I do not like my hon. friend's use of the term "political enterprise." This has nothing to do with politics.

Mr. BENNETT: What I mean is that the governor in council is the political party in power. The governor in council means the ministers of the crown and nobody else, and to that extent it is purely political. That is what I am endeavouring to say and exactly similar words are used elsewhere. The governor in council may provide for these terminals. In other words, as an act of executive government, provision is made for this matter. Then His Majesty the King in the right of the Dominion expropriates land and part of the money may be spent on these lands provided that the governor in council so approves, approval being evidenced by approval of the plans under the provisions of section 7, which reads:

The general plan or plans of the said works and amendments or additions to such general plan at any time made, shall, on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be subject to the approval of the governor in council.

All I am trying to suggest is that in the interest of the country and of everybody connected with this great national railway system, there should be some approval between the government and this scheme, and in the absence of any better suggestion, I think that approval should be by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. Is that an unfair suggestion to make in view of the fact that under section 2 the whole launching of the enterprise is placed in the hands of the governor in council? In other words, we are giving a blank cheque for $50,000,000 to the governor in council.

Mr. DUNNING: Oh, no.

Mr. BENNETT: That is exactly what it means. That may not be my hon. friend's intention, but all he has to do is to look at the language of the statute. The courts will determine what it means if there is any doubt about the matter. The point is that under section 2 we have conferrred this enormous power upon the governor in council. I am sure my hon. friend will agree with that. Then we provide for the expropriation of lands by the crown, and third, we provide that the money must be spent in doing work on lands or property of all those railways and terminal companies plus lands acquired by the crown. But according to section 7 the whole must be subject to the approval of the governor in council. My suggestion—and it was the only one that it struck me could be reasonably made since we have no other authority to whom we can refer the matter—is that it should be approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners. Certainly, if this were a private company, any expenditures of this kind would have to be approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. DUNNING: Not if they were building on the site of an existing station; not an addition to or an enlargement of an existing station.

Mr. BENNETT: This is not that; this is a brand new scheme, and if the Canadian Pacific or the Algoma Central—there are only a few

private railways left—were to undertake this, they would have to have the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners. My hon. friend will remember the section.

Mr. DUNNING: I wish my hon. friend would read the section and then with his legal acumen tell me whether, if the Canadian Pacific desired to-day to build a terminal at the tunnel terminals in Montreal they would have to go to the railway board for approval of the site. I am not a lawyer, and I am at a great disadvantage in this discussion. I should like to get the best legal opinion possible. Would he give me a legal opinion on the question?

Mr. BENNETT: Any disadvantage the hon. gentleman may be under is more imaginary than real. Section 188 of the Railway Act reads:

> Before the company proceeds to erect any station upon its railway, the location of such station shall be approved of by the board.
>
> 2. Every station of the company shall be erected, operated and maintained with good and sufficient accommodation and facilities for traffic.
>
> 3. The company shall erect, maintain and operate stations at any points on the railway designated by the board, and shall provide such accommodation and facilities in connection therewith as the board directs.

Then there is provision for railways that are subsidized by parliament. The theory upon which the railways are required to secure approval is that the question of adequate facilities must be considered.

Mr. DUNNING: If the Canadian Pacific were proposing to build the tunnel station, my hon. friend would not say that under that section they would have to go to the railway board for approval of that site.

Mr. BENNETT: I think they would because they are not building on the site of their present station.

Mr. DUNNING: Assuming the Canadian Pacific were the company involved instead of the Canadian National, the Canadian Pacific coming under all the terms of the Railway Act, would they, in my hon. friend's opinion, require to go to the railway board for approval of the tunnel site in connection with a scheme of this kind?

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend has asked me his question in too narrow a sense. Would they have to go to the board to carry out this plan of extension? I have no doubt that the answer would be yes.

Mr. DUNNING: No, no.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend from South Toronto points out that the board may tell them where the station is to be put, and has frequently done so. When there is a question as to the adequacy of their facilities they go to the board for approval of their plans for extension.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is not sticking to the section.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh yes. This statute —the railway act—is intended to be so simple that one who runs may read and wayfaring men though fools need not err therein. That is the reason the act was administered so informally by previous chairmen. Any person could appear before the board. I can recall very distinctly an application being made for a station by a number of residents in a place in southern Alberta and the railway company would not build them a station because it was pointed out that the revenues were less than $15,000, and an informal discussion took place. I put this to the minister, the very question that he put to me: Could the Canadian Pacific construct these works without the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners?

Mr. DUNNING: I will answer that in the light of such knowledge as I have, although I am afraid my hon. friend has not clearly answered the question which I put to him. If the Canadian Pacific railway were making a proposal of this kind they could determine themselves to go ahead with their passenger terminal assuming that they owned the existing properties. The only difference between the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National under the existing law would be that the Canadian Pacific would have to go to the Board of Railway Commissioners with their route maps for any lines around the city or in connection with the general plan for new lines. The Canadian National is by its own act, passed in 1919, exempted from the necessity of so doing, and can and does secure ministerial approval instead. That is the only difference. My contention, and again I am in a legal argument, is that this is the only difference between the two companies in a project of this kind, that the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National are absolutely on all fours so far as the station locations are concerned and the jurisdiction of the Railway Act with respect thereto, and that they are on all fours with respect to other matters except the approval of route maps and detailed plans of that kind.

My hon. friend spoke in addition of the concluding words of section 6:

—and, with the approval of the governor in council evidenced by the approval of plans under the provisions of section seven of this act, upon the property owned or taken by His Majesty the King in the right of the Dominion of Canada.

I am sure my hon. friend did not read that closely because the only lands owned by His Majesty the King and mentioned in section 7 are lands which are being used by His Majesty the King for canal purposes, and the concluding words of section 6 apply only to the use of any lands presently owned by His Majesty for canal purposes. In other words, they are in the same position in regard to the crossing of such property as the Canadian Pacific or any other railway and they have to get the approval of the minister.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend cannot have read that carefully. It does not say upon the property owned or taken by His Majesty the King in the right of the Dominion of Canada. It is just the opposite of what my hon. friend says. You see, it is property owned or taken by His Majesty the King in the right of the Dominion, and clearly it must be for this project.

Mr. DUNNING: For this project, but perhaps my hon. friend will read the previous words:

evidenced by the approval of plans under the provisions of section 7 of this act.

Section 7 relates to detailed plans affecting any canal or other property controlled by the Department of Railways and Canals, which plans have to be subject to the approval of the minister.

Mr. BENNETT: No. The minister has left out three words of the section. It says "the general plan or plans of the said works and amendments or additions to such general plant at any time made, shall, on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be subject to the approval of the governor in council."

The rest of it refers particularly to canals or Indian lands and other properties. It is the first three words of section 7 that the provisions of section 6 refer to.

Mr. DUNNING: I think we are talking at cross-purposes.

Mr. BENNETT: No, my point is this, that this act provides that part of this money may be spent in putting buildings on lands owned by His Majesty the King. I say that there is no adequate provision that the land shall be land acquired or owned by His Majesty for the purpose of this railway and vested in this railway. I think that is reasonably clear.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is, of course, aware that in addition to the lands owned in Montreal by the several companies mentioned, the Canadian Northern Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Terminal Company and the Canadian National Realties, the crown owns land in Montreal in the right of the old Intercolonial railway, which is land held by His Majesty the King, but for railway purposes. The intention of the lawyers—again I do not know whether they have carried it out or not—was to provide that land which has been held in Montreal for Intercolonial railway purposes may be used by the Canadian National Railways for the purposes of this act, and that structures may be erected upon it. Again my hon. friend's criticism is one of draughtsmanship, and I shall be glad to hold the section up.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend has answered the very question I put, and exactly as I think it should be answered. There may be lands there belonging to the old Intercolonial railway and they are held in the right of the crown. They certainly should be vested in this railway company before we put our money into this scheme, having regard to the fact that we are issuing securities and guaranteeing them. That is the only reason why I question the section at all.

Mr. DUNNING: Section 9 should be read together with it.

Mr. BENNETT: But leaving these words as they stand conveys an erroneous impression.

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend would like the section to stand—

Mr. BENNETT: I would like it cleared up. That is all I am interested in.

Section stands.

Section 7 stands.

On section 8—Agreements with municipalities.

Mr. STEVENS: I have looked this over very carefully and I think the draughtsmanship is bad. The first part of the section down to the word "thereto" in the 47th line

of page 3, certainly is subject to the interpretation which the minister places upon it, but let me read the balance:

—or with respect to the opening of new streets, the closing of existing streets and ways, to the making of diversions or widenings, and the making of sub-streets, subways or overhead facilities in connection with the said works—

Mr. DUNNING: The "said works"—

Mr. STEVENS: Just a moment. The said works are defined in section 2 in this way:

The whole being hereinafter referred to as the "said works".

Furthermore, the Railway Act does provide for reference to the Board of Railway Commissioners for even diversions and deviations and changes, and not necessarily crossings only.

Mr. DUNNING: Wherever there is a crossing of a railway by a highway or of a highway by a railway; and the intention of section 8 is to provide for situations where no such crossing exists.

Mr. STEVENS: But this places it entirely in the hands of the governor in council, which is obviously not the intention of the minister.

Mr. GEARY: In the last line of section 8 you use the words "the said works," which the minister says refers to the first line of the section, but "said works" is defined in section 2, and unfortunately the same words are used in section 8 with a different meaning.

Mr. DUNNING: I will let that section stand.

Mr. BENNETT: The suggestions have been made only for the purposes of clarification. Where you have a section that defines the meaning that is to be given to two words, wherever those two words are used together in the act, it must be taken that they import the meaning given to them by the statute, and the words "said works" mean all the works mentioned in section 2.

Mr. DUNNING: I have got the point, and it is on the record.

Section stands.

On section 9—Expropriation.

Mr. BENNETT: If the minister will turn back to section 6 he will observe that it says "upon the property owned or taken by His Majesty in the right of the Dominion of Canada," and I would add "transferred by His Majesty to the company." Having taken the land this section enables you to alienate, and the alienation is to take place in the manner indicated and compensation is to be fixed in the manner stated. Unless and until that transfer takes place, the moneys to be raised under this statute should not be used except on that land. You cannot put your own money on land belonging to the crown and then create a security of the company that is to be binding against that particular property. And the closing words of section 6—

Mr. DUNNING: The securities will not be mortgage securities—

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know what kind they will be. The principle is just the same. You should not spend your money on property you do not own. I think my hon. friend will realize how great the difficulty is, and that is the reason that section 9 is there and provides in the last words:

—shall upon request be transferred by His Majesty to the company.

These words in section 6 contemplate the moneys or a portion of them being spent upon land so acquired; and if you say:

—upon the property owned or taken by His Majesty and transferred by His Majesty to the company.

—then you have the matter complete.

Mr. DUNNING: We can pass section 9, and the relationship of my friend's remarks to section 6 can be taken into account in examining the matter.

Section 9 agreed to.

On section 10—Lands for purpose of undertaking of company.

Mr. BENNETT: That is a section which I think the minister will hesitate to ask this parliament to pass.

Mr. DUNNING: I hesitated, indeed I did.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister indicate to us the reasons that were sufficient to overcome his scruples? Perhaps they may have some effect on us.

Mr. DUNNING: It is to avoid the possibility of litigation in any matter which is covered by the schedule. The schedule of the act clearly sets out what is required and what is for the purposes of the company. It is for the purpose of avoiding litigation with regard to the work which parliament by this act is authorizing in a general way that the section is put in. I do not like sections which rather appear to me to have as their object the debarring of a subject from his ordinary right of going to court to prove something which he deems to be in his interest. On the other hand there are considerations of

great magnitude involved, and what might be called petty litigation should be as far as possible discouraged, especially when parliament is passing upon the project as a whole, especially when the lands have been placed under expropriation already in order that there may be sufficient room to deal with the projects outlined in the plans and models considered by the railway committee the other day.

It is on the advice of the legal officers that section 10 is included, and certainly no government would attempt to say that certain lands or undertakings were required for the purposes of the company if they were not. I do not think there is any question of arbitrary use of the power, but it is advantageous in the prevention of vexatious litigation on petty, small grounds.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure that that answer would hardly be sufficient to convince the minister as to the desirability of it. This enables a railway company to take a strip of land a thousand feet wide, if it so desires, instead of sixty or one hundred feet. It enables the railway company to take land to any extent it may desire for the purposes of the railway without limitation or restriction. The minister has indicated that he is governed very largely by the reports made by the technical advisers of the railway. They find themselves dealing with a situation in connection with which they say: "Why waste time negotiating any longer over one hundred feet? Let us take the whole area of 500 feet, and we can deal with the matter afterwards." I recall railway companies attempting to acquire larger areas than might be required for their particular undertaking, in which case the compulsory powers were at once cut down, owing to the fact that they are not allowed to acquire more than they could use for their undertaking. The minister will remember the circumstances under which railways at times have endeavoured compulsorily to take somewhat larger areas than might be required for right of way and station grounds, and the Board of Railway Commissioners has refused it and held them down exactly to what the statute says. This section confers enormous powers. I say let the minister protect himself, to get away from the political side of it, by utilizing the Board of Railway Commissioners and adding a provision to that effect. I get his point exactly. It might be a desirable thing to take the whole area rather than split it up. That is really what is behind it all. In its present form this section affords an intolerable opportunity for the exercising of pressure upon the government, and I say that in the same way I expect the minister would say it to me if I were similarly situated. It is not fair to the government; it is not fair to the minister. It seems to me it should be subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners instead of the governor in council. I put this to the minister: Is it fair to the members from Montreal if someone whose land has partly been taken, says—advised by his solicitor—"There is not trouble about this; all you have to do is go to your member and get him to bring the matter to the attention of the government." As long as governments are human, as long as members and their supporters are human, whether it be the government of to-day or of some other day, it is not right or fitting that that section should stand as it is. It is not fair to the public; it is not fair to members of parliament; it is not fair to the minister himself.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend knows that no railway company in Canada is subject to such a provision as he now proposes.

Mr. BENNETT: Excuse me.

Mr. DUNNING: Will my hon. friend quote the section?

Mr. GEARY: I think my leader refers to section 199 of the act, which has to do with the extent of lands that may be taken, first 100 feet for right of way, then up to 500 feet for station grounds, including the width of the right of way, 100 feet. Then section 200 reads:

—should the company require, at any point on the railway more ample space than it possesses or may take under the last preceding section—

It must go to the railway board for authority to take the same for such purposes.

Mr. BENNETT: And section 201.

Mr. DUNNING: Of course my hon. friend from Toronto is familiar with some of the difficulties that arose in that city, in connection with the union terminal scheme, on account of that section he has just read. There have been very extensive difficulties, not the kind of difficulties mentioned by the leader of the opposition, but the kind of difficulty which does involve considerable hardship to the railway undertaking itself. I cannot conceive of the kind of difficulty arising to which the leader of the opposition refers. As a matter of fact, in connection with this matter all the lands necessary to carry out the scheme as propounded by the railway officers to the railway committee are now under expropriation.

Mr. BENNETT: Then that gives the complete reason why this section should go out.

Mr. DUNNING: I may tell my hon. friends opposite quite frankly the reason why I approved of putting them under expropriation—and, in fact, it is crown and not railway expropriation. The reason I approved of it was to get away from just that kind of accusation of political interference in connection with the valuation of lands and so forth. I thought that if they were placed under expropriation no question would arise in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite or anywhere else regarding this railway, in its purchases of land, being used politically by anyone.

Mr. BENNETT: The values must still be settled by the exchequer court.

Mr. DUNNING: Surely my hon. friend is not implying that the exchequer court could be politically influenced in the way he fears.

Mr. BENNETT: Sometimes the parties have been induced to withdraw and to make private settlement.

Mr. DUNNING: I suppose that in many cases private settlements are made and may be made in connection with this matter. But this matter, by virtue of a section which we shall come to later on, is continuously and consistently under the review of parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: That is true anyway; we find the money and have a right to review the matter.

Mr. DUNNING: It is true anyway, but it is true in a specific sense in relation to this enterprise with which we are dealing. I did try to put all the safeguards I possibly could around the matter—safeguards not only from the point of view of protecting the public treasury in a proper manner as well as of protecting the railway, but also, I may frankly say, from the point of view of protecting myself against insinuations from the other side of the house that this or that or the next thing could or might or would happen.

Mr. BENNETT: Why say "from the other side of the house?"

Mr. DUNNING: That is where insinuations usually come from.

Mr. BENNETT: They have not to-day.

Mr. DUNNING: With regard to myself, no.

Mr. BENNETT: What insinuations have been made now or at any other time in this session of parliament?

Mr. DUNNING: The occasion for that comment, I will tell my hon. friend frankly, was his own last remark with reference to what might be done under this section. He assumed a case where more land had been taken by the railway company than they actually required for the undertaking, and he pictured a member coming around and exercising some pressure in this way or that way. To my mind such a thing is wholly imaginary—

Mr. BENNETT: Is it?

Mr. DUNNING: —and is inclined to convey the impression that a member could come to the Minister of Railways, in the interests of a client, and get something done which was irregular and improper. I want to say that this minister of railways does not propose to do that sort of thing. I am not resentful of my hon. friend, but I am resentful rather of the idea. I do not think I ought to be treated as though I should be likely to do that sort of thing, because it would be so plainly wrong and bad, to me, for an expropriation to be filed with respect to a piece of property and then for back door influence to come along and in some way or other get it shifted out of the way for political purposes.

Mr. McGIBBON: There might be another minister of railways later.

Mr. DUNNING: I would not do it.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad to hear the minister say all these things—

Mr. DUNNING: There again.

Mr. BENNETT: He says that on this side of the house we made insinuations.

Mr. BRADETTE: I listened very attentively to the hon. leader of the opposition and I feel positive that he was insinuating political interference on the part of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. BENNETT: I would give the hon. gentleman credit for having more intelligence. There was no insinuation made with respect—

Mr. BRADETTE: There was an insinuation and I have no lesson of intelligence to take from the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad my hon. friend thinks so, because I know of no one who would be more likely to exercise it than he. No man would be more ready to press upon the minister the desirability of looking after his constituents than my hon. friend if he thought it would advance their interests—if he thought it would keep them out of courts of law. The case I took had no reference to the minister or to any particular matter. I do say, however, that I know something about the democratic system of govern-

ment. I have held office under the crown for a very short time, but I have held office long enough to know that Conservatives are not vastly different from Liberals nor Liberals from Conservatives in that regard, and where—

Mr. DUNNING: Don't forget the gentlemen in the corner; they claim to be of superior clay.

Mr. BENNETT: I have seen striking evidence in my time that they too are exactly the same. I live in a province where there is a very progressive government which looks after the affairs of the country very carefully; yet members have been known to press matters on the attention of the executive with considerable force for the purpose of advancing the interests of their constituents. And I take it that this will always be so. Speaking for those about me, and in good part, I suggested to the minister that this might create an intolerable condition, and when I said that I had in mind the history of this country. There have been expropriations, and settlements have been made before the cases ever went to court; and there have been in court cases in which all the evidence that might be led by the crown has not been led. That has happened. I can show my hon. friend records of proceedings in the courts of the country which bear out this assertion. There have been cases in which the classifications have not been all that they might have been. For example, the building of the Transcontinental railway: the subsequent investigation that took place would indicate that with respect to these classifications millions were spent that should not have been spent simply because the classifications were made as they were. We know that under day's work grave scandals have arisen. A committee has been investigating a matter in which certain work under contract was farmed out by the contractor. All these are matters about which every thoughtful man interested in the welfare of the country is thinking.

Mr. DUNNING: If that was the extent of my hon. friend's remarks—

Mr. BENNETT: Did I say anything more? But the minister gets up and charges this side with making insinuations against his integrity or his probity or his ability—

Mr. DUNNING: Now my hon. friend is misunderstanding me.

Mr. BENNETT: There can be no misunderstanding of what the minister said. His language is clear, unequivocal and unambiguous with respect to that. And one of his supporters, rushing to his defence, says, "Of course, it is an insinuation against the minister." If the time has come when we cannot by illustration direct attention to the conditions that exist in the country, then all I can say is that parliament has come to a pretty pass. I wonder if the house realizes that the conditions that prevail here could not prevail for a minute in the United States with the powers of investigation which they put into operation. We know what happens in relation to contracts, and no one must think that we are all fools or children. When, therefore, we say to the minister that we desire to safeguard the public interest, it is not to be supposed that there is any ulterior object in such a statement so far as the minister himself is concerned. The minister is only a servant of the crown at the moment, and for that reason we say that it is not fair, it is not right, it is not just that the governor in council should be charged with the responsibility here contemplated; for the governor in council means the cabinet of the day, and the cabinet of the day very often means the exigencies of the politics of the day. I heard one hon. member, desiring to improve the Election Act, make the statement that he wished to do so for a certain well defined purpose and for a well defined reason. And I gave him credit for his frankness.

Now we are merely suggesting to the minister that this power should not vest in the governor in council, and I gave an illustration to support this contention. There is not a member of this house, whether he be Liberal or Conservative, who will not say that if a constituent presses him hard enough he in turn will press the matter on the government. And there have been the gravest complaints as to the extent to which such pressure has been brought to bear in the last twenty-five years, resulting in favourites getting things they would not otherwise receive; they have been favoured merely because they had the power, the strength, the influence, the determination and often the willingness to assist the government of the day or its candidates. We are not blind to these things, and it will not do for the minister to make cheap remarks with reference to insinuations against himself, when we suggest the substitution for the governor in council of the Board of Railway Commissioners, a body which was created by the Liberal party in parliament in years gone by, for the purpose of preserving some semblance of decency in the conduct of public business in relation to these matters. It is for that reason that we make the sug-

gestion, and not with a view to making any insinuations against the minister. There is no reason why the minister should dismiss the matter with a wave of the hand and the statement. "You cannot make these suggestions about me." No one is talking about the minister; we are discussing a principle. The hon. gentleman's estimate of his own virtue may be correct; he may be the Simon Pure, the one virtuous minister the country has ever known. That well may be. But there is no reason why he should parade the fact before the public this afternoon when we are endeavouring to suggest some method whereby we may more properly safeguard the public interest.

Mr. DUNNING: I am quite content that the public of Canada shall see my remarks side by side with those of my hon. friend in Hansard to-morrow.

Mr. BENNETT: So am I.

Mr. DUNNING: With that I leave the matter. Let me say this, however. There is one reason why too much reference to the Board of Railway Commissioners should not be made in a statute of this kind, and that reason is that the law's delays may be used to prevent the Canadian National getting along with something which this bill has authorized them to proceed with. My hon. friend is familiar with the extent to which the law's delays may be used to prevent an enterprise from getting along with something which has been authorized.

Mr. STEVENS: Not in this instance.

Mr. DUNNING: In this instance the law's delays have not yet had a chance to intervene to the extent to which my hon. friend referred. All the law's delays will be called into requisition should this matter be before the Board of Railway Commissioners, which is really a court to that extent, by those who are desirous of delaying or preventing this project going through. Having said that I am prepared to meet my hon. friend to the extent of allowing section 10 to stand for consideration. As I said at the outset, it was a rather arbitrary power for the Canadian National to take unto itself, and my hon. friend had no need to take offence there.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not.

Mr. DUNNING: Possibly I misunderstood his line of argument.

Mr. BENNETT: I had not a thought in the world of the minister.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry if I have misunderstood him. I do not pretend to be any more virtuous than my hon. friend pretends to be; I am just an ordinary man, as he is, but at the same time I have tried to render some public service in this country and I do not propose to take what I assume to be an attack. In view of my hon. friend's explanation probably he did not intend that attack, but I do not propose to take that kind of thing lying down from any man; it is merely a matter of self defence with me.

Mr. BENNETT: Do not make faces over it.

Mr. DUNNING: In view of my hon. friend's later remarks, I admit that he did not intend his remarks as I understood them, and I will let it go at that.

Mr. GEARY: The only trouble with the minister's attitude of self-defence is that he adopts also the principle of the Monroe doctrine, and fights everybody in self defence.

Mr. DUNNING: I frankly admit that my preference is for defence by attack.

Mr. GEARY: That is what I said.

Mr. MANION: Even when you are not attacked yourself.

Mr. STEVENS: I have very strong objection to this section because it is removed from the realm of the court. The minister referred to the railway commission as "even the railway commission," and while I admit that in recent years that body has not had the confidence of the people which it enjoyed some years ago, nevertheless it has always been my effort to sustain its authority, which during the major portion of its history has been a very excellent one. It does strike me as being exceedingly dangerous to place in the hands of the governor in council, without an appeal to the exchequer court or any other court or to the Board of Railway Commissioners, the power of deciding whether or not lands are properly being taken for railway purposes. The minister knows that the moment expropriation proceedings are filed you can proceed with the utilization of the lands for railway purposes.

Mr. DUNNING: Does my hon. friend suggest that the railway could go ahead if it had notice that a hearing was pending before the Board of Railway Commissioners for a decision that the land being taken was not required for railway purposes?

Mr. STEVENS: If the Canadian Pacific was putting this scheme through they would have to go to the railway board for their expropriation.

Mr. DUNNING: I would ask my hon. friend to read the sections as the hon. leader of the opposition did.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not want to reread the sections, but section 200 reads:

Should the company require, at any point on the railway, more ample space than it possesses or may take under the last preceding section, for the convenient accommodation of the public, or for the traffic on its railway, or for protection against snowdrifts, or for the diversion of a highway, or for the substitution of one highway for another—

And then the section goes on to describe that the company shall give ten days' notice of such application, and shall furnish the board with the plans, and so forth, of what it intends to do. There is no reason in the world why the Canadian National Railways should not follow that procedure. There would be a great deal more confidence in the whole scheme and considerably more satisfaction and lack of apprehension if the railway board's jurisdiction was preserved in this matter.

Mr. RYCKMAN: As the minister has intimated that he will permit this section to stand, when the matter is next brought before us I should like to be informed as to whether or not the advice of the law officers of the crown has been received on the question whether the provision here made is intra vires of parliament. Having regard to recent cases before the privy council it seems to me that where land is required by a railway for the purposes of its operation, and the railway itself requires it, it can then be expropriated for the benefit of the railway. This point was decided in a recent case in connection with the railway running into Rouyn. If a determination of the question whether or not the land was necessary for railway purposes was left to a board, if I may so call it, such as the governor in council, and that board was given the power finally to decide, righty or wrongly, I think it would be ultra vires of this legislature as determined by privy council decisions.

Mr. DUNNING: I will be very glad to see that consideration is given to the point raised by my hon. friend. Of course before this bill came to the house it was submitted to the Department of Justice, but I will call special attention to that point.

Section stands.

Sections 11 and 12 agreed to.

On the schedule.

Mr. GEARY: Subsections (d) and (e) of the schedule refer to grade separations, and I should like to mention the statement of Sir Henry Thornton that the whole proposal originated in the question of the separating of the existing level crossings, and that that was what urged him to press forward to some sort of completion the plans which we have before us. Grade separation itself is a very important part of this whole proposition. I might refer to one grade separation with which I am very familiar, that in the city of Toronto. This proposition will cost some $33,000,000, and I understand that the city of Toronto will pay about $10,000,000, or almost a third. Even though it is only a quarter, I think it should be so arranged that there can be no doubt that the city of Montreal will contribute its fair share of the cost of the separation of grades. A very large saving will be made if you take good care that the act provides that the allocation of the costs will be attended to.

Mr. DUNNING: I can assure my hon. friend that there was no thought in anyone's mind that any other body than the railway commission would settle the matter of the allocation of the costs of the grade separations. I should like to move the following amendments:

That subsection (d) be amended by adding after the word "separation" the following words:

by means of elevated, or depressed, or underground tracks, or streets,

That subsection (e) be amended by adding after the word "separation" the following words:

by means of elevated, or depressed, or underground tracks, or streets,

That subsection (k) be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(k) Connections and transfer facilities to the tracks of the Montreal harbour commission near Longue Pointe, and/or at a point further east, and connections and transfer facilities to the C.P.R. east and south of the Lachine canal, and at other points, except at Forsythe (now Rouen) street. The company to pay part cost, to be determined, of facilities jointly owned or jointly used.

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION POLICY

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

The house resumed from Wednesday, May 22, consideration of the proposed amendment of Mr. McRae:

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

this house regrets the failure of the government to profit by Canadian experience in the colonization and settlement of the country and deplores the fact that men and women have, during recent months, been settled on western crown lands at great distances from transportation, educational, hospital and other necesary facilities, thereby making it almost impossible for them to achieve success and happiness in their new surroundings, and is of the opinion that such conditions can only be remedied by an immediate reorganization of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Mr. W. E. ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): When I was speaking at eleven o'clock on Wednesday night in reference to the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke), I believe at that time I referred to the French-Canadians, Canadians from your part of Canada, Mr. Speaker, who had gone to the United States on account of lack of a national policy on the part of the government. To-day I had handed to me this telegram addressed to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Maloney):

Boston, Mass.,
May 26, 1929.

Doctor Maloney,
Member for South Renfrew,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Read your speech carefully. Congratulations. Hope that you endeavour to obtain some government help and thousands will be ready to go west from here.

Jean Gissely.

This is a sample of how Canadians who have left this country are anxiously waiting for some policy that will enable them to return. Anything that I may say with reference to the incapacity of the Minister of Immigration is not in any way a reflection on him personally. I believe he is a man of very lovable character and of strict integrity, but throughout this country we realize that his department, so far as progress is concerned, is in a most pitiable position. We realize also that from now on we need not so much a department of immigration as a department of repatriation. Canadians are leaving this country faster than foreigners are coming in. They are leaving at a loss to themselves through head tax, and a benefit to the treasury of the United States, while the government spends almost $5,000,000 annually to bring fewer numbers into Canada from abroad to be assimilated to our conditions and customs.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is much more generous in his suggestions to the Minister of Immigration to relieve him of his responsibilities than he is in offering him direction in the matter of an immigration policy. Some time ago in the city of Ottawa the Prime Minister said that the Minister of Immigration was one of the best ministers he had, and that he was entirely satisfied with the progress of his department. In one of the press reports a few days later I noticed that the Prime Minister had invited the Minister of Immigration to accept a high and dignified post left vacant through the death of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. This was certainly a high and glowing tribute to the honourable career of the Minister of Immigration, had he accepted it it would have been a dignified retreat from an unfinished task. I realize, however, as many others do, that the canny judgment of the Minister of Immigration, despite the lure and thrill of such a dignified honour, could still discern the difference between a resource and a liability, and therefore he is still in charge of the Department of Immigration.

Mr. FORKE: That is small potatoes—peanuts, in fact.

Mr. ROWE: I realize that the minister's administration has been pretty small potatoes.

Mr. FORKE: Go on talking about the administration. Damn it all you like.

Mr. ROWE: I realize that the minister's struggle to maintain population by means of immigration has been pretty small potatoes and peanuts, if the minister wishes to put it in that way. His struggle between details and constructive policy is certainly a small activity in a very weak administration. I will say to the minister that I wish him good luck and Godspeed to any vacancy that may be left still waiting through recent senate vacancies in his province and that may be more attractive to him. I think he will then be well remunerated for his party inconsistency and administrative incapacity.

We have in this country a big problem in the matter of immigration. The house has heard from this side a constructive proposal to deal with that problem. It is high time that we had some government leadership, some signs of activity that will mean something for the progress of Canada. Ever since this government came into power in 1921, when they were elected on a defined policy that was later on called a chart, they have been drifting from one line of policy to another as though they didn't even have a compass. Just recently in Windsor I read a newspaper report of remarks made by the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) speaking, I presume, as a minister of the crown on behalf

of the government when he discussed the United States threats of a higher tariff. He said:

We face a serious problem with our neighbours. When the Liberal govenment is faced with a problem it has handled it and never shirked its responsibilities. It stands for Canadian interests and it will solve any problem in Canada's interest and in Canada's interest alone. We'll see to it that Canada is amply protected. We are not looking for a fight, but we certainly won't run away from it.

They are almost adopting the red-blooded attitude of the hon. member for Fort William. It seems to me we have by this party in time of peace a war policy and in time of war a peaceful policy. We hear talk about the great prosperity of Canada and its satisfactory trade conditions, but we find that our gold reserves are lower than ever before and that we have a growing adverse balance of trade. British immigration is growing less and foreign trade is increasing. Our British trade is decreasing, foreign trade is increasing and our balance of trade is decreasing all the way down the line. It is high time that the government gave to the Department of Immigration as well as to other departments a well defined policy. I do not want to charge them with instability, but they are open to a charge of theft so far as policies are concerned, when we hear a minister of a free trade government declaring that we are going to amply protect Canada, when we have the Department of Immigration administered by a man who not long ago said that he was not only a free trader, but a freer trader, an advanced Liberal in a free trade government. We should have in this department, if any change is contemplated, one of the several protectionists in the cabinet, because if there is any department that depends on a national policy of protecting labour in Canada for the Canadian people, for the development of our own resources within our own country, it should be the Department of Immigration. If the government would devise a national policy that would develop our own resources within our own country and preserve our markets for our own people, we would have a larger population, a higher standard of living and a more contented people. As long as we call for cheaper goods, we also cheapen our standard of living. When we cheapen our standard of living, it is hopeless to talk about high class immigration.

I realize that the western wing of the party opposite has had, as regards policy, a change of heart that is very noticeable. Some years ago we heard in this house how they worried about rural depopulation and they wanted more people and more wheat. To-day they want less wheat and fewer people because of congested markets due to an unbalanced production. We heard the Prime Minister say that no industry, whether agricultural or manufacturing, would be hurt by the policies of his government, and that if it was hurt, a change in our trade policy or our trade treaties would at once be made; but it is to be noted that 25,000,000 pounds of dairy butter came into Canada during the year ended the last of last month. We have had many differently defined policies, but it is high time that we had some policy that would promote the development of the country. I am heartily in accord with the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) as I believe it to be a big constructive idea for a big and growing country.

Mr. O. L. BOULANGER (Bellechasse): I believe I have criticized the prevailing immigration policy enough to have the right to call attention to one respect in which an improvement has been made. This new feature of the immigration policy of Canada consists in the vote of $1,300,000 which the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Forke) will ask of parliament, and which is described at page 22 of the estimates as follows:

No. 55. Immigration contingencies and general expenses, including grants to immigration societies, women's hostels, provinces, and loans for stock, equipment, et cetera, for Canadian boys, as may be authorized by the governor general in council.

I wish to see in this vote a recognition by the government of the principle that in matters of colonization in Canada, Canadian citizens should be entitled to the same advantages as are offered to immigrants. This is a move which will help greatly to satisfy public opinion in this country, and the government deserve to be congratulated upon it. The public will see in this move the beginning of a new national policy of colonization in the interest and for the advantage of Canada first, not in the interest and for the advantage of another country or in the interest and for the advantage of certain classes of citizens of another country.

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization has not yet explained how he proposes to spend that sum of $1,300,000 in order to promote the colonization by Canadians of the vacant lands of Canada, which are of great extent according to what has been said in the house. I suppose that he will do so when his estimates come up for discussion. In the meantime might I suggest that he set up

for the assistance of Canadian settlers some of the schemes which have been devised for the assistance of immigrant settlers. These schemes are fairly numerous and can be summarized as follows:

1. Assisted passage agreement between the Canadian and Imperial governments whereby members of British agricultural families over nineteen years of age and houseworkers over seventeen years of age pay to come from England to Canada the following rates:

Halifax, St. John or Quebec	£2.0s.
Montreal	3.0
Toronto	3.10
Winnipeg	4.10
Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon	5.0
Calgary or Edmonton	5.10
Vancouver	8.0

The difference between the rates paid by the immigrants and the regular third-class rate of £10 now charged by the steamship companies is paid half by the Canadian government and half by the Imperial government.

2. Free passages for boys from fourteen to nineteen years of age coming to earn their livelihood on the land in Canada. Their entire transportation is paid half by the Canadian and half by the Imperial government.

3. Free passages for girls from fourteen to seventeen coming to Canada to engage in housework under the auspices of the Canadian government or of an approved immigration society. Their entire fare is paid by the governments of Great Britain and Canada.

4. The reunion of families scheme, providing reduced passages rates for the reunion of non-agricultural families. A wife eligible for assistance under this scheme pays £3 for her passage, and children under seventeen receive free transportation. The Canadian and Imperial governments pay the balance, or the whole of the regular passage rates, as the case may be.

5. The £10 ocean rates granted at the request of both governments by the steamship companies to all British immigrants not of the classes above mentioned.

6. Reception and distributing farms run at the expense of the Imperial, Dominion and provincial governments, where the British boys are received, trained and distributed among farmers in the district where such farms are located. Cash contributions are made as follows for the operation of the reception and distributing farms. The provincial government pays $10 per boy, the Dominion government $10 per boy, and the British government $20 per boy.

[Mr. Boulanger.]

7. The placing of boys with farmers, providing for the selection of suitable homes for the above-mentioned boys by the provincial governments, which furnish after care, protection, and what supervision is required for the welfare of the boys for a period of three years after their arrival in Canada, and also take care of their savings.

8. The boys' land settlement scheme whereby the British and Canadian governments propose jointly to loan a total of $5,000,000 over a period of ten years to assist suitable British youths to take up farming in Canada on their own account.

9. Grants to immigration societies, provinces, women's hostels, and so forth, and the furtherance of the British Empire settlement scheme.

10. Loans where considered necessary and advisable to immigrants accepted under the three-thousand family scheme and to household workers, the loan being free of interest and repayable in instalments, to cover that part of the ocean passage which the immigrant has to pay under the other schemes.

11. After care which the government undertakes to give to immigrants for a period of five years after their arrival in Canada.

12. The three-thousand family settlement scheme, which is almost completed whereby the government undertook to assist financially in the bringing over and establishing on Canadian land of that number of British families. During the three years up to January 31, 1929, 2,999 families have been settled under this scheme. Of this number there have been 520 withdrawals and cancellations.

According to the report of the Department of Immigration and Colonization for the year ending March 31, 1929, at page 56, I find:

> The land settlement schemes which have been briefly described above involved an estimated expenditure of $24,000,000, excluding settlement or administration expenses and cost of transportation.

I have been informed that an average British immigrant family costs this government something between $80 and $100. This is the cost under those schemes which have been adopted to assist immigrants to come and settle in Canada. I sincerely believe that schemes such as those which I have described should be tried by the government to assist in the settlement of Canadian citizens on the land. If those schemes have proved good in the case of immigrants, they should also prove good in the case of Canadian settlers. Therefore I suggest that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization employ the sum of $1,300,000 which he is asking parliament to grant him, in assisting in the trans-

portation of Canadian settlers from the congested older districts to the virgin good lands of which we have heard so much; in the providing of loans to settlers without capital for the purpose of land, stock and equipment, in helping in the establishment of boys on the land, in encouraging the return to the land from the cities, in stimulating to a greater extent the return of Canadians from the United States, and in cooperating with colonization societies and provinces which have land to settle and colonize, just as the minister is doing for certain classes of immigrants. If it is well and good to do that for immigrants, it should be equally well and good to do it for our own Canadian citizens. It is claimed that we have to assist immigrants to come here because we need more people to share our national debt with the present population and to help us produce more revenue for our railways, and it is said that assisted colonization by Canadian settlers will not produce that desirable increase of population. I confess humbly that I fail to see how the national debt can be decreased appreciably if we use the taxpayers money to buy immigrants by the boatload at the cost indicated in the report of the Department of Immigration and Colonization. I also fail to see how the railways can be helped materially if it is true that they do not receive governmental assistance in the transportation of immigrants, as I see from the figures which I have just quoted that the only difference in the cost of transportation of immigrants between Quebec, the usual port of landing, and Montreal is £1, between Quebec and Toronto £1 10s., between Quebec and Winnipeg, £2 10s., between Quebec and Regina, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, £3, between Quebec and Calgary and Edmonton, £3 10s., between Quebec and Vancouver, £6. Please remember that these rates apply only to adults, as children of nineteen and under are transported free from the point of departure to the point of destination.

The Montreal Star related some time ago the story of a Scotchman—of course, he had to be a Scotchman—who by taking advantage of all possible schemes of assistance brought his family consisting of himself, his wife and eleven children, to this country for 20 cents a piece, whereas it would cost a family of the same size to go from say Quebec to Edmonton close to $1,200. The assistance of Canadian settlers, if it does not immediately produce an increase in the present population of Canada, will at least stop our population from decreasing by preventing to a great extent the emigration of Canadians to the neighbouring country, and if we keep our people here the next census will not be so disappointing with regard to the natural increase of the native born population.

It has been argued that assisting the settlement of Canada by the sons of Canada by way of transportation aid and in other ways is not to be advocated, because it is not the business of the central government to help shift people from one province to another. However, I read in a pamphlet published by the British government, and called "Report of the Oversea Settlement Committee for the year ended 31st December, 1928," page 5, the following:

> The object of empire settlement is to distribute the white population of the British commonwealth in the most efficient manner as between all its parts. But, in view of the conditions which at present exist in parts of this country, there is a widespread wish that the policy should be made use of so far as possible to find openings in other parts of the empire for those who cannot find work at home.
>
> In these circumstances, it is very desirable to make clear to what extent and within what limits this can be done. In a recently published press statement, the Secretary of State has expressed the view that coupling unemployment and migration together is calculated to give a wholly misleading idea of the government's policy in regard to migration both at home and in the dominions. "The object", he has written, "of a policy of empire migration is first and foremost to build up the strength and wealth of the empire as a whole by the better distribution of its population, and to increase the openings for success in life and the development of character of all our people. Such a policy obviously offers great opportunities of better employment, of a more independent and varied life, and of increased prospects for the children, as far as concerns the individual family that goes overseas. It also creates more employment at home for those who remain, because those who go out help to build up our best markets, which are those of the empire. These are the main reasons which justify a policy of empire migration. They apply all the time, and with just as much force when the state of employment is good at home as when it is bad. Incidently, and accidentally, the actual movement of migration may help to relieve the labour market in times of industrial depression, and many of those who migrate, and make a success of their adventure in a new country, may actually be unemployed at the moment of their deciding to go. But it is the probability of their succeeding which is the one factor which must weigh with the government, and not the fact that they are unemployed."

If a better distribution of population is desirable for the empire, it is just as desirable for Canada, in which there is congestion in the older settled parts and vast areas of vacant lands in other parts. If it is desirable to shift at the public expense to another part of the empire people who cannot find land o·

employment in their present environment, it should be just as desirable to shift from one Canadian province to another, Canadians who cannot find land or work where they happen to have been born or raised. It seems to me that assisted colonization by Canadian settlers will be commendable just as long as the surplus farmer population of older Canada has to go to the cities, or to the United States to earn their livelihood. Until we have provided for our own young farmers, until we have stopped the flow of the farmer's sons to the cities, or across the border, I fail to see the utility or necessity of bringing immigrants from a country which is mainly industrial, and where the farming population has dwindled from about 1,149 000 in 1881 to about 930,000 in 1921.

Australia and New Zealand have stopped that business, and I see in that very same report from which I quoted a moment ago that Australia and New Zealand have practically discontinued the policy of buying immigrants. At page 13 of that report it is stated:

> At the present time, nominations for industrial workers are allowed by Australia and New Zealand, but unfortunately economic and other circumstances seem for the present to point to a further reduction in the immediate future of the flow of population from this country into those two dominions.

And at page 23 that same report mentions another report made by Sir Arthur Duckham, K.C.B., as follows:

> Whilst the report is, generally speaking, optimistic as regards the prospects of Australia, reference is made to the "vicious circle of ever ascending costs and prices." This is described as crippling Australia's progress and her power of supporting increased population.

And at page 26 the British report sums up in the following words:

> In present economic circumstances in Australia and New Zealand, it is unlikely that any schemes will be arranged in the near future in these dominions which will provide directly for the settlement of families from this country excepting those with capital.

Incidentally, we might take a lesson from what is happening in Australia, and that lesson is this, that high tariffs and high protection are not conducive to increase of population. New Zealand and Australia are highly protected countries, and in this connection I might read something which is reproduced from the Manchester Daily Despatch, a British paper, relating to conditions in high tariff Australia:

> (The Australian tariff board recently warned the commonwealth that tariffs were being raised to such a height that costs would inevitably go up and make selling difficult.) The War Office has given an order for a million tins of "bully beef" to South America. The desire of the authorities has always been, and rightly so, to place such orders within the empire. But Australian prices have militated this time against such a course. The British taxpayer cannot be mulcted in order to bolster up the internal policies of the commonwealth, some of which hit the working classes of this country.

I sincerely believe that we would do well to follow the example of Australia and New Zealand at least as long as the supply of Canadian settlers lasts. When it stops it will be time to look elsewhere for settlers who can never be as good as our own people, no matter where they come from. This morning on the train I happened to read the Montreal Gazette, and on one page of that paper, page 4, there is a rather curious picture of the immigration situation in Canada. It consists of three items of news which are set up side by side, and which I will ask the permission of the house to read:

> English Settlers Arrive
> 900 Girls and Young Boys Arrive at Quebec
> (Special to The Gazette.)
>
> Quebec, May 25.—Two special trains were required here to-day to carry away from Quebec nine hundred of the choicest class of settlers, who made their way to Canada from different parts of Great Britain and northern Europe aboard the Duchess of York. Salvation Army lassies, with the familiar red-tipped blue uniforms, sturdy youths with the glow of health upon their cheeks, youngsters who proudly announced that they were going to Canada, and many others went to make up this heterogeneous lot, and the dialects of Northumberland and Cumberland, Warwickshire and Yorkshire, the drawl of London and the burr of Scotland in addition to the brogue of Ireland were all to be heard.

Now, we have the other side of the picture:

> Demonstration by Hungry Newcomers
> Six Immigrants Who Broke Restaurant Windows Will Be Deported
>
> Six young recent immigrants from the British Isles who did not find conditions in Canada to their liking will be sent back to their native shores after serving two months in jail with hard labour, Chief Justice Perrault ordered on Saturday morning, after the men had pleaded guilty to smashing two plateglass windows of a restaurant on Empire day.
>
> The prisoners, all hardy types from England, Ireland and Scotland, gathered in front of the establishment of Aird and Bowen, Ltd., at 750 St. Peter street, on Friday afternoon, and hurled several stones at the windows of the place. They admitted they were merely trying to attract attention to the fact that they were in need of money and wanted food.
>
> Damage of $150 was done by the angry half dozen young men. Some of them told police they were anxious to return to the old country and did not care how they got there. One at least had been out to western Canada and was dissatisfied with the wages offered him.
>
> Each was asked by the Judge how long he had been in the Dominion. Two at least had been here only a week. Of the others none had

been on this side of the Atlantic longer than a month. All claimed to have been unable to procure work of any kind in Montreal and elsewhere.

They pleaded guilty to the damages to property charge and smiled broadly when they heard the sentence. None had local addresses. They said they had joined forces on Empire day and decided to demonstrate to mark the holiday celebration.

The next article is:

Youth to Be Deported
(Special to The Gazette.)

Brockville, May 25.—After pleading guilty in police court here to the theft of jewellery from his employer, Harry Foster, aged 19, who arrived in Canada two months ago under the auspices of a Montreal immigration society, and who has since been employed by Gordon Loney at Lansdowne, is being held in jail here awaiting the arrival of an officer of the society which will return him to England.

Another picture of the immigration situation is contained in a news item of La Liberte of Winnipeg, which recounts what took place on May day in that city. I translate part of the article as follows:

In the parade held in Winnipeg on May 1 there were 2,500 participants, three-quarters of them foreigners, and they carried banners emblematic of revolution. These banners bore the following slogan: "Only a world proletarian dictatorship will bring peace to the workers and victory to socialism. Long live the soviet union. Free Arvo Varra and all political prisoners". The band of the Ukrainian labour temple played the Internationale, which was joined in by three hundred school children. These good little fellows had also a rally yell which went as follows: "Everybody listen, everybody yell, capitalist, capitalist, all to go hell". On the market square orators preached the overthrow of the present social structure and a girl of fourteen made a speech which ended with these words: "Let us all march, to the world of revolution".

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the best way of keeping our people at home on the farms, instead of having to bring in strangers whom we are inducing to come to Canada to engage in agriculture, is to make life on the Canadian farm more attractive and profitable than any other calling; and with that end in view I would go so far as to advocate spending all the money which at present we devote to immigration for the purpose of improving the conditions of farm life. If our people leave the country it is because they expect to do better elsewhere, and they will return if farm life is made more attractive and more remunerative. The key to our colonization problem is to make farming a sufficiently paying proposition by helping the farmers to improve and modernize their methods, by creating an efficient buying and selling organization for them, by enabling them to produce more and to better advantage, by finding markets for them, and so forth. I would gladly see the government spend for this purpose all the millions set aside to promote immigration. I do not believe that anyone can do better on Canadian land than the Canadian farmer. If, therefore, we improve the conditions in the farming industry in Canada, not only will the rural population remain on the land but I believe that we shall see a large number of expatriated Canadians returning home; from the cities men of rural ancestry will go back to the country, and immigrants, seeing the happiness and prosperity enjoyed by these Canadians, will themselves make an effort to come to Canada without having to be coaxed, or bought, or pampered or coddled.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): I understand that the amendment to which we are now speaking is the following, which was moved by the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) and seconded by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs):

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

this house regrets the failure of the government to profit by Canadian experience in the colonization and settlement of the country and deplores the fact that men and women have, during recent months, been settled on western crown lands at great distances from transportation, educational, hospital and other necessary facilities, thereby making it almost impossible for them to achieve success and happiness in their new surroundings, and is of the opinion that such conditions can only be remedied by an immediate reorganization of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Certainly one of the districts affected in the manner to which my hon. friend refers in his speech is that area in the Peace River where settlers went in last year, and I may as well say at once that I cannot support the amendment because it asks me to endorse the statement that it is impossible for these settlers to make a success. I have had some experience in pioneering. In the year 1911 I went three hundred miles from a railway to take up a homestead. Nearly everyone told us in those days that we were crazy and that we could not make it go. Well, we settled up something like one million acres in the Peace River district, ranging from two to three hundred miles from a railway, and I do not know of any country or new district anywhere which has retained a greater percentage of its original settlers.

The hon. member in his speech, at page 2737, quoted the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) as having made the following statement in a speech which that hon. gentleman delivered last March:

In the Grand Prairie and Peace River country, 5,216 homesteads were taken up, a gain of 450 per cent over the previous year.

Commenting on this, the hon. member for North Vancouver made this statement:

> The minister did not say to the house where he was placing these 5,000 new settlers; that part of the story was left for me to tell. Perhaps he does not know.

Then he goes on for a column or two of his speech to explain that a large number had settled twenty, forty, sixty, eighty and a hundred miles from a railway; which is perfectly true. I have here some information regarding these 5,000 homesteaders and it certainly has some bearing on the question. Just a little over 1,000 of these are second homesteads. Most hon. members will recall that last session there was introduced into this house by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), and passed, a bill providing that certain persons might take up second homesteads. I believe that 1,200, or at any rate something over 1,000 of the 5,000 filed in Peace River last year were second homesteads. In that case it was mostly settlers who had already been established in the Peace River country and who knew what they were doing, whether they went twenty, forty or sixty miles from a railway. And as regards the other 4,000, they are for the most part people who have already had homesteading experience, or the sons of people who have already farmed in the three western provinces and in British Columbia. I do not believe that 10 per cent of the people who went in to take up homesteads in Peace River last year could be regarded as immigrants in the strict sense of the word—people asking the Department of Immigration for information as to where to go in order to find homesteads. I am subject to correction, but the people whom I met on their way in and out were people who had had experience in farming in western Canada and who knew, therefore, what they were doing.

Having offered that criticism by way of explanation as to why I cannot accept the amendment, I wish to observe that there are some constructive ideas in the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Vancouver. I do not know that I can follow him in all the details of his settlement scheme, for reasons which I will give in due course. I read the speech twice over and there are in it some things that are not clear to me yet. But the hon. member did bring out this fact, that unless we take into consideration in connection with settlement the questions of transportation, the clearing of lands and the selection of lands on which we shall encourage settlement, we are apt to cause settlers a tremendous amount of hardship and difficulty which could be avoided.

[Mr. Kennedy.]

Most hon. members of this house know that I have been urging for a survey of a coast outlet, not because I expected to get that outlet immediately, but because the people want to know just where the branch lines will be built in the Peace River in order to fit in with the outlet when it is ultimately constructed. We have got somewhere in connection with the survey of a possible location of railway branch lines. This I believe to be primarily the responsibility of the federal government. Undoubtedly the control of the location and the construction of railways will be in the hands of the Canadian National, the Canadian Pacific and the federal government. Some years ago we were building railways in Canada ahead of the settlers. In some cases we made mistakes in connection with the location of the railways; in other cases we had duplications, and in other cases we permitted the settlers to go on lands which should never have been settled at all. To-day we are asking the settlers to go out and prove the country before we go ahead with railway construction; we are erring in the other direction. If we adopt the policy of bringing immigrants to this country and expecting them to go out and settle in the newer districts, we have a bounden duty as the federal parliament to see that the settlers obtain railway transportation just as quickly as possible. The same would apply to our own people who are asked to settle on these lands.

I have some criticism to make of the heads of our two railway systems who have been shouting for immigration. I think there will be time enough to shout for immigration when they have provided the last permanent settlement in western Canada with a reasonable amount of railway service, and they have not done that as yet. Settlement in this country is three or four hundred miles ahead of railway development, epecially in the Peace River district. I am not blaming the Canadian National or the Canadian Pacific for that, because they have just recently taken over the Peace River railway from the Alberta government. The immediate problem to be solved is to provide railway transportation for the five thousand settlers who took up land there last year, and another possible five thousand who will go in this year. In a new country it is absolutely impossible to do anything with regard to the permanent location of schools, hospitals, and so on, until you have the railway into the country or until you know exactly where it is going to be. We cannot avoid hardships and difficulties, but by a wise policy of rail-

way development we can bring that suffering down to a minimum. In the Peace River block we have an intensely settled district, but it cannot be fully settled until it is supplied with railway facilities. That district is intensely settled sixty miles from a railway, and it justifies the extension of the railway.

As I said a little while ago, I had some difficulty in understanding the proposal offered by the hon. member for North Vancouver. At page 2730 of Hansard, he says:

As to the percentage of the 100,000,000 acres available for agriculture, probably 10 per cent should be allowed for land covered by water. In many districts there is no waste at all. A conservative estimate is 75,000,000 acres of good agricultural land.

Then at page 2731 he makes this statement:

Besides, the best of our districts awaiting settlement to-day are more or less covered with timber of varying density, from open park-life country, light brush or scrub, to the so-called timber land, little of it giving promise of ever becoming of commercial value so far as the timber is concerned. Peace River district is very fortunate. About 50 per cent of that country is what is termed park-like land, and of this at least half is open prairie. Our problem is to make this land available for settlers with the least cost at the earliest possible date.

I do not know whether there are 75,000,000 acres of good land in the Peace River district, but putting these two statements together, it would appear that the hon. member claims that there are 75,000,000 acres of good agricultural land, fifty per cent of which is prairie and park-like land. Prairie land is open land practically ready for the plough and requires no drainage. Then the hon. member states that the other fifty per cent is park-like land. According to these two paragraphs it would appear as though we had 36,000,000 acres of that sort of land in the Peace River district. There have been only about 4,000,000 acres alienated altogether, according to the report which I received from the Department of the Interior. In the Grande Prairie district we have 517,600 acres homesteaded, and we have 1,203,360 acres in the Peace River district.

I would like to read what the hon. member had to say with regard to the question of financing new settlers. At page 2733 of Hansard he says:

It would not require any great administrative ability to assemble and equip clearing units, which might be located at several points, in number sufficient to clear and make available along the lines I have indicated homes for at least 2,000 new settlers a year.

At page 2735 he says:

I proposed last year that the government issue land bonds against their expenditure on such a development. I gave as the maximum required $300,000,000 for a ten year programme, an average of $30,000,000 per year.

Again on the same page he says:

When the settlement of a district is complete, a land value of $30 an acre would be in keeping with the present Peace River values. This means that the homesteader who gets a partially improved homestead for the amount spent on it by the government (which I estimated last year not to exceed $1,500) would not be long in seeing that at $30 per acre for his 160 acre homestead he would have a prospective value of $4,800,

Two thousand homesteads per year at $1,500 each amounts to $3,000,000, but the program suggested amounts to $30,000,000, which would mean 20,000 homesteads per year. I am a little confused when I consider those figures. The hon. member seems to have dropped or added a cipher in one of these statements. I am in accord with his suggestion that transportation is absolutely essential and must be brought close to the settlers, and that we should develop some scheme of financing the settler. In 1926 two bills were presented to the house which, although not along the line of the proposition recommended by the hon. member for North Vancouver, had that very matter in view.

I am also in sympathy with the proposition of clearing the land by fire. I agree with the hon. member's statement that a large percentage of the park-like land could be handled for about $12 per acre. I speak from experience in connection with that because I had some cleared and turned over last year which cost me just about that much; yet I do not see why we should go ahead with a scheme involving an expenditure of $6 per acre for clearing when we can handle it by fire for less than $1 per acre.

The amendment directs the whole criticism at the Minister of Immigration, and to me that seems to be striking the wrong head. We should criticize three or four departments if we come to the conclusion that it is necessary to accept a scheme of that kind in order to have a government which is right up to the standard of what Canada needs. It would require the cooperation of the Railway department, and the railways as well, both the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National; it would require the cooperation of the Department of the Interior, the department which demonstrated conclusively in 1919 that land could be cleared cheaply by fire but which has not gone ahead with a development in that way. It would require the cooperation of the Department of Immigration as well.

I am heartily in accord with the Minister of Immigration when he takes the stand that immigration brought into this country must be controlled in relation to the needs of labour and the conditions prevailing in the country and that we should not bring in any imm-

grants whom we cannot place or for whom we cannot find work. I do not believe that it is feasible to bring in a large number of new immigrants and place them away out on the frontier in a block by themselves. The immigrant should come here and obtain his experience by working for some other farmer for two, three or five years. Then he would be in a position to go and select his land or buy his farm. By that time he would have formed a pretty good idea of the kind of farm he wanted and the price he could pay for it. If you put a block of green Scotchmen, Englishmen or any other class away out on the prairies by themselves, especially in a year when there is a crop failure, you have not in your settlement the element that can take the long view and steady the settlement through to the good years which are sure to come. In the new settlements what you want are people of experience in doing the kinds of farming necessary in a new district, or a very liberal mixture of them in order to guide and steady the newcomers. For that reason, while I have not been altogether satisfied with everything the government has done and while I am also not prepared to condemn the scheme advanced by the hon. member for North Vancouver, because there are a number of good ideas in his speech, I feel that his amendment does not fit in with the constructive ideas in his speech, and therefore I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. J. A. FRASER (Cariboo): I should like to make a few remarks in regard to the immigration policy of this government. We have been spending in the neighbourhood of five to six million dollars a year in order to secure immigrants whom we consider are necessary. It does not appear from the general criticism which has been directed toward the government and its immigration policy that that money has been as well spent as it should have been, or that we are getting the service that we should be getting for our expenditure on immigration in general. I take it that we are all agreed that if the Immigration department were functioning with full efficiency we would be getting better results. I am going to quote from the report of the Department of Immigration for the year ending March 31, 1928, in order to show that some of the remarks of the minister and his department hardly fit in. For instance, at page 59 I find the following remark from the commissioner in regard to the publicity work in his department. It is headed "Films":

> Films—There is an increasing demand for the use of films, and during the year the supply at the London office was frequently insufficient to meet the demand. The film "Twenty Minutes in Canada" has been in use for such a prolonged period that the request is usually for something new, which as yet we are unable to supply.

That is, notwithstanding the amount of money we are giving the minister to spend on these services, the services he is giving to the public are antiquated. We find the same thing again on page 75, and I want to read from the department's own publication what they say in regard to literature which has been distributed:

> A booklet to which very wide distribution is given is called "Canada West". As its name suggests, it deals with the western provinces of Canada—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. It contains maps of each province and text and illustrations giving information particularly along the line of agricultural opportunities. This booklet is printed in three editions: one designed for distribution in Great Britain, one for the United States, and one printed in French, used mainly for repatriation purposes in French-speaking communities in the New England states. New British and United States editions were compiled, but the printing was not completed during the year. A sufficient number of the French edition were on hand so that no reprinting was required. The "Eastern Canada" booklet deals with the eastern provinces in much the same way as "Canada West" does with those lying west of the great lakes. It, too, is issued in three editions—British, United States, and French. Orders for British and United States editions were placed during the year but were not completed. The French edition on hand was sufficient to supply the year's requirements.

Again I say that instances the fact that the Immigration department, for some reason or another, is not sufficiently coordinated or working in proper cooperation to keep even a supply of the films and literature which are necessary for distribution in the countries in which we are soliciting immigrants. That shows beyond any question of doubt—and it is reflected throughout the whole of the criticism of the Immigration department—that within the department itself there is a certain amount of disorganization which could easily be remedied by efficient cooperation. These weaknesses within the organization amply demonstrate why we are not getting satisfactory service from the department throughout the whole Dominion.

As regards the question that is immediately before us, the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae), I was rather surprised and startled to hear the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy) say that he could not agree with the scheme outlined by the hon. member for North Vancouver. But after listening to what he had to say on the matter, I came to the

conclusion that he was not very far from agreeing with the hon. member for North Vancouver. His argument to prove that it is not exactly the scheme we must have seemed to me to prove that it was a pretty efficient scheme and its adoption provided that the details were worked out by men with the proper spirit for the task, would result in much greater efficiency in the Department of Immigration than we have at the present time.

After listening to the information which has been given to the house during the last three or four sessions in regard to the Peace River country, one cannot doubt that we have in that section of Canada a very large area—whether it is 75,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres does not alter the question very much—which is capable of vast development. The Canadian people by their characteristics are well qualified for the task of bringing that large area under settlement, and, given proper direction, of making it productive. What we require is an administration which as a whole has caught the vision of that northern country and its possibilities, and which will lay down policies and courageously follow them out in order that the development of that country may proceed with some degree of rapidity.

It has been stated time and again in the house that the proper way to develop that northen country is to give it an outlet to the Pacific coast, and until that outlet is given the Peace River country cannot develop as it properly should. The reason is plain to any person who will take into consideration the location of the district. The whole land is situated not more than 800 or 900 miles from the Pacific coast, whereas there is a haul of 3,000 miles at the very least in order to bring the produce to the eastern seaboard. Therefore we do not need any argument to prove that it is necessary to connect that district by the shortest line possible with the Pacific coast. It is in that respect, and in that alone, that I find most fault with the present Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) and the present government. The hon. member for Peace River did not like to unload the whole responsibility on the Minister of Immigration, and perhaps I should not attempt to unload on him the lack of railway facilities in that section, but at the same time, had we in the position of Minister of Immigration a man who had caught the vision of that section, who was seized of its possibilities and who had made up his mind to develop it, I feel certain that the railway development there would have progressed further than it has so far. To that extent I must hold the Minister of Immigration responsible for lack of railway development in the Peace River country. As a matter of fact, the western prairies have been settled and brought to their present stage of production because behind the organization of effort in that territory there were men who had caught the vision, who were seized of the possibilities and who were determined to give the country the opportunity to develop. At the present time I believe that the responsible officials of the government are not properly seized of the possibilities in that country, that they have not caught the vision, and are not evolving and following out progressive policies which would reflect credit on the Canadian people in the development of an empire such as we have in that part of the country.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FRASER: At six o'clock I think I had shown to the satisfaction of every reasonable person that the Department of Immigration and Colonization was not achieving the results that it should. It may be well to review for a few minutes some of the statements that have been made by the present government through its ministers and by officials connected therewith, having to do with the matter now under consideration.

In the first place, I would like to remind the house of the promises made by the present Prime Minister during the election campaign of 1925. I think it will be recalled by most hon. members that during his campaign in western Canada, referring to the immigration policy of the government which he hoped then to lead, he made or is reported to have made the statement that the spearhead of his immigration policy would be directed towards the Peace River country. Well, since then we have had four or five years of government under his leadership, and what has been the result? What has happened to that spearhead? It seems to me that it is very badly blunted and bent. It looks to me as if the platform then laid down was pretty much the same as that on which he was supposed to attain office in 1919. If that was not so, certain it is that the policy which has been directed towards the colonization of the northern country has not been a very energetic one, and the results achieved have been feeble and futile.

Strong men and women have gone to that country to help in its development, they have pointed out the possibilities of that country

if proper opportunities are afforded for its development. Yet the present government has not supplemented as it should the efforts of those early pioneers, nor does it look as though they may expect to get much assistance from the present administration.

Then we have the president of the Canadian National Railways, who, when he visited the Peace River country in 1925 to inspect it at first hand and examine into its possibilities made the statement that if the people in that district would produce 10,000,000 bushels of grain he would be prepared to give consideration to their railway problems. The people of the Peace River country took him at his word. They went diligently to work, and in the year 1927 they not only raised 10,000,000 bushels of grain but actually shipped out over the railways 11,000,000 bushels, thus carrying out their part of the bargain in full measure. And what has the president of the Canadian National Railways since that time done to carry out his part of the bargain? When he was asked the other day in the railway committee what the situation was in regard to the implementing of that promise he said "Well, just the same answer as you get from this government when you ask them on any vital question—it is still under consideration." In 1925 the promise was made. The people accepted it in good faith. They did their part, and now in 1929, four years later, the answer of the president of the Canadian National Railways is that the matter is "still under consideration."

The Minister of Immigration says we are doing very well so far as immigration is concerned. Perhaps we are. The members of the cabinet draw very comfortable salaries. They spend about half a million dollars on motor cars and gasoline in travelling around the country looking after official business—

Mr. DUNNING: That is terrible.

Mr. FRASER: Awful.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Some was spent in Europe.

Mr. FRASER: —while the farmers in the Peace River country producing their crops are despoiled of $6,500,000 for lack of railway facilities which should be provided by this government. I arrive at that conclusion in this way: the Peace River country in 1927 produced 11,000,000 bushels of grain. I presume they produced as much in 1928. It cost the people in the Peace River block 30 cents per bushel to haul that grain to railhead; if you multiply the 30 cents by the 22,000,000 bushels, you will find it amounts to about $6,500,000. In view of that condition, it is not astonishing that we should ask what is the horizon of the Minister of Immigration. Is he giving consideration to those areas which are a considerable distance from his own little corner of Manitoba called Pipestone? If he is thinking only, of his own little district of Pipestone then he is merely indulging in a kind of pipe dream.

The Prime Minister's spearhead is bent and blunt. The Minister of Immigration sobs, with drooping head, "It is well enough", and the president of the Canadian National Railways says he is "giving consideration" to the cry of the people. Surely it is time the development of such areas should be placed in stronger hands, under the direction of people who have a clear vision of the possibilities of that great country and an appreciation of what we expect of them in relation to the development of this country.

But there is another angle to this immigration policy to which I wish for a few minutes to direct the minister's attention. What has the Department of Immigration and Colonization done towards the colonizing of their own lands in the province of British Columbia? They have in that province, in the Peace River block and along the railway belt, large areas of very good land. Will the Minister of Immigration tell me what well organized, well directed effort they have ever made to colonize those areas, outside of the colonization effort under the Soldier Settlement Board; whether they have ever made any effort, whether they have had a colonization agent in any part of those areas? Not only that, but they have very important interests also in British Columbia so far as the Grand Trunk Pacific is concerned. Along that line of railway they have never made any effort to help colonization. All along that line there is good land, there are industrious people, an excellent climate, and as good soil as you can find anywhere in the world; yet this country is not as prosperous as it should be, and a line built to the highest standard of any railway in the Dominion of Canada, with the best possible grades, is being operated as a second class branch line. During the summer they operate a railway service six days in the week, but they provide the business people along that line with a mail service only three days weekly. That does not assist in the colonization of an area of that kind. The minister says that he is willing to cooperate with any of the provincial governments in assisting immigration, but I say he has made no effort to colonize that part of the country with which I am acquainted.

Mr. WARD: Will the hon. member tell the house what advantages he hopes to gain for Canada by the immediate settlement of this last virgin district we have left?

Mr. FRASER: I suppose it will have to remain unsettled so long as this government is in power and so long as the hon. member keeps it in power. But I understood that what this country required was a greater population, and I do not know where you will find a country in which the people have a better chance to make a living than in the area I have described. I say that all the necessary materials for the proper colonization of that country, and for making it prosperous, will be found along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; and will not the prosperity of each and every individual along that line add to the prosperity of the property which the government itself owns? Every contented settler helps in the unkeep and building up of the railways, and I submit it would be money and effort well spent if the government did a little more in the way of colonizing that district. In addition to the colonization department of this government, which is neglecting that country, we have also a very expensive colonization department in connection with the Canadian National Railways, and it is making absolutely no effort to colonize that country along the Grand Trunk Pacific line.

I said a moment ago that we had in Canada, if we went about it in the proper way, all the materials for a satisfactory colonization of that great country. Now, someone might ask where the people would come from. Well, the first thing to which I would direct the attention of the minister would be the number of people annually leaving Canada. I find from the records that something over 50,000 Canadians left this country during the last fiscal year of the Immigration department. I submit with all sincerity that if proper efforts were directed to these new districts these 50,000 people would be very glad to remain in Canada and find employment here instead of going across the line to look for work. If the colonization of the western country, and particularly that northern district to which we are directing attention at the present moment, were undertaken under a comprehensive scheme, the people who find it necessary to leave Canada annually would, I am sure, be very willing and ready to turn their energies in the direction of developing that northern country, instead of going over into the United States. The Minister of Immigration says that Canadians do not leave this country to go to the United States for the purpose of farming. It is admitted that they do not. But I am pointing out that if you filled up that section of Canada you would create a demand for all kinds of necessities which farmers require for the development of the land, and those people intending to leave, even supposing they did not want to go on the land, would remain in the towns, engaged in the production of commodities required for the development of that country.

I think it would be well if a good deal of the money spent in sending officials to the United States and to countries overseas were spent in Canada, along proper colonization lines. If I had anything to do with it, I would suggest that these men be brought home from Europe and the United States and be asked to turn their attention to the northern country and to develop some proper scheme of colonization which would assist the efforts of settlers after their arrival in Canada. Let these men earn their money at home rather than abroad.

Mr. FORKE: I may inform the hon. member that we have no immigration agents in Europe.

Mr. FRASER: Colonization agents then.

Mr. FORKE: There is no one seeking immigrants on the continent of Europe; we do not pay anyone.

Mr. FRASER: You are paying out large sums of money in Europe.

Mr. FORKE: We are paying no officials for immigration work in Europe except the inspectors at ports of sailing; that is all.

Mr. FRASER: Does the minister mean to tell this house that he is not paying a substantial sum of money in Great Britain and on the continent in the work of looking after colonization and immigration?

Mr. FORKE: We do in Great Britain.

Mr. FRASER: Well, Great Britain is a part of Europe.

Mr. FORKE: A little information would go a long way sometimes and save a whole lot of talking.

Mr. FRASER: If the minister would talk a little more the house would have a little more information.

Mr. FORKE: Wind up and I shall have a chance.

Mr. FRASER: Not in this debate, I am afraid. Now I find, with some consternation, that this government has a colonization policy for the province of British Columbia, to a certain very limited extent—and limited, I am glad to say, it is. But I find that, notwith-

standing the antipathy of the people of British Columbia to oriental immigration, we have, according to the Auditor General's report, a colonization or an immigration agent stationed at Hong Kong. I find that this man costs the Dominion of Canada the sum of $8,075 per annum. Now I suggest that this is not a very popular thing from the standpoint of the people of British Columbia. British Columbians are not seeking immigration from oriental countries; indeed, we prohibit immigration from the orient, especially from China. But, as I say, there is this immigration agent stationed at Hong Kong. The Minister of National Health (Mr. King, Kootenay) has just taken his seat, I see. I suggest to him that he have a little quiet talk with the Minister of Immigration and point out to him how unpopular it is to invite immigration from these oriental countries.

Mr. FORKE: I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, but it is absurd to suggest that we have an immigration agent in Japan or China, seeking immigrants, when as a matter of fact we actually prohibit Chinese from coming to the country, and allow only a very limited number of Japanese to enter. To say that we are seeking immigrants in those countries is therefore so absurd that the statement should not be made.

Mr. FRASER: You do not deny that you pay $8,075 for an immigration agent in Hong Kong.

Mr. FORKE: He is certainly not seeking immigrants.

Mr. FRASER: But you pay him $8,075.

Mr. FORKE: I will look into the matter; I did not know there was such an official. He is not an immigration agent; I do not think there is such a man. I think the hon. member is entirely wrong.

Mr. FRASER: No, I am not wrong; I am not quoting anything wrong; I am absolutely within the facts. I will give the minister some names, good Chinese names, to support my statement. You can find these names in the Auditor General's reports. In those reports I find these two: Li Kam Hi and Fung Choy. Now what are these men being paid for? Why are we disbursing this money in this way?

Mr. RYCKMAN: Both friends of the minister.

[Mr. Fraser.]

Mr. FRASER: I submit that so long as our people are crossing the line on the present scale it is obvious that conditions are not what they ought to be, the Minister of Immigration to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. FORKE: With reference to that man in China, I would point out that we have to have a man there to vise the passports of people coming to this country. But that man is not seeking immigrants; he is there to prevent emigration of his own kind.

Mr. BENNETT: But there must be people coming if there are passports to vise.

Mr. DUNNING: It is not for immigrants.

Mr. FORKE: That applies only to students or to visitors.

Mr. FRASER: Is there such immigration agent in India or Japan?

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. FRASER: Why in China then?

Mr. STEVENS: That was to find a job for a lame duck.

Mr. FRASER: To find a job for a lame duck? Well, I will take that explanation.

Mr. STEVENS: That was in 1922.

Mr. FRASER: As a matter of fact the line of our population in Canada requires broadening, and there is no section of the Dominion where the opportunities to broaden this line are as favourable as they are in northern Alberta and northern British Columbia. I submit, therefore, it is time that serious attention were given to the matter; action has been too long delayed. It is all very well to point to the number of homestead entries there are in the northern country. It is encouraging to see so many homestead entries. But it must be remembered also that the responsibility of this government does not cease when they grant a homestead entry to an intending settler. I submit, therefore, with all due respect that the homesteader should be followed up with modern facilities which will enable him to carry on in that country with a reasonable degree of efficiency so that he may be able to make a success of his labours and become prosperous.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (North Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of the opportunity offered by the amendment of the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) to refer for a few moments to this matter of colonization and immigration. In doing so I intend to speak as a settler

and workingman. It has been said that Canada needs a larger population, but I believe I am voicing the sentiment of the majority of the people of northern Ontario when I say that this country is not in need of an unlimited immigration. Political leaders have expressed the thought that the prosperity of a country is directly related to the number of people within its borders; in other words, that an increased population is a good thing of itself irrespective of the conditions which result through that growth in population. When a new census is issued many people are pleased to see an increase in the number of inhabitants within our borders, and they do not take into consideration the social and economic condition of the population as a whole. Seldom do we stop to consider whether the well being of the inhabitants is improving in accordance with the increased population and the country's progress.

We are asked to pride ourselves upon our increased population, and we point to the United States as an example. In 1790 the population of the United States was 4,000,000 people; in 1929 it had increased to 120,000,000. A lot of people in Canada would like to see a similar increase take place here during the same period of time. In 1820 the population of the United States was practically the same as it is in Canada to-day. It took that country some twenty-three years to double its population, and the same rate of growth would give Canada a population of 19,000,000 in 1952. We must not forget that conditions are not identical with those existing about a century ago. The social and economic situation to-day does not warrant our expecting as rapid an increase in population.

Canadian industry has greatly benefited through its inventiveness, coupled with the inventiveness of the American people to the south of us; and I do not think anyone will contradict me when I say that conditions to-day cannot be compared with what they were fifty or seventy-five years ago. I have pointed out that our present population of 9,600,000 people is about equal to the population of the United States in 1820. There is no similarity between those two periods; conditions to-day are entirely different from what they were a hundred years ago. It is a well known fact that our agricultural population is strongly opposed to a rapid increase in our rural population; it is also a well established fact that the big industrial leaders and the city dwellers are always asking for a larger population. The transportation interests have been asking for an increased immigration from eastern and southern Europe, and certain politicians have been asking for the men with the sheepskin coats. Economically and socially Canada cannot absorb a too rapid increase in population, such as occurred in the country to the south of us.

To refute the argument of those who say that Canada should follow the American development, there is a wealth of information to be found in the reports of the Agriculture department in the United States. Conditions which developed in that country should be carefully considered if we are to avoid the difficulties which they encountered. During the past twenty years the farm population of the United States has decreased nearly 5,500,000. The figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that the farm population in the United States was 32,000,000 in 1909; in 1929 this had decreased to 27,511,000. About 1,960,000 left the farms last year; 1,978,000 left in 1927 and 2,155,000 left in 1926. It will be readily seen by these figures that the great increase in the agricultural population in the last century in the United States resulted in a decrease during the present century. The transportation companies, the financial interests, the distribution agencies and others concerned all made their profits during the years when the west was being peopled, but the farmers were not permanently benefited and we find that their successors are now leaving the farms.

The argument may be adduced that the Canadian farmer does not live under the same conditions as the American farmer, that the Canadian farmer must rely more and more on the export market. The figures show that during 1909, 14.8 per cent of the agricultural production of the United States was exported; in 1923 the exportations amounted to 16 per cent, and in 1925 they had increased to 18.2 per cent. In other words the American farmer was no less dependent upon foreign trade in 1925 than he was in 1909.

The second factor in the agricultural problem is the relation of efficiency in production to the farming population. The above figures show that there has been a great decrease in the farm population of the United States; and yet this is what Dr. O. E. Baker of the United States Department of Agriculture, has to say regarding agricultural production. His department has been working on an index of farm production which is now fairly complete, and he says:

—to show that at no time since 1900, and probably since 1890 has agricultural production increased at so rapid a rate as in the years since the world war. This is very remarkable in view of the decrease between 1919 and 1924 in farm land, in crop land, in number of farm

animals, in number of farms and in farm population, as shown by the census. . . This increase in production has continued during 1927 and 1928, and it appears likely that agricultural production will increase for several years at about the present rate.

The reasons for the opposition of the agriculturists to a rapid increase of their number have been stated already. The opening up of new farm areas, improved methods of cultivation and other factors have resulted in an increase of production which has been more rapid than the increase of population. We must realize that most of the countries in Europe are satisfied to have a population which remains stationary.

I read with a great deal of interest the several articles by the ex-premier of Ontario, the Hon. E. C. Drury, which appeared in MacLean's Magazine. Mr. Drury stated that the agricultural sections of the country could not possibly absorb a large increase in population, and also pointed out that on account of the improved conditions in industrial activity more and more immigration would be absorbed in that way. I am absolutely in accord, Mr. Speaker, with what Mr. Drury said when he argued that an increase of immigration would practically clog the agricultural centres, but I do not agree with the ex-premier of Ontario when he states that the industrial centres could absorb quite a large number of immigrants. I believe that industry has a duty to perform in absorbing, first of all, the domestic population. It is a well known fact that there is a strong trend from the farm to the larger centres of population and our industries could easily find practically all the employees they require from that source.

A great improvement has taken place on the farm with regard to machinery. To-day we have the combine which cuts and threshes the wheat at the same time, taking the place of dozens of men. Our rural sections are able to produce a much larger quantity of their products with a smaller number of men. The same principle can be applied to the industrial centres. During the last seven years there has been a reduction of almost 2,000,000 workers in the United States industries, but in spite of that the production per worker is to-day some 43 per cent greater than it was in 1920. This has created a tremendous unemployment problem despite the general prosperous conditions which prevail, and the surplus of labour which is now seeking employment is the result of the years of tremendous immigration. In my section of the country a modern paper mill was built about 4 years ago; an up-to-date mill was erected there just recently, and it has been found that five or six men can do the work which it required fifteen men to do ten years ago. We are not in the same position to-day which the United States faced fifty years ago, economically, agriculturally and industrially, and we are all aware of the fact that at the present time the United States is confronted with a great unemployment situation which will be unavoidable in Canada if we follow the principle of unlimited immigration.

It surprises me to hear criticism from the other side as to unemployment in this country. If we permit unlimited immigration we will be faced with an unemployment situation which will be incapable of solution. Just to give a concrete example to show that in the industrial centres they have an unemployment problem, let me take for instance the United States Steel Corporation, the largest producer of steel products in that country, the production of whose plants may be taken as a good indication of business conditions. In 1923 it employed 260,000 men in all its undertakings, whereas in 1928 it employed only 222,000 men. In five years it had been able to reduce its labour force by about 40,000, and at the same time to maintain as high or a higher production of steel. In the manufacturing plants the displacement of labour is most marked, as it is possible to correlate the production and the working force. In 1926 the plants of the United States Steel Corporation produced 14,300,000 tons of rolled and finished steel products, and employed about 184,000 people. Last year they produced 14,000,000 tons, but employed 160,000 men. Labour, it appears, is assuming a less and less important role in manufacturing, and for that reason the need of immigration grows steadily less. This is characteristic of all the industries in the United States, and as all are displacing labour, it becomes increasingly difficult for the men to find work. Of course new industries are being developed, but notwithstanding their demands for labour there is still a surplus of workers.

We could apply the same principle to the automobile industry in Canada, which during the last few years has increased its output but at the same time has decreased the number of men employed. Canadian development is patterned on United States lines. Efficiency in production is almost as great in Canadian as in United States plants. The output of automobiles in Canadian plants has been greatly increased, and yet some of the factories find they need fewer employees. Canada to-day is in a far different position from that

occupied by the United States fifty years ago. At that time the United States had no industrial rival to attract its citizens, and those who desired to leave the country were forced to take an ardous journey at great expense. Canada cannot afford to reduce the standard of living or its wages in any field, because of the ease with which a native-born Canadian can cross over into the United States to seek a higher standard of living. Let me quote a sentence written by Mr. A. S. Whitely in a recent issue of Saturday Night. He said:

> Necessity forces us to conform to American standards in our economic life and this in turn means that we can adopt no economic policy that would tend to prejudice our present standards. The immigration of peoples to our country must be guided very carefully so that no class of workers will find that they are being subjected to severe competition whether in the field or in the factory. Any modification of our present policy of immigration should be undertaken only with the greatest safeguards for the Canadian people.

I may be a little parochial in my viewpoint, but one thing that has always surprised me in a discussion of this nature is that we speak in terms of the western prairies. I should be the last man to wish any harm to the western prairies, because I realize they constitute one of the biggest factors of our present prosperity. But coming from a part of the country which also needs a colonization scheme—and I believe the proposed scheme involves some $300,000,000—it seems to me that the hon. member for North Vancouver should include northern Ontario in his proposal. It seems strange to me also, coming from the northern section of Ontario, that any of those schemes should take in only one section of the country. British Columbia has a very large section to be colonized; Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, northern Ontario and Quebec have large sections and the maritime provinces have also a section that could be colonized. That is why I believe that in a discussion of this nature we should generalize our experience and include every section of the country.

Another thing that surprises me is the falsity of some of the statements. I listened with a good deal of interest the other night to the well prepared speech of the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). He mentioned that Canada had a total area of 3,500,000 square miles—and that is true—but at the same time he did not say that four-fifths of that area is not fit for colonization purposes. We often say that a hundred years from now we should have the same number of people as they have in the United States. But we forget our climatic conditions. We seem to follow a policy of hush-hush, of not mentioning the climatic conditions which constitute an important factor in regard to colonization and other schemes. We all know it is an historic fact that the Labrador coast and the Hudson bay were discovered at the same time as the great lakes, but if one looks at the map he will see that the southern section of Ontario contains practically one-third of the population of Canada, while on the Labrador coast and the Hudson bay region there are only a few thousand people. Let us visualize this point in another way. Suppose Canada had the same climatic conditions as exist in the United States: I would guarantee an exodus of millions of people from the United States within the next few years. We have good healthy climatic conditions in Canada, but if you look at the map you will see that most of our colonization and settlement is on the southern part of the country. It is true that we have a wonderful north, and coming from there I believe in its future, but it is absolutely impossible for the north to maintain a dense population at any time. Therefore we must follow some of the principles that the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) gave utterance to the other night, namely, that when we speak about immigration and colonization we should tell the truth and the whole truth in respect to all these matters. In northern Ontario we have a winter that lasts from five to seven months, and every hon. member present knows that we never dread spring, but we are all more or less afraid of the winter. This is a condition of affairs that we do not publish to the world, and when the immigrants come here they are disillusioned during their first winter, and in fact cannot accommodate themselves to these conditions.

Our climatic conditions give us seasonal employment. We all know that there are dozens of industries which work full time during the summer months and which have to close part of the time during the winter. Our agricultural activities are also not as great in the winter as in the summer. Construction work, railroad work, and so forth, are more active in the summer than in the winter. Practically only mining and lumbering are as active, if not more so, in the winter than in the summer. So we have there a situation which must be dealt with. If we have seasonal employment we should also have seasonal immigration. By that I mean that no immigrant should be allowed to enter Canada from the first of September to the first of March of the following year. I speak feelingly about this matter because I remember that as a young man working in the

lumber camps we received $35 to $40 a month, and early in the fall many immigrants would come out and underbid us by working for $25 a month, thus taking the bread from the mouths of the Canadian people. In the fall we should be very careful about admitting immigrants and the wonder is that we do not have more unemployment during the winter months. Everyone knows that industrial activities in Canada are not as great in the winter as they are in the summer, and to be fair to our own Canadian people as well as to the prospective immigrant we should provide that no immigrant be allowed to enter this country from the first of September to the first of March of the following year. People who have done manual work, who have to compete with immigrants to earn bread and butter, will fully appreciate my suggestion in this regard.

I do not believe in paternalism, in spoon-feeding. We had a wonderful example of government paternalism in our section of the country; I allude to the Kapuskasing settlement. With the best intentions in the world, the provincial government spent in that section hundreds of thousands of dollars to assist some returned soldiers to settle on the land. Certainly the land was opened up, cottages were built, and a certain amount of capital was furnished; but because the people who were put into that section of the country were not familiar with the climatic conditions, they were unable to succeed, the result being that eventually the provincial government had to send trains there to bring them out. We must realize that farming is not a trade; it is a vocation, a profession, a calling, and no matter what department tries to do the work, you cannot make a farmer overnight. Farming has to come as a training from boyhood, or one has to have a certain amount of training that will make him familiar with the agricultural situation. I am not in favour of helping any prospective immigrant, but if that principle is to be maintained, it should be made generally applicable to our Canadian people who want to migrate from one province to another—although, as I say, I am not in favour of such a scheme.

Subsidies for the clearing of the land is the solution of the problem as I see it in my section of the country. It is not so hard for a person to leave the section in which he lives, whether it be in Europe or in Canada. His trouble begins when he starts to prepare the land for cultivation, and it is when men show themselves to be bona fide settlers that the government should step in and subsidize them. I read with a good deal of interest last week in a report of the provincial government of Quebec that it has spent nearly a quarter of a million dollars in subsidies for the settlers in that province. That is the best investment the province could make, and I say that this principle should be applied generally throughout Canada. Cut out any other spoon-feeding grants that you will, but help the man who is actually settled on the land and is or intends to become a farmer.

I listened with a good deal of interest to the scheme that was outlined by the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae). The poor settlers that would locate in the part of the country to which he referred would be loaded with debt, and new settlers would only get discouraged. There is another phase to be considered. We ask for more and more agriculturists and farm hands in this country, but it is a known fact that in the part of the country I represent only a very small percentage of the people actually remain on the farm. The man you want to help is not the one who travels from one section of the country to the other. Rather you should help the man who is making sacrifices and doing real pioneer work. Some people say: Why do they not do like our forefathers, hew a home for themselves out of the forest? Social and economic conditions to-day are quite different from what they were many years ago, and I am convinced that if the government would see fit to subsidize the farmer in the actual clearing of his land, that would be the solution of our immigration and colonization problem. The best immigration and colonization agent in this country is the satisfied worker and the satisfied settler. I have in my constituency several communities that are prosperous. These people came from Scotland and England, from the province of Quebec and other parts of the province of Ontario. A few of them found that the land was good and decided to settle there. They have that community spirit which is absolutely necessary for successful colonization, and they have been doing better colonization work than has been done under any other government scheme that I have so far seen.

Just a few words in regard to the colonization situation in northern Ontario; and in this connection I wish to make a special appeal to the representatives, whether Liberal or Conservative, from Ontario. I am not going to make any criticism of the provincial administration in Ontario. I have said previously in this house, and I say it again, that I believe Premier Ferguson is a friend of the north, but for the last ten years we have had no colonization policies emanating from the present provincial government. Whether

it is because of ignorance or some other reason, I do not know. It seems to me that the provincial government's activities are centered mostly on the newsprint and mining industries. That is a good thing for the northern part of the province, but what applies to the rest of Canada is applicable also to northern Ontario; its primary industry is, and always will remain, agriculture. I am saying this not in any spirit of bitterness, but because I know that our section of the country is well situated for settlement purposes.

Northern Ontario consists of nine districts —Nipissing, Timiskaming, Sudbury, Algoma, Thunder Bay, Rainy River, Kenora, Patricia and Cochrane. These districts cover an area of 330,000 square miles, of which 20,000,000 acres is good land. The clay belt, which starts from the Quebec border and runs west a distance of 350 miles, and is from 25 to 150 miles in depth, comprises about 16,000,000 acres, of which 75 or 80 per cent is suitable for agricultural purposes. I have often read statements by the premiers of the different provinces that they are willing and ready to receive a large immigration. I must say in all sincerity that northern Ontario is not prepared to receive a larger immigration. The present Premier of the province of British Columbia, during the visit of the Empire Parliamentary Association last fall, stated to that body that he was willing to receive more and more immigrants for British Columbia from the British Isles. I do not know the exact situation in British Columbia, but I believe it is the same in Ontario—no provincial government is in a position to-day to receive a very large number of immigrants. If Ontario were suddenly called on to take care of 10,000 new immigrants we would not have the facilities which would be necessary properly to receive them, and they could not make a livelihood.

Three or four years ago, without any reason whatever so far as we could see, and without consulting anyone residing in the northern section of Ontario, the provincial government saw fit to reduce the size of our farms from 160 to 80 acres. Let me ask hon. members: would anybody leave the older sections of Ontario and Quebec or Europe to settle on eighty acres in northern Ontario when they could just as well go out west and get a quarter or half section to settle on even to-day? I believe that this reduction in the size of our farms is prejudicial to any colonization scheme in northern Ontario, and members on all sides of the house should use whatever influence they have to make the provincial government of Ontario realize the anomalies that exist to-day in that northern part of the country.

I read a very interesting interview by the Premier of Ontario last fall, in the Monthly Review, in which he expressed his surprise at the size of the farms in Denmark. If this new ruling in regard to the size of the farms in northern Ontario had been made after the premier had visited Denmark, I would have been inclined to think he was trying to copy in northern Ontario the pocket edition farms that are to be found in Denmark, but the provincial ruling came out before the premier's visit overseas. I intend to protest against it at every opportunity and to ask the provincial administration in Ontario to make the size of our farms what they were three or four years ago. No farmers will leave the older provinces to settle on a farm of eighty acres in northern Ontario, because we have a lot of waste land and a lot of low land, and the settler must necessarily have a larger holding if he is going to settle and attract population to that section of the country. I could give the names of people who have resided on their farms in northern Ontario for the last fifteen years and still have no transportation facilities. They have no road facilities. About twenty years ago the provincial government opened the land along the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway and along the Canadian Northern railway, comprising an area of 5,000 square miles. I believe that that was a very bad scheme, but the provincial government is yearly spending a considerable sum of money on it. The northern development branch department spends nearly $5,000,000 a year on it, but even with that enormous expenditure, on account of the thinly settled population and the very large areas to be settled there are still many people suffering under the present colonization scheme that we have in that section.

I believe we should have two separate departments in the provincial government, one dealing with lands and the other with forests. The two departments are at present combined, but I think it would be much better for northern Ontario to have them divided so that more attention could be given to all the problems pertaining to colonization. I am making these points as clearly as I can so that the house will realize that colonization or immigration schemes, as was said by the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Adshead), are almost a provincial matter. The provinces should have something to say about bringing a large immigration into any section of the country.

Coming to the amendment that has been moved by the hon. member for North Vancouver, I believe that his proposal is the very negation of his amendment. In his amendment he mentions that in some sections of Alberta people are settled far away from transportation facilities and do not enjoy the benefits of schools and hospitals, but almost in the very same breath he delivers a speech in which he wants the government to spend $30,000,000 a year for the next ten years to maintain a situation which he considers bad. I know that it is a bad situation to place the farmers away from the facilities of civilization, schools, hospitals, good roads and the like. I think the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver North defeated its own end because his proposal would simply continue the present anomaly. It has been proven that Canada to-day is not able to receive a very large number of agricultural immigrants, nor are the industrial centres able to receive a very large immigration.

The new sections of our country always have great problems. In my speech on the budget I made allusion to the fact that last fall the premiers of Ontario and Quebec called a conference of the newsprint interests to see what could be done for the industry. We are all familiar with the fact that in that industry there has been surplus production, and one of the first results of that over-production was that the prices were reduced to the producer. One thing that surprised me was that the pulpwood producer was not present at these conferences. Immediately the price of newsprint was lowered, the price of pulpwood paid to the settler was lowered, and last winter we had this anomaly, that in one section companies were cutting their own wood at a cost of $12 a cord and at the same time were paying $5.75 a cord to the settler. I should be the last man to advocate price fixing, but there is too much of a spread between the actual price paid to the settler and the actual cost to these big industries. If the government see fit to protect industry, I think they could also see fit to protect the primary producer, who is the settler. Pulpwood is the first crop in our section. In the last fifteen years I do not remember a year, unless it was at the end of the war, when farmers were making a dollar out of their pulpwood. Statements have been made in the provincial house that the settler is the enemy of the forest. He is not. He wants eventually to get at the land. and if in the meantime he received a fair remuneration for cutting pulpwood he would be the first man to protect the forest; but in order to get at his land so as to make a living off it as soon as possible, he destroys the forest as fast as he can. There is also the fact that in our pulwood industry and in our lumber camps a lot of men are receiving only $40 and $45 a month. The father of a family cannot live on such a wage. After paying rent and clothing for his family there is nothing left. I have seen a good many settlers in northern Ontario leave on account of the fact that they could not make a living wage, and having done so they spread the rumour that that section of the country is not fit for cultivation.

It has been mentioned quite often—I believe it was stated during the discussion—that the solution of our colonization problem will be brought about by the imposition of a higher tariff. I do not believe that our friends opposite are quite serious when they say that, especially applying it to a new country such as new Ontario. It must be realized that our settlers cannot be expected to manufacture their products and ship them and compete in the markets of the world with a high tariff. Surely our friends opposite do not realize the situation. Would they like to have a higher tariff against newsprint, or against the mining industry? I believe they are simply talking about something to which they have not given very careful consideration. One of the things that has kept many people away from that country is the cost of manufacture of the goods which they have to buy. The same thing applies to the agricultural population. We cannot expect in this country to bring in hundreds and thousands of people every year and place them on farms and enable them to have fair prices for their products. We read that we have shiploads of wheat all ready to be unloaded but that on account of over-production they cannot be unloaded. We know that last year western farmers produced a very heavy crop, but to-day they are getting a lower price for it than they did the previous year. The policy of the government should not be for larger immigration, but for quality rather than quantity.

Mr. W. T. LUCAS (Camrose): Mr. Speaker, while I cannot agree with the amendment that has been placed before the house by the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae), I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating him on giving to the house a well thought out scheme of dealing with our very important immigration problem. I think the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) stated during his debate that while he has been the subject of a great deal of criticism from time to time, the suggestion put forward by the hon. member for North

Vancouver is the first constructive suggestion that he has received. I am sure the house will agree with me when I say that the hon. member for North Vancouver must have given a great deal of time and thought to this question, and must have gone to a great deal of expense to develop the scheme which he has placed before us.

So far as I am concerned, I must say that I cannot agree with that scheme, first because we are still quite young out in Alberta, and we have hopes that if we live to a reasonable age we will some time in the not too distant future get control of our natural resources. I am not in favour of delegating to the Dominion government the control of a vast area in the province of Alberta for the purposes of colonization. That is something about which the province should have a great deal to say, especially with regard to the number and class of settlers that they admit. In the second place, I think the member for North Vancouver was wrong in directing his amendment only against the Department of Immigration. If we had to deal only with the amendment it might be very hard to vote against it, but it is the scheme that is outlined in connection with the amendment to which I take objection. The amendment says in part:

> This house regrets the failure of the government to profit by Canadian experience in the colonization and settlement of the country and deplores the fact that men and women have, during recent months, been settled on western Crown lands at great distances from transportation, educational, hospital and other facilities, thereby making it almost impossible for them to achieve success and happiness in their new surroundings.

With that part of the amendment I think every hon. member will heartily agree, and if that policy had been adopted in the early settlement of the country I am sure we would have met with a great deal more success. It is too late now to go back to the older settled portions of the country in order to apply some of the ideas which the hon. member for North Vancouver has laid before the house. However, some of them might be adopted yet, by applying block settlement in the undeveloped sections of our country. I do not believe it is fair to the new settler to allow him to go at random hundreds of miles from the railway and then leave him stranded there, because if that is done he will not be able to make a success.

Coming now to the latter part of the amendment:

> —and is of the opinion that such conditions can only be remedied by immediate reorganization of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the reorganization of the Department of Immigration and Colonization will not remedy the situation. This amendment should have been directed either against the whole government, or against the Department of the Interior, which has the mapping and blocking out of the homesteads. Once those lands are blocked out and put on the market, as it were, for settlers, I take it that the Immigration and Colonization Department is not responsible.

The hon. member for North Vancouver in outlining this scheme, as I understood him, said that in this block settlement a settler would receive a homestead at possibly a valuation of $1,500 for improvements; that with concentration this territory would develop very rapidly, the land would soon reach the value of improved land in older settled districts, and I think he mentioned a sum of approximately $30 an acre. In my opinion Mr. Speaker, if that plan were adopted it would mean an exodus from our older settled districts, because the man who was heavily involved, who had a heavy debt hanging over him, would be certainly well advised to throw up his farm, go into this new district and take up land where he would have an overhead of only $1,500 to start with, in the knowledge that within a very short time, because of this concentrated development, the value of the land would increase to approximately $30 an acre.

If there is any criticism to make in regard to the government, I would say that they have not attributed to this immigration problem the importance it deserves, because until the present minister was appointed the Department of Immigration and Colonization did not have a minister of its own. It was treated more or less as a subsidiary.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the immigration question in Canada is one of the most important problems that we are faced with to-day. When we consider Canada as a young, practically undeveloped country, covering a vast area, in fact greater in area than that of the United States, with immense natural resources, capable of sustaining a population of almost unlimited numbers and at the present time with only nine or ten million people. We are now laying a foundation for the future of this country. On the foundation we are laying to-day will depend the future, and therefore to my mind the matter assumes a very great importance. With reference to criticisms of the government, I want to give credit where it is due, and I believe the present Minister of Immigration has perhaps a greater conception of what the farmer is up against than any other minister who has held that

portfolio. I can say that our farm organization passed resolutions congratulating him on having limited the number of settlers brought in under the railway agreement, and I am sure that from this corner of the house at any rate he will not be criticised, at least for maintaining some restrictions on the numbers and classes of immigrants coming into the country.

There is hardly a public man in Canada to-day who, in making a speech, does not refer to the great natural resources with which this Dominion is blessed, and anyone who cares to go into that subject can certainly make a very fine presentation. But I sometimes wonder whether we are honest with ourselves, whether we are sincere when making these statements, whether we really believe them, when after boasting about these great natural resources we turn around and offer people inducements to come to the country and share those resources with us. It seems to me to be something like the man trying to sell gold dollars for pennies; because if we write and tell these people about our great natural resources and then offer them inducements to come to Canada, the first thought that occurs to them is this: If those people are so anxious to get rid of those resources there must be something wrong.

We hear a good deal these days about keeping the present farm population on the farms, and this has reference very largely to the desire to retain the boys and girls in the rural communities. Well, one of the most important things that can contribute to bringing this about is the raising of the standard of living on the farm, and unless we are able to do this it is difficult to keep the boys and girls from drifting into the cities. Our organizations in the west have been doing a great deal in an endeavour to raise the standard of the social and economic life of the farmers, just so that we may do what every person is anxious to do, namely, to keep on the old homestead those who are best fitted to develop the country. But while we are doing that, on the one hand, there is on the other a tendency on the part of certain interests in the country to flood Canada with a type of people from certain parts of Europe who have a much lower standard of living than we are accustomed to here. The result is that what we are doing with one hand we are undoing with the other. I do not think we shall ever make much progress by following such a system.

[Mr. Lucas.]

The idea seems to prevail in many quarters that we need an increased population in Canada. With that idea I have no quarrel. But I am throroughly convinced that we are never going to increase the population of this country very rapidly by specializing in the immigration of farmers. The whole trend at the present time is from rural to urban life and industry. During the last twenty years in the United States the rural population has decreased 5,500,000 in number. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economy, the farm population of the United States in 1909 was 32,000,000, and in 1929, 27,511,000. Now let us take the figures in Canada. Going back to the year 1870, we find that the percentage of rural population was at that time 69; in 1901, it had decreased to 63 per cent, and in 1925 it was 50½ per cent. But in the United States while the farming population has decreased in such large numbers we find nevertheless that the proportion of agricultural exports has greatly increased. The same authority informs us that in 1909 the percentage of exportable agricultural products was 14.8; in 1923 it was 16 per cent, and in 1925, 18.2 per cent.

I am of the opinion, with reference to increasing production in Canada, that with the present farm population we have, and with the increased efficiency of machinery—because we are rapidly approaching the power farming age—our farmers, if given fair markets, could very materially increase their production of wheat; and when we consider that we produced this year over 500,000,000 bushels of wheat, it seems to me that we are going to increase this product at a more rapid rate than consumption will take care of. Our problem is the relation of efficiency in production to farm population.

What I object to in connection with this immigration question is the fact that everyone seems to be anxious to increase the population by bringing in more farmers, but no one wants to bring in anyone who will compete in other walks of life. So far as the immigration policy is concerned, I should be willing to throw it open to those people who would like to come here and share the country with us; but certainly no discrimination should be shown in endeavouring to bring farmers alone. We notice in the papers today that the price of wheat for the first time in years has dropped below the dollar mark on the American market, and if the scheme is put into force, which the hon. member for North Vancouver has laid before the house, for bringing in another few million farmers

for settlement within a few years in the Peace River country, one can readily visualize the result. And I feel it would not be fair to those farmers whom we have at the present time.

I think our federal government should take full control of the immigration policy and not delegate it to any other organization such as the railways. There is no doubt about it that the railways are anxious to bring in more immigrants. Increased production means increased business for them; and they get the same cost for hauling a bushel of wheat, irrespective of what the farmer gets for it, whether he gets any profit, or what quality of wheat is shipped. We can therefore readily understand why the railway companies are anxious to bring in new settlers. But if we flood this country with agriculturists and the price of farm produce drops below a remunerative basis, then it simply means that these people will move into the cities and we shall be in a worse position than when we started. I believe that the very best immigration policy any country can have is one that produces a prosperous, contented settler. We are spending at least five million dollars through the department, and there are other organizations, such as the railways and the provincial governments, which are also spending large sums. But our Dominion government is spending this year approximately $5,000,000. The figures are $3,462,000 in the regular immigration estimates, and under the item "soldier and general land settlement" we have $1,400,000 for general settlement, advances and cost of administration. That is given as the expenditure in connection with the colonization of the settlers brought to this country. My contention is that if a sufficient amount of that $5,000,000 was expended to place fairly before the world the possibilities of the resources of Canada—

Mr. FORKE: When the estimates come up I will be able to show that the amount expended in securing immigrants is only $1,404,483.

An hon. MEMBER: Is the rest for salaries of officials?

Mr. LUCAS: In that case the minister must have a tremendous overhead in his department.

Mr. FORKE: There are many other services besides immigration.

Mr. LUCAS: We have endeavoured to reestablish our soldiers by placing them on the land, and as the minister knows, many of them are struggling along and it is very doubtful whether many of them will ever be able to come through. I believe that if the government would spend a sufficient amount of money to place properly before the world the advantages which Canada offers, and leave it at that, and then spend this $5,000,000 in order to reduce the soldiers' indebtedness, it would go a long way towards keeping many of the returned men upon the land. They would be there permanently and I believe it would be much more advantageous to spend the money in that way than practically to throw it away as we are doing at the present time.

Mr. HARRY J. BARBER (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to deal with this question of immigration in a general way or to direct general criticisms against the department. We all remember the opening remarks of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Forke) when he undertook to reply to the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae). He said that one of the peculiarities of his department was that he had no idea from what quarter he might expect an attack. I think he realizes, as we all do, that the Department of Immigration is open to strong criticism from almost every quarter. This afternoon an hon. gentleman opposite directed criticism towards the plans or schemes evolved by this government during the last four or five years, and I intend to confine my remarks to one of those suggested plans or schemes.

There is a natural desire on the part of Canadians to settle this country, as far as possible, with people of British origin, and I am sure many hoped that success would follow the adoption of the plan known as the three thousand family scheme, which was backed by the British government. I do not say that that scheme has entirely failed, but I do claim that it would have been more successful had it been fairly and wisely administered. This plan or any plan will be successful only so long as we keep faith with the people who are brought to this country. Through letters and interviews I have had directed to my attention the conditions which surround some twenty or more families in my district, and I do not think my district is different from any other in Canada. From the evidence produced in these cases I have come to the conclusion that people have been brought to this country under misrepresentations, and that the conditions which sur-

round them at the present time are almost unbearable. I should like the house to bear with me for a moment while I read what some of these families have to say. Just note the reception this family received:

We arrived in Canada in May, 1926, our destination unknown, other than somewhere round Vancouver; arrived at Winnipeg, informed destination Haney—arrived at Haney—taken to Whonnock—10 miles east—to the property known as "Reid property", we being the fourth since the board took it over, one of these being a Jap. Needless to say what a Jap could not make go, a Britisher need not try in the line adopted. The holding was 6¼ acres including buildings, house, creek and bush. Mostly gravel—not quite what one would suggest as suitable for mixed farming (what we came out to do) and keep a family of five.

That is the experience of one of the families which were brought out by this department under the three thousand family scheme. The problems which have been placed before these people are practically unworkable. Another man writes and says:

I have got about 25 acres of cleared land, 20 acres of lake, which is no good at all, and 59 acres second grown bush and stumps. I might say the 25 acres of cleared land is entirely run out and it will take qute five years to get it back into shape. The price is $5,800, which I am sure is twice its value.

Another man writes:

I have erected a silo and also spent upwards of $3,000, never leaving the place. The description of place is 25 acres of lake, which is no earthly good and only 25 acres cleared, and 54 acres are bush and stump. The price is $4,800, which I am sure is twice its value. The cleared land being completely run out. With luck and no failure of crop at a big reduced price we could perhaps struggle through.

Another man writes:

Well my trouble is that the land we are settled on is far above the value that was stated in the old country and I find it impossible to make a living on the farm at the present price as we do not get returns for our produce to meet the payments by half.

Those are a few of the many letters which I have received. There is another settlement to which I wish to refer, and one which I think the minister is well acquainted with; the Scotch settlement on the Amiens farm near Gifford, British Columbia. Fifteen families are located on this farm, having been brought to this country under the scheme during the years 1925, 1926 and 1927. These settlers were no doubt proud of the fact that a brother Scot was the head of the department of the government which had brought them to this country. They felt that under those conditions they would at least receive a square deal. They are of a very intelligent class, and realizing the position in which they have been placed they organized themselves into a body and conducted their negotiations with the department in a businesslike manner. I have before me a number of letters directed to the minister, and I should like to refer to one written in February, 1928, and directed to the land settlement branch. In my opening remarks I mentioned that I was convinced that a number of people had been brought to this country under misrepresentations, and the statements made in these letters verify that charge. This letter reads as follows:

We would refer you to a memo headed, "memo re settlement of fifteen Scottish families in dairy farming, British Columbia", a copy of which was given to several of our number by your agents in Glasgow. There are a number of statements in this memo which are absolutely false and others are grossly misleading. We would refer to them in detail.

The statement was made: "This farm was successfully operated as a dairy farm along modern lines by the Hygienic Dairy Company of Vancouver." This was absolutely untrue as any who were shareholders in the concern can testify. It so happens that two of our number are acquainted with people in the old country who put money into it and got nothing out of it.

Another part says: "The property has been subdivided into fifteen farms of approximately thirty acres each & etc." This is untrue and would lead one to believe that all boundary fences had been erected, whereas the settlers after coming here had to erect all the boundary fences between the different holdings, as well as build bridges to carry farm wagons and loads.

Under the heading of "Soils and Crops", it says: "The soil is uniform throughout", and that it is "very fertile" and produces large yields of grain, hay, potatoes & etc.". Some of us have had two crops and others one crop off the land and it is beyond our comprehension how anyone with even the most elementary knowledge of agriculture can say such things. The crops have not even been average crops with the possible exception of Timothy hay and that is of little use as a feed for dairy cows. With regard to the statement that the "soil is uniform throughout", we should like to know how it is that the prices per acre of different holdings vary so much, and if, as the Superintendent of the Vancouver office says, these holdings were valued by an independent advisory committee, why, with such information as to prices, was such a statement put in the memo?

It futher states "Drainage is provided by the creek which runs through the farm and large exterior ditches which are maintained by the provincial government. Isolated small parts of the farm requiring additional drainage can readily be remedied." Care is taken that no information is given that the cost of the ditches & etc., are a direct charge against the land and amount to fully $1.50 per acre. In this connection also it has been noted that the dyking charges amount to $1.90 per acre in addition to above. This information also was carefully left out. The statement that isolated small parts requiring additional drainage can readily be remedied is untrue. The whole place needs

drainage. The enclosed photographs were taken on 12/1/1928. The holdings below the water are valued at $190 and $195 per acre and taxes (dyking, drainage and municipal) amount to $5.20 per acre per annum.

Then again:

The statement is also made that the British Columbia Electric Railway provides an hourly service to Vancouver. That is untrue. There are only three trains each way daily.

And further:

We would draw your attention particularly to the following:—land prices and taxation.

Land is valued to us at far above its economic value. Prices of holdings range from $153 to $200 per acre. The combined municipal, dyking and drainage taxes work out at fully $5 per acre per anum and these are more likely to increase than decrease. Holdings in this vicinity can be rented easily for $10 per acre.

. . . This land with taxes works out at about $20 per acre per anum, inclusive of stock and equipment loan and insurance.

In regard to the £300 which is advanced by the British government this is what they say:

The loans of £300 per settler granted by the British government are not being unfairly disbursed. All booklets et cetera issued at home indicated that this sum would be available for each settler but we now find that not more than $7,500 can be debited to any settler's account. This means that settlers with larger holdings or higher priced land get a smaller loan for stock and equipment than those with cheaper or smaller holdings. The maximum accommodation supplied is for eight cows and two horses per holding and no settler however competent can ever hope to make full anual payments, purchase necessary feed and live, off that stock.

They conclude their letter by saying:

In conclusion, we would again urge you strongly to set up an inquiry into the matters here. This would reveal a state of affairs which goes to make land settlement under Dominion government auspices at least in British Columbia one of the foulest blots on the union jack since slavery was abolished. If you cannot undertake to have this done in face of all the facts we have put before you, would you kindly make transportation arrangements for ten or twelve families from this settlement back to the old land where we know we can get everything fair and aboveboard and without any deceitful practices.

They have written a number of letters, and they complain that they have not had a reply to many of them. They have pressed continually for some kind of investigation. In a letter dated March 5 last, they draw to my attention the following:

In Colonel Rattray's letter of 3rd March, 1928, he made mention of a plan which he was formulating for the purpose of assisting us, and again, in Overseas Settlement Department's letter, dated 5th April, 1928 and Lord Lovat's letter of 23rd April, 1928, the statement is made that the Land Settlement branch had prepared a plan for putting this settlement on a successful basis. That plan has never been divulged to us.

On June 8 of last year, while these estimates were under consideration, I drew to the attention of the minister the condition of this settlement and he promised me that an officer of the department would be sent immediately to British Columbia and that these matters would be adjusted. Major Ashton arrived about the latter part of July for the purpose of making a report. About two weeks ago I asked the minister for a copy of the report which I received along with a letter from the minister dated May 13. This report is headed "An up-to-date statement of conditions regarding the Scots settlement". Still in that report no plan of relief has been disclosed, so that the situation has not been relieved up to the present time. The minister points out in his letter that these settlers have already received preferential treatment as compared with Canadian citizens purchasing adjoining property at Amiens. I should like to point out that they have not received what might be termed preferential treatment, apart from the fact that their payments of principal and interest of 5 per cent are amortized and spread equally over twenty-five years, whereas Canadian citizens pay 10 per cent of the purchase price down, the balance bearing interest at 6 per cent and being repayable in equal instalments spread over a period of twenty years. Then the minister points out that it might be interesting to note that a certain gentleman has purchased one of these holdings of 38.5 acres and has paid $10,000 cash for it. This happens in almost every community. Some man may come along who has a good deal of money and can afford to pay more then than the man who intends to pay for the land out of the production. I happen to know of this Mr. Menaul who paid the $10,000. He was an Irishman who had accumulated considerable wealth retailing milk in Pasadena, California. He was born under the union jack and he declared that he was going to die under it. He came into this country to live in his retirement and he wanted to farm as a hobby, at a profit if possible. This is the man who purchased this land and whom the minister points out to me in comparison with these men who have settled on holdings on this particular piece of property. But the report of the real estate man to the minister is not quite correct. I find that in the purchase of this property by this gentleman there were included sixty tons of hay at a value of $14 a ton, also $500 worth of equipment under the bill of sale and a house on the property costing over $2,500. This house is quite modern, has electric light, hot and cold water, bathroom, cistern, sinks, water filters, and so forth. Such

facilities are hardly comparable with those on the property for the accommodation of these settlers. The commissioner's report states:

> Regarding the Scots settlement on the old hygienic dairy farm (Amiens), near Gifford, B.C., I would report that though these holdings are sound farm units; the situation there is unsatisfactory; particularly with regard to the attitude of the Scots settlers towards the financial responsibilities they have undertaken in connection with their holdings. This situation is clearly indicated by the action of a number of these settlers who had live stock purchased for them on the under standing that specified amounts from their monthly cream cheques were paid to our Vancouver office in reduction of their indebtedness and had made specific assignments to that end.

In reply to that I should like to point out that no settler was made aware by the Soldier Settlement Board, before signing a land agreement or purchasing a family cow, that such assignment was required, nor did he understand fully what was really meant; otherwise not one of those land agreements would have been signed. In most cases settlers had three or four cows and were then confronted with a demand for an assignment before further stock and equipment would be purchased. They point out that clause 2 of the agreement of sale states quite explicitly that no demand for payment would be made until the 2nd October following the settler signing the agreement. One man points out that he came out in 1926 and a demand was made in September 1926, when it should not have been made until October, 1927. The commissioner says that the general attitude of these families is based on the old adage, that "the wheel that squeaks the most gets the most grease." I have known this community, I have visited them and been in touch with them ever since I first heard of their troubles, and I find that their general attitude is this: "Right is might" and "British justice shall prevail."

The commissioner in his report shows that these people were induced to come to Canada through misrepresentation. That was one of the charges that this community made to the minister. I should like to quote what the commissioner says in regard to that. Referring to these memoranda which were supplied to them overseas, he says:

> There are statements in the letter and pamphlet that are capable of an interpretation which is not in keeping with the facts. Unfortunately, too, other statements are incorrect.

The commissioner, therefore, who was sent out to investigate this settlement, corroborates the charges made in these letters which I have read. The charge of misrepresentation is backed up by the minister's own commissioner whom he sent out to investigate.

[Mr. Barber.]

In regard to the properties on which these people are placed, they are valued too high, and as a result the settlers cannot hope to pay for them. The whole question comes down to this, that the minister cannot expect to place these settlers on property that is valued simply from a real estate standpoint. The property should be valued on the basis of production.

I have pointed out that these men have been brought in under this scheme through misrepresentation. They are expected to meet total charges against their land amounting to from $20 to $21 an acre per year and keep their families. Many of them have suffered great hardships in order to meet their obligations. One man told me that he had a wife and seven children—

Mr. FORKE: Surely the hon. member knows that these men are not paying anything at the present time.

Mr. BARBER: And they are not going to pay until they get a settlement.

Mr. FORKE: They cannot be undergoing very great hardship when they are not paying anything at all.

Mr. BARBER: These payments ceased only last spring.

Mr. FORKE: They should be doing fairly well.

Mr. BARBER: One man, a real good Scot right from the minister's own country, with a wife and seven children, came out under the minister's scheme and the assignment of his milk cheque left him only three or four dollars a month. He told me with tears in his eyes that he and his family had lived on bread and tea for weeks at a time. Another man told me that in 1927 he paid $483 to the board and received a credit of $34 on principal, the balance going for interest and other charges, and he had records to show this.

In view of all these conditions, the commissioner still says that their attitude is based on the old adage, that "the wheel that squeaks the most gets the most grease". If the minister —who has boasted that he is a Scotch settler, and I am sure we are proud of that fact were himself obliged to experience the conditions under which these men are trying to make good, and were loaded down with the burdens that they bear, he would certainly do some spuealing too.

In conclusion I would say that the cases which I have dealt with prove that people are being brought to this country under conditions that are not desirable and not in the best interests of immigration. It is, in other words, mighty poor advertising. These people

write to their friends in the old country describing the conditions under which they are suffering, and this is bound largely to counteract any benefit that might come from the expenditure set aside by the minister each year for publicity.

While the minister was in my district last year I suggested that he call in and see these settlers at the Amiens farm settlement on his way to Vancouver, but he refused. There was only one conclusion I could come to, and that was that while he was perhaps proud of his race, at the same time he feared them.

In order to establish settlers satisfactorily in this country it is necessary that we should do so on a sound economic basis. That brings me to a resolution which was passed just the other day at the convention of the provincial branch of the Canadian Legion held at Chilliwack. It deals with the settlers under the Soldier Settlement Board, and reads:

> That as the Soldier Settlement Board has failed to establish settlers on an economic basis, we do ask that the appointment of a royal commission to enquire into the reasons for failure and find out a remedy for this condition. We would point out that the total abolition of interest is an integral part of such a remedy, interest already paid to be applied to wiping out the principal and such further relief as equity and fair dealing would show to be necessary as to the unpaid principal. And this convention goes on record as pledging its support to the soldier settler problem both morally, financially and aggressively until such time as a committee to be appointed by the Canadian Legion is satisfied that a sufficient measure of relief has been granted.

I hope the minister will take into consideration the importance of dealing with these people in a fair and honest way so that they may become good and satisfied citizens of our country.

Miss AGNES MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): I think the speech of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Barber) is the best possible argument against the adoption of the scheme proposed by the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae).

Mr. BARBER: It is already adopted.

Miss MACPHAIL: Then why get into another? If we can get out of the thing we are in, let us not try it again. I thought on Sunday that I would read something that was heavy and yet something with humour, and so I read the speech of the hon. member for North Vancouver containing his proposal and the minister's reply, and in them I got both food for thought and a good deal of amusement. The hon. member for North Vancouver has certainly studied the subject, but he has studied it as some people have studied farming—from an arm chair. He talks like a promoter to me. His speech read like a prospectus. It would almost convince one who knew that the thing would not work. I have no doubt at all that the hon. member for North Vancouver is very honest, very clever, and a very estimable gentleman, but he talks of these farmers as though they were inanimate objects, and sometimes I think that farmers must be almost inanimate objects or they would do something to this House of Commons. I wish they could sit in the galleries and hear the words of wisdom that drop frm the lips of hon. members. It seems a pity that such wisdom should be entirely lost. At least the farmers would learn from them a lot about farming that they never learn in actual experience. By listening to the speech of the hon. member for North Vancouver—a lengthy and careful speech, which I did not hear as I was not in the house, and I do not know whether or not he read it; there seems to have been some question about that—they would certainly have heard much about farming that they had never heard before. I say again that the arguments made by the member for Fraser Valley are the best possible arguments that could be made against his scheme. After having read his argument carefully and having read the amendment I could not see that the one bore any relation to the other. That may be because I am stupid, or because there was no relation between them. When I vote against the amendment it is not that I am voting against the amendment but against the scheme.

I am very glad that we still have some unsettled fertile land in Canada that has not yet been broken up and is overgrown with weeds. Let us have it there until we can make good use of it. I am not in too great a hurry to do it. I say that the farm is not a paying proposition and anybody who believes it is should try it and see whether it is the paying proposition that these clever gentlemen think it is before we bring in more farmers to compete with those already here. To do so is not sound sense. To-day farming is a hobby which is pursued by about three classes of people—by the class of people who have made a lot of money out of other people which they do not know what to do with; by people who farm because they like it so much that they would rather do that and make less money than do something else and make more; by people who are caught by force of circumstances from which they cannot free themselves. I think that covers

the lot. As a farm representative I could not sit silent while a lot of what I think was poor twaddle was being talked. I had prepared a speech on immigration, and I filed it away so carefully that I cannot now locate it, so I shall only speak briefly and say what I feel should be said.

As a farmer representative I cannot help to put over a scheme which will still further lower the standard of living on farms. If we want to make Canada more prosperous, then let us bring in lawyers. I do not know of anything we need more in order that their services will not cost so much. Let us bring in more doctors; let us bring in bricklayers and carpenters; let us bring in judges; let us bring in people who are well paid, and let us share our prosperity with them. But let us not bring in people and try to put them on farms where people like my people, who are pioneers, cannot make a decent living on the land, and every one in the house who knows anything about farming knows that that is true. What is the use of bringing in more people to put them in a condition like that? What we are actually doing through our general policy in Canada is to over-industrialize Canada instead of trying to help agriculture. The manufacturers, transportation people and bankers are the people who get the best break in Canada. Our immigration policy reminds me of a person who is constantly having a hemorrhage of his purest blood and trying to keep his health up by having a blood infusion. It is poor preventive medicine, but that is the kind of thing we are doing in the Dominion of Canada.

Who are the people who want immigrants? The railways want immigrants. The banks want immigrants. The manufacturers want immigrants, and there are a few farmers who want cheap labour and think they can get it that way. These people who want immigrants want to bring in more and more of them, and the greener the immigrant the richer the harvest. I think if your take those groups of people out you would not have anybody who wanted to pour immigrants into this country.

I had the privilege of addressing some sixty gatherings in western Canada last year, and twenty odd in Ontario, and I found that the people were more interested in this subject than any other. If you could have heard some of the real farmers laugh at the members of parliament over this subject, and at the government—well it was refreshing to my soul.

I want to propose an immigration policy for the Minister of Immigration. I do not want to be destructive, so I will attempt to be constructive. I would not spend one dollar of state money on immigration—not a dollar. I would do nothing to induce people to come to this country. The Minister of Immigration has stated that the most of what he heard was destructive, not constructive. I should like to recall to the mind of the minister this very proposal that was made time without number in our own caucuses and at our own conferences before he saw fit to cross the floor of the house, and had he taken with him the wisdom he found there he would be even a better minister of immigration than he is—and at that he is better than the one we had before. That is the opinion that is held by farmers throughout Canada. They do not want to see money spent on immigration. I remember a speech that was made one time, quite near morning, by the member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). I am not sure whether it was in 1922 or 1923, but if the Minister of Immigration wants to read about farm conditions let him get that speech and read it. I have not heard as good a speech on the subject since.

If I were going to spend any money on immigration I would spend every bit of it on inspection, inpecting those who come into Canada, in order to see that we got the very best. And I would not go fishing for those, either, telling them a whole lot of things that have not even a resemblance to the truth. I remember last year the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) stating that domestics were induced to come to Canada by telling them there were three hundred thousand surplus men in Canada. What a terrible disappointment must have awaited some of the new women! But if we are to have immigrants coming into this country I would have a very rigid examination of them to see that they were physically healthy and that they were mentally sound, We have not had a careful enough or rigid enough inspection of the people that we have let into Canada in the last few years, although I think it has been a little more rigid than it was before. But even yet, if some of the specimens I have seen coming in this year are general, then all the worse for Canada. And so I would be very, very careful about the kind of people that we let in. But as a farmer representative in this house I must again protest about having only farmers and domestics come in. Let all classes come in who want to come if they are physically and mentally fit, and I would not restrict it to any one nation. What we need in this country is a virile people, people who are not

afraid to face the climate we have or afraid to face any condition, and who can adapt themselves to new environment.

The wheat crop of the world for 1928 exceeded the crop of 1923, which was a bumper crop by 300,000,000 bushels. We need not go on thinking that we can continue increasing our output of wheat without affecting the price of wheat, as I think wheat prices are beginning to show. I want to quote very briefly from a speech made by George McIvor, who is the general sales manager of the Canadian wheat pool. He says:

> I do not wish to overemphasize the large production of grains in 1928, as the other side of the picture, namely, the very heavy consumption of wheat this year, is very important, but I do wish to make it perfectly clear that the supply of bread grains relative to the demand for same is considerably larger than last year and, of course, it naturally follows that the supply will be disposed of at lower prices than those prevailing a year ago.

Any sensible person who knows that if you increase and increase your production you will finally decrease or lower your prices. People after all can eat only so much, and while it is true that when the standard of living begins to rise in the oriental countries there will be more bread grains consumed there, it is also true that as the standard of living goes even higher, as it is in this country and some other countries, less bread grains are consumed. The people use other things, and do not consume as much wheat as they did before.

A farmer who lives in my constituency was telling of an amusing experience he had with immigrants, and as a matter of fact this experience was rather coming to him. Last winter we had a long discussion on this subject of immigration. He still thought that it was a very good thing for the man who owned the land to bring in immigrants in order that he might get someone cheap to work for him, and so he proceeded to test out his own theory. He got quite a good looking and really clever fellow, an immigrant. He was to stay a year. He came in the fall, stayed until the beginning of seeding and then left. He tried for another, and one came to his town and he went out to get him. It was a cold and blue sort of day. The farmer met the boy, for he was nothing more than that, and brought him to where his team and wagon were and told him he would be back in a moment. When he came back the boy was missing. They instituted a search and located him. When they got near him he took to his heels and fled, and that was the last of him. So he tried a third one, and he told me without any hesitation at all that he wished heartily this last one would follow the example of his predecessor. That is his experience, and he is now coming round to my position on the immigration problem.

I am not going to quote resolutions passed by farm organizations; the Minister of Immigration is familiar with them. He knows the position of agriculture in the matter, and as this is an immigration policy that affects agriculture, then agriculture should be consulted; they should have the say as to what is to be done. As soon as other classes are willing that their numbers should be added to from other countries then they have the right to say what is to be done, but not until then.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, before the question is put there are a few things that I desire to say, more particularly as this question of immigration has been one of great interest to the farmers of the west, and especially to the farmers of Alberta. They have taken such a keen interest in this question that they have never failed to notify the department from time to time, through their conventions, as to what their ideas in respect to the matter were, and I am going to take a few minutes before the question is put to emphasize to the minister and to the house one or two of the points which perhaps have not been brought out by previous speakers as definitely as they might have been.

I note, of course, that the minister is saying that he has had no constructive suggestions. I think he made an exception of the suggestion which came from the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae). But I venture to observe that certain constructive suggestions have come from the United Farmers of the west. They may have been suggestions with which he did not agree, or he may be in a position to-night or some other time to reveal the weaknesses of those suggestions. But that they were constructive there can be no doubt, and I hope if he has overlooked them so far he will take them into his serious consideration in the immediate future. One of these constructive suggestions I can put in a very brief form.

I am not certain just exactly how much is being expended on immigration. I know we are about to vote in this house approximately $7,000,000. Some of this goes to one thing and some to another; I do not know how much goes to immigration and how much to something else. Now the minister assures us to-night, in an aside, that we shall not spend much more than slightly over $1,000,000 directly on immigration. But cer-

tain it is that we are going to vote over $3,000,000 having to do with immigration. If only $1,000,000 of this sum is expended in the actual work of immigration and $2,000,000 close by or near to immigration, then the minister, I am sure, will have considerable explaining to do. But I do not think we can go beyond the vote of $3,500,000 in the estimates directly accounted for by immigration expenditures. Now here is a constructive suggestion which I would offer the minister—and it comes direct from the lips of the farmers of the west. Instead of continuing to spend that $3,500,000 in an immigration policy which, for a number of reasons, is absolutely futile, it would be far better political economy and far better for Canada as a nation if that amount were expended in assisting young Canadians who desire to take up agriculture. That, I submit, is a constructive suggestion. The minister may find some reasons why it should not be adopted; he may be able to show us its faults. So far he has not done so; so far as we can see, that $3,500,000 will continue to be spent in bringing to this country people who go out as fast as they come in. The minister has not said to us that he has given the suggestion consideration and finds it cannot be seriously entertained. However, I leave it with him as one constructive suggestion and I hope he will give us a reply, either now or during the discussion of his estimates. Before I am through I shall place on Hansard a number of resolutions passed by organizations in my own riding, as well as resolutions passed by larger organized agricultural bodies, to indicate that the question of immigration is one of great importance to them and that they do think they have at least some constructive suggestions to put forward.

May I for a moment digress to say that I am not levelling any criticism at the Department of Immigration; I fancy that department is just as efficiently run as any other. I am criticising the policy of immigration as such and I shall try to show to the minister and the house that that immigration policy does not belong to the immediate present; it is an immigration policy which had its origin in narrow class desire. There was perhaps a time in the history of Canada when that immigration policy was a great deal more serviceable than it is at the present moment, but I shall try to show that, in the light of certain developments which are now taking place in the country, to continue the present policy is utter folly.

The hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) emphasized the fact that this immigration policy is a class policy. It is a class policy in its origin. It is actually believed, I understand, fairly sincerely by land speculators, that Canada will become more prosperous if more people come into the country; it is believed by railroad companies that Canada will become more prosperous if more people come in; it is believed by banks and ordinary business concerns that Canada will increase in prosperity with an increase in population. Well, we can understand these people, and perhaps from their narrow point of view it would appear to them that greater prosperity must result from an increase in population. Of course, there will be more railway tickets sold; there will be perhaps a little increase in banking; there will be more potatoes and beef and biscuits and so forth sold if our population increases in number. But looking at the question from the national point of view, it will be seen at once that this is after all a narrow class view to take of it, and those who have advocated that policy and who advocate it to-day have obviously not taken all the factors into consideration. The present immigration policy is furthermore a class policy in its effects. The Canadian policy to-day, as it is applied, is strictly speaking a class policy.

Again, the hon. member for Southeast Grey has gone so far as to point out specifically that we would not object if the Immigration department should undertake to bring in a large number of lawyers or doctors. We can apply exactly the same argument to doctors which the hon. member for North Vancouver used in reference to the prairies. The hon. member points out, and quite properly, that there are vast areas of land that can be put under cultivation, that there is a great deal of brush that might be cut, that machines could do the cutting, with immigrants to operate those machines. No one will question that; the hon. member's analysis is perfect in this respect. But might I not point out that annually we have great waves of measles, great waves of whooping cough, great waves of flu, providing any amount of work for doctors—far more doctors than we now have in Canada. It would be as wise to advocate that we should increase the number of our doctors by means of immigration because of periodic attacks of flu as it is to say that because we have large stretches of uncultivated land we should have more immigrants. That is not sound reasoning from the economic point of view; it is perfectly logical from any other standpoint, but absolutely meaningless from the economic. I suggest, then, that some consideration must be given Canada's immi-

gration policy strictly from the economic point of view, and before I am through I shall indicate something of my meaning in that regard. It is assumed—for what reason I am at a loss to know—that agriculture can absorb almost any number of people; I believe the hon. member for North Vancouver went so far as to suggest 2,000,000 people more for the Peace River district alone. Why not make it 4,000,000? I do not see why anyone should stop at 2,000,000. If we are sure of placing 2,000,000 may we not stretch a point and make it 4,000,000?

I say it is assumed, apparently without any reason whatever, that agriculture can absorb an indefinite number of immigrants, and it is assumed, I take it, on this basis: that inasmuch as there are a great many millions of acres of land yet untilled, and many hundreds of millions of pigs yet unborn, which farmers could look after, therefore there is work for any number of farmers to do. That is the reasoning. But there cannot be an unlimited number of anything in connection with any industrial enterprise; we cannot have an unlimited number of miners, and unlimited number of carpenters, an unlimited of doctors, notwithstanding what I said a moment ago about the periodic breaking out of diseases which might provide employment, temporarily at any rate, for many more doctors than we have. These professions and classes and industrial groups cannot be increased indefinitely. How, then, is it assumed that agricultural pursuits have no limit? Who is the oracle who insists upon that philosophy? Since when has agriculture been outside the laws of supply and demand any more than carpentry or medicine? Surely no one will seriously entertain that idea. Yet there can be no other basis for such an argument. Well, if it is not true that agriculture is beyond the law of supply and demand, by what reasoning do those who advocate a continued increase in immigration, and particularly in agricultural help and agriculturists generally, come to such a conclusion as I have indicated? Just because there is land not yet cultivated? Just because there are millions of pigs yet unborn? Just because there are some places where scrub still grows? Is that an economic reason why more people should be brought in at public expense? The time has come when there should be a little more clear thinking on this question, and particularly on the part of men who come from western Canada.

Let me come now to what I regard as the important phase of the present situation. No one will deny that agriculture is passing, and indeed passing swiftly, through a period of development. When that development has been completed we will have an agricultural industry which will not be recognized when compared with what it is to-day. Agriculture is gradually becoming industrialized, and that process is always followed by organization, copitalization and specialization. I do not believe that any advice of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) or any advice out of the profound farming experience of the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) will stay the natural evolutionary process of this great industry. Let me give the Minister of Immigration an illustration. I can take him to one of the most beautiful valleys in Canada.

Mr. FORKE: Is that Pipestone?

Mr. IRVINE: It is one much more beautiful than Pipestone.

An hon. MEMBER: Pipe dream.

Mr. IRVINE: And I can show him one hundred farmers who have settled along the river there. On a cold winter's morning those one hundred farmers will get up, early of course, and they start one hundred gasoline engines to pump a few buckets of water to one hundred little groups of pigs—one gasoline engine would drown every pig in the whole valley. The industry is overcapitalized and every individual farmer is impoverished. He is endeavouring to industrialize himself and at the same time to hold on to the conditions of peasantry from which the industry has evolved. I suggest that agriculture is standing at the parting of the ways. It must follow the views of the Minister of Agriculture and go back to peasantry by the route of mixed farming, or else it must go forward to organization, centralization and specialization. Which of the two is it going to follow? If we are to go forward to centralization and specialization, as I believe will be the inevitable tendency, then to bring in more farmers will either put a stress upon those whom you bring in as well as upon those who are already here, or will drag the whole thing back to the days of peasantry. It may be all very well to put another one hundred farmers into that valley and have every one of them start with a few cattle and pigs and a gasoline engine; that may be all right for the manufacturers of gasoline engines but it is not good business and it is not following the natural order of events in respect to the industrial development which is taking place before our very eyes. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that with proper organization, capital-

ization and specialization there is a sufficient number of farmers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta properly to farm every foot of land in those three provinces. Instead of trying to fill up these so-called vacant lands with individuals without money and without experience or knowledge either of the country or of agriculture, if the ministers of immigration and agriculture would lend their best intelligence and direct the country's best efforts toward encouraging better organization, sounder finance, closer specialization, greater centralization and increased output with the resultant reduction in overhead, they would be filling a long-felt want of the western agriculturist. The western farmer is in the position to-day which the small business interests were in during the time of keen competition before the great mergers took place and before industrialism was so well established. I think the Minister of Immigration said something; would he kindly say it loudly enough so that I can understand him? If it is not meant for me, of course I do not want to hear it.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member has been reading Harper's Magazine.

Mr. IRVINE: No, I have not; but if it was anything like what I am saying it was very good. I commend Mr. Harper, or whoever it was wrote the article, on having been able to appreciate the situation. That is the situation as I see it with respect to agriculture in the west, and I believe that specialization and proper organization has scarcely begun.

Then there is the question of production itself. There is no doubt that if a boot and shoe factory in Canada increased its output there would be great danger of blocking the market unless the purchasing power could be increased to an amount which would equal the increase of production. The same is true of live stock, of dairy products, of horticultural products and of agricultural products, because none of them are immune from the law of supply and demand. It may be all very well for the railway companies, the banks, or organized business to make a great hip-hurrah about getting more people to come to Canada and go on the farms, but in doing that they are, first, reducing the standard of living of every farmer by increasing the supply of goods without increasing the demand; and second, the country will be flooded with immigrants, progress will be blocked and we will be back to the old Russian peasantry days. If we follow our present immigration policy we will be going towards the days of peasantry, whereas if we follow the other we will be striving for proper organization.

[Mr. Irvine.]

I should like to read to the house a few of the resolutions which have been passed within the last month or so in the riding of Wetaskiwin. The first one, passed by Pleasant Hill Local No. 608 of the United Farmers of Alberta, reads as follows:

> Resolved, that whereas, through the years we have all known cases of capable, promising, Canadian young men who wish to follow farming, but for lack of means were compelled to leave the country;
>
> Therefore, in our opinion, while our government is evolving plans to aid British immigrants, we believe it would be wise and fair to include in such plans as much help for Canadian boys and men who desire and possess the qualifications to settle on farms.

The organization authorized the gentleman who signed this resolution, Mr. J. P. Beach, the secretary, to forward the resolution to the Minister of Immigration, and a copy was sent to myself. A similar resolution was passed by the Lacombe Women's Institute, and is signed by Mrs. E. L. Misener, secretary. Practically the same resolution was passed by the Progressive local of the United Farmers of Alberta and was forwarded here. Another resolution was sent through the Lacombe Local. This was passed by the Lakeside Woman's Institute and is signed by Mrs. Arthur Bauer.

I have another resolution which was passed at the annual convention of the United Farmers of Canada. No doubt the minister has received a copy of this, but I do not know whether or not he regards it as a constructive suggestion. I am not going to read it as a constructive suggestion, but rather as indicating that the farmers of Saskatchewan as well as of Alberta, are not satisfied with what might be called the blind immigration policy now being followed in Canada. The resolution reads:

> Whereas this convention is opposed to the present method of securing immigrants;
>
> Therefore be it resolved that we urge the federal government to appoint a national commission of inquiry with just representation thereon from organized labour and organized agriculture, that shall study the problem of immigration and assimilation from every possible angle, such commission to conduct public hearings to make provision for the attendance of representative witnesses whose testimony shall be taken under oath, and to report to parliament the conclusion reached by it and make such recommendations as in its judgment it may deem proper, and that pending the findings of such a commission, no further agreement shall be entered into by the federal government with the railroads after the present agreement has expired.

In conjunction with that resolution I would make one final constructive suggestion and offer it for the minister's consideration, namely, that he drop the present immigration

policy entirely. He may regard that as a destructive suggestion, but it would save a considerable amount of money even if nothing were done. As I suggested in my opening remarks, Canada would be better off from an economic point of view. Moreover, we would escape the difficulties which result from assisting immigration out of the taxes paid by the people, whose burden is now as heavy as they can bear without our bringing others here to compete with them in what they are actually producing, thus lowering their standard of living. I hope the minister will give due consideration to the suggestions that have come from this section of the house, and that the immigration policy which is now calling for at least $3,500,000, will be discontinued until such time as the government knows what is the best kind of policy to pursue.

Mr. B. W. FANSHER (East Lambton): I cannot understand why the amendment should have been moved, unless it was that the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) wished to launch a new immigration and colonization scheme, because to my mind the amendment has no bearing whatever on the argument advanced in its behalf. Why the hon. member for North Vancouver should have spent a good deal of last summer away north in the Peace River district in order to study out a scheme and find a place where assisted immigration and colonization might be put into practice, I do not understand, I think his time would have been better employed had he spent his summer vacation in old Ontario in the constituency in which he was born and brought up, West Middlesex, and there used his talents to devise ways and means to keep many of the farmers on the land in some of those older districts. But he goes away into that northern area and devises a scheme which would cost the government millions of dollars, to say nothing about the railway facilities or the roads that it would be necessary to provide.

In the old province of Ontario, where we have splendid highways and railway facilities, rural depopulation is nevertheless taking place. Why, then, should the hon. member feel it necessary to go into the remote parts of the north country in order to devise a scheme of this kind when agriculture to-day is in such a position that the farmer's son cannot establish himself upon the land in the community in which he was born and raised? In fact, agriculture in this country has never been able to establish itself upon land that it had to purchase. The first settlements in Canada were not made under the conditions of immigration that we have to-day. The early pioneers did not receive assisted passages to come to this country. They came here with the idea of establishing homes. It is true that they got free land. The first generation born upon that land had to move a little further west in order to obtain free homesteads and thus it was that settlement was effected over Ontario, thence into Michigan and the western states. The rising generation born upon the land was compelled to proceed a little further westward and there establish itself upon free land again. Hence many farmers' sons born in Ontario went to Michigan, Illinois, Iowa and other states of the union. This took place about the middle of last century. Later on, in the seventies of last century, many farmers' sons proceeded to the northwestern states, the Dakotas and Montana, and there established themselves upon free land.

In the beginning of this century hundreds of farmers' sons from Ontario, in order to carry out their desire to become farmers, had to go to the Canadian northwest in order to obtain free land. The time has now come in this Dominion when the available free land has become pretty well taken up except in the far northern areas, and to-day we are up against a new problem, one that we have never before faced in connection with immigration and colonization. Any farmer's son wishing to establish himself to-day cannot do so by obtaining free land. He has to go out into the market in order to purchase his farm. With the remuneration that is received from the industry it is almost impossible now for a farmer's son to establish himself upon a farm. Hence even in old Ontario, where we have all the facilities, hundreds of farmers' sons will not undertake the risk of going into debt to the extent of the purchase price of a farm and equipment, thus conscripting themselves, as it were, to a heavy debt for the major portion of their lives. They will rather choose other occupations where the initial cost is not so great. Thus it is that hundreds are migrating towards the cities and towns. This new condition that we are up against might as well be faced now as at any other time. We are compelled to realize that sooner or later we must make conditions such that the farmer's son who wishes to buy a farm and establish himself thereon will have some prospect of making that occupation pay. To-day the oldest or any other son of the family who wishes to get married and start upon a farm, when he counts the cost and realizes that he cannot get much financial assistance from his parents, does not care to burden himself with the mortgage necessary to purchase a farm and equipment. We must somehow or another make agriculture so profitable that the farmer's son will be prepared to undertake the purchase of a farm and implements,

and until we do that it is idle to talk of any immigration scheme involving the expenditure of millions in bringing from foreign countries people who are not acquainted with our ways, climate or soil conditions.

The government of the day announced in its platform of 1919 the best immigration policy that I have ever heard announced, either in this house or out of it, but I am sorry to say that they have never carried it out. This country was hardly settled when there was placed a load on agriculture to assist every other industry under the sun. That load is there to-day, and agriculture is falling down under it. The Liberal party in 1919 had a platform which, as regards tariff planks, constituted the best immigration policy ever put forward in this country, but they failed to carry it out. If they would to-day scrap the Immigration department and, so to speak, step on the gas in implementing the tariff policy enunciated in that platform, they would do more to stimulate immigration of the agricultural classes than anything else they could undertake. The farmer is up against it to-day at every turn owing to the assisting of industry in other lines, industries that will permit no competition whatever, that will not have immigration that may affect their industry, but that are willing that the farmer shall have all the competition they can give him. At the same time the farmer must provide assistance for industry to the tune of 20, 25 or 30 per cent. Let us relieve agriculture of some of this burden. Agricultural machinery, it is true, is not taxed to any great extent, perhaps an average of 10 per cent, but many articles that are used on the farm are taxed 25 or 30 per cent and even more. Even the rough clothing that the farmer and his family wear about the farm is taxed from 30 to 35 per cent; yet the government revised the schedules only last session and left them at these ridiculously high levels. If we want to assist agriculture let us relieve it of some of the burdens it now carries for the assistance of all the other industries of this country, and we shall have done something which agriculture can appreciate and from which it will benefit. I hope the government will realize that if they would put into effect their tariff platform of 1919 they could give some relief to the farmer, and it would prove to be one of the best immigration policies that has been presented to this country in years.

Amendment negatived, on division.

Main motion (Mr. Robb) agreed to, and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

[Mr. B. W. Fansher.]

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

Civil government—immigration and colonization salaries, $314,505; contingencies, $45,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the minister give us some explanation of this item?

Mr. FORKE: The details will be found on page 82. The number of employees provided for 1929-30 is 184; for 1928-29 it was 179, representing an increase of 5.

Mr. SPENCER: What are these five new employees doing?

Mr. FORKE: The increase both in the number of employees and in the amount provided for is accounted for as follows:

1 — Assistant commissioner of immigration	$ 3,120
1 — Stenographer Grade (3)	1,380
3 — Stenographers Grade (2)	3,240
5	
Difference between salary voted in 1928-1929 estimates for a head clerk and salary of a chief clerk	600
Provision for annual increases	3,450
Additional salary for Deputy Minister	1,000
Total gross increase	$12,790
Less:—	
Amount of adjustments due to deaths, resignations, etc., in the minor classes	3,855
Total net increase for 1929-1930	$8,935

Mr. GARDINER: May I inquire the reason for the appointment of an assistant commissioner, and what will his duties be?

Mr. FORKE: His duties will be to assist the Commissioner of Immigration. We have always had assistant commissioners.

Mr. GARDINER: Not last year.

Mr. FORKE: Oh yes. We have three, and it has been found necessary on account of the increase in the work to appoint this assistant commisisoner.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not see any provision in the estimates for an assistant commissioner last year. This is a new appointment, and I should like to know the reason for it, and what the duties of the assistant commissioner will be.

Mr. FORKE: The commissioner sometimes works twelve and fourteen hours a day, and sometimes on Sundays. He requires an assistant to help him. He has been very much overworked during the past year.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the assistant commissioner be located at Ottawa?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Who is the present commissioner?

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Little.

Mr. GARDINER: What does the commissioner do when the assistant is to assist?

Mr. FORKE: Of course I am not in a position to give details as to all his duties.

Mr. GARDINER: Give us some idea.

Mr. FORKE: He has charge of all the technical work in regard to immigration. We have a commissioner in the west, one in the east, and one located at Ottawa, and this new assistant will be located in Ottawa. The commissioner overlooks the whole work in regard to immigration.

Mr. GARDINER: I thought that work would have been done by the deputy minister and by the assistant deputy. Do not these gentlemen do any work?

Mr. FORKE: Most certainly.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister must have recommended this appointment to council when his estimates were before them, and surely some explanation must have been given to council as to why a new assistant commissioner was required and what his duties will be.

Mr. STEVENS: That would be in writing.

Mr. GARDINER: But the minister would surely have to give the reason for the appointment.

Mr. FORKE: The appointment was made on the recommendation of the deputy minister because of the increased work. At present the staff is overworked. I know that some of them go back after dinner many nights to do their work. The appointment is absolutely necessary.

Mr. SPENCER: What has occurred during the last year to increase the work of the department so that an assistant commissioner is needed?

Mr. FORKE: There has been increased immigration, and if my hon. friend will look through the estimates he will find other services that have brought about an increase of work. New bridges have been opened up, for instance, where immigration work has to be done. It is often overlooked that there is in the Immigration department a preventive service requiring a large number of employees. That is a work that has to be carried on even if no immigrants come in; we still have to have officers along the border for the purpose of examining those who enter the country for any purpose. There are one or two bridges on the St. Lawrence river where we require officials for that purpose. All this has increased the work of the staff.

Mr. SPENCER: Was this appointment made through the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. FORKE: Every appointment is made through the Civil Service Commission.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, May 28, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

On motion of Mr. L. S. RENE MORIN (St. Hyacinthe) the eighth report of the select standing committee on standing orders was concurred in.

NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY COMPANY

On motion of Mr. Morin (St. Hyacinthe): Bill No. 282, respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company was referred to the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect the supplementary estimates determining to some extent when we may be able to close our labours.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should hope by Friday of this week.

TREATIES AND CONVENTIONS MADE BY OR AFFECTING CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): May I ask the Prime Minister when there will be brought down the return showing imperial treaties and statutes having application to Canada as well as treaties

negotiated by Canada herself. In view of the announcement that the committee of experts is to meet in October, some of us would like to be in a position to criticize the actions of the government in dealing with that committee, and the information I ask for forms the basis for such criticism.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I may say to my hon. friend that I was told by the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs that the task which had been assigned to the department was a very onerous one, that for some weeks he had had one or two officials of the department at work on the preparation of the material asked for, and when I spoke to him he was very doubtful as to when the work could be completed. But I will be glad to have placed at my hon. friend's disposal anything that we have up to date. His order was a large one.

Mr. CAHAN: It simply indicates the magnitude of the task the Prime Minister and others have undertaken.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Quite.

REPORTS OF HARBOUR COMMISSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John-Albert): I wish to ask a question of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin). Perhaps the Prime Minister will kindly convey this question to him. When may we expect to have tabled the reports of harbour commissions? I refer more especially to the report of the harbour commission of St. John.

MOTOR AND PLEASURE BOATS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): I would like to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect a decision of the cabinet on the repealing of the tax on motor and pleasure boats on the Muskoka lakes.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I doubt if my hon. friend's wish in that particular will be met at any rate while the house is in session.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will it be met after the house rises?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That I cannot say.

[Mr. Cahan.]

NATURAL RESOURCES OF WESTERN PROVINCES

ADMINISTRATION OF WATERPOWERS IN ALBERTA, SASKATCHEWAN AND MANITOBA

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of Interior) moved the second reading of Bill No. 311, respecting water-power in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. BENNETT: Explain. The minister said he proposed making a more lengthy statement.

Mr. STEWART: This bill is to meet the request of the house formulated in a motion that the administration of water-powers alone should be transferred to the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and that these water-powers should be administered in the same manner as is provided for in the Railway Belt Waters Act, and under an agreement similar to that existing between the province of British Columbia and the Dominion government. In the case of British Columbia the Dominion government is the owner of the lands—the railway belt and the Peace River block. In the three provinces mentioned the ownership of the waters remains within the jurisdiction of the Dominion government. At first glance it would appear to be an easy matter to outline the provisions by statute and to declare in what manner this was to be done. The law officers of our department, as well as the law officers of the Justice department, found it most difficult to do that. I have had them prepare what I am offering to-day, that is, legislative authority to make agreements, and in all particulars where they will apply the provisions will be similar to those of the Railway Belt Waters Act. That is briefly all I am asking to be done to-day.

I understand that in one case in Alberta, while they have not in any sense passed a water-powers administration act, they have as a government secured authority from their legislature to take advantage of this legislation when passed by the Dominion parliament. So that the matter will be simply one of agreement between the two governments, this government binding itself to turn over the complete administration of the water-powers of the province.

I may observe in passing, however, that some difficulties are bound to arise in connection with the administration of these powers. In every instance in which a water-power will be created the streams are interprovincial. This has caused us a good deal of difficulty in the province of Manitoba; and

without in any way reflecting on any authority I think it is fortunate that the federal government had some control in relation to the administration of water-powers as between Ontario and Manitoba. Some very serious difficulties arose there, and I think I am safe in saying that it was by the good offices of the federal government that these difficulties were ironed out, with the result that they enjoy a complete utilization of the Winnipeg river and of the waters that flow out of Ontario into and through Manitoba. No doubt the same situation will present itself in connection with the administration of the water-powers of the three western provinces, but it is highly probable that the transfer of all these resources will take place in the near future, and the water-powers will, of course, go with all other resources. But from this date on, whenever the provinces are ready to avail themselves of it, they will have complete control of the administration of the water-powers, subject, of course, only to the same provision as is contained in the Railway Belt Water Act, namely, the right of veto on the part of the Minister of the Interior of the federal government.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister stated, I think, that Alberta had passed legislation which would enable the province to take advantage of this act. Was this act referred to the government of Alberta and has it been approved by them?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No; that was unnecessary. The act merely gives us authority to transfer the administration—not the water-powers but the administration of the water-powers—to the provincial government.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I hope that when we are in committee on the bill the minister will indicate in what respect this legislation is of particular advantage to Alberta. I should like to know the extent of the water-powers in Alberta affected by this legislation.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): All the water-powers of every sort not already allocated.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Except that within the park areas.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, and in reserves.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is left?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They are reserved in the British Columbia act in that respect.

Mr. ADSHEAD: But what is there left in Alberta outside the park areas?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not prepared to say offhand, but there are indications of a good many chances to establish water-powers on the Athabaska river. All these rivers fall very rapidly from the mountains. On the Red Deer river there are possibilities.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): This bill means really nothing; it is merely a pretence and that is all, for the simple and obvious reason that it is predicated on the assumption that the property ownership remains in the Dominion, and that the administration may, subject to the power of veto of the Minister of the Interior, be granted the province. In other words, if the province prepares a lease which is in any sense dissimilar from the ones now in use, the minister's veto power may be exercised—I do not say will, but may be. But there is a greater difficulty which we must face sooner or later, and that is that there are no water-powers in Alberta outside the parks. Such water-powers as are in the province of Alberta must necessarily be water-powers that have their source in the Rocky mountains, and with the wide extent of the boundaries of the Rocky Mountains park and other parks in the north, it is now painfully apparent that there can be no utilization of these water-powers for industrial and commercial purposes so long as they remain in the park, for the park authorities have made it perfectly clear that they will allow no one to undertake hydro-electric constructions within the park. That has been made perfectly clear, and they have gone so far that I ventured the other day to direct the minister's attention to the rather ridiculous position taken in relation to a dam away up in the mountains in connection with the Spray lakes. The minister himself felt that the situation was little short of ridiculous. My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is very much given to the maintenance of the beauties and scenic attractions of western Canada. I submit, however, that we must face actualities, and the fact is that there are in Alberta no water-powers which are at present not within the park areas. For that reason, so far as we are concerned, the bill is nugatory

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is only one within the park area which it is possible to develop and that is lake Minnewanka.

Mr. BENNETT: I understand that further north there may be, by utilization of storage—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have cut that out under the new boundaries.

Mr. BENNETT: The new boundaries have not yet been settled?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Mr. BENNETT: If the minister contemplates changing the park boundaries then he and I are at one. But as the boundaries now stand—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The Spray lakes will be outside.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, that meets the position to which I am directing attention.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On the title.

Mr. COOTE: Under this bill will the province have jurisdiction over the water-powers on rivers where irrigation rights have been granted—that is to say, where the right has been given to utilize water out of these rivers for irrigation purposes?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes; that applies already to Bow river, both irrigation and power development being provided for.

Mr. COOTE: Will the government wish to retain control or to have the final say in regard to what may be done in the way of developing water-powers on the rivers in view of the interest they have in the irrigation system?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I cannot conceive of any difficulty arising by reason of the water-powers. The water-powers that can be established will all be out of the irrigation outlets; they are all lower down. You might develop power at Bassano but that has been already granted for irrigation purposes, and irrigation in that case would be paramount.

Mr. COOTE: It is conceivable that the government might be asked at some time to have reservoirs created for water for irrigation purposes, and that water might be required at a time of year when the power company might be seeking a franchise and be desirous of getting water for power. In other words, there is room there for a conflict of interests as between those concerned in irrigation and those who are developing power. Would the Dominion government in that case wish to retain control of those rivers for the protection of those interested in irrigation?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend will notice that the bill provides that all grants made heretofore are fully protected and cannot be interfered with. But in any case irrigation is paramount. As to the question whether the establishment of a storage dam in the mountains for power purposes would result in a conflict between the power and irrigation interests respectively, that of course could happen; but in the plan now contemplated as affecting the southern irrigation district this would not occur. I have gone very carefully into that point. That happened perhaps in other cases where irrigation was established, but it would not affect the irrigation in this particular case.

Mr. COOTE: It does seem to me there is quite a possibility of friction between the Dominion government and the provincial governments; a provincial government might perhaps want to use some storage of water for power purposes and the Dominion government might want to use it for irrigation. I was just trying to find out how this bill would affect a situation of that kind.

Mr. BENNETT: They can use it for both.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes. I do not think there will be any conflict as between the Dominion and the provinces; the only conflict I fear is the conflict which may arise as between the provinces themselves. There may be claims if storage dams are created in order to obtain more power; it may be said that this is holding up water that should pass down the stream, but that would only apply to the other provinces. It will be remembered that when we had our proposed agreement for the transfer of the resources the province of Saskatchewan asked that the whole Rocky mountain slope be made a federal forest reserve in order that the sources of the interprovincial streams might be maintained. That was one of the provisions of the proposed agreement, but I anticipate no difficulty as between the federal and the provincial authorities.

Mr. ADSHEAD: On the Bow river, entirely outside the park area according to the plans I have seen, there are certain power units which have been established even below

the Ghost river, I believe. What will be the position of those units; will they be under the jurisdiction of the province or of the Dominion government?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They will be under the administration of the province. Every license issued from the date of the passing of this act will come under the administration of the province, unless the province refuses to take advantage of this legislation.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Have any of these licenses been granted as yet?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The last statement of the minister is very interesting, but it does not really mean very much. The value of the undeveloped power sites still left in the province of Alberta is not very great; they are all within the present boundaries of the park area.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, my hon. friend is wrong in that statement; he is very wrong as far as the Red Deer river is concerned. There may be storage basins in the park area, but there is no power site.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): We mean the power development; the possibility will be determined by the exclusion of certain areas now within the park boundaries. In part at least the minister admits that, and in answer to a question by the leader of the opposition he suggested that certain areas now included in the parks were to be placed outside the present boundaries. I would like to ask the minister when he proposes to bring in that legislation.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I do not propose to bring it in at this session, but for the information of the hon. gentleman I may say that the Spray lake proposal comes within the park boundaries. The only possibility of increased power in the Banff national park would be the raising of the level of lake Minnewanka, which now is raised considerably and which is used as a storage basin by the Calgary Power Company.

Mr. BENNETT: But it is not much good.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, I admit that, because the water freezes on the way down, but the utility of that basin could be increased very materially by raising the dam. We have objected to that; I say frankly that I have objected to it and I suggested to the Calgary Power Company that they take the Spray lakes.

I want to make our position clear with regard to the Spray lakes. After a great deal of negotiation we have practically come to an agreement with regard to that question. A great many members of this house object to that development altogether on account of the scenic properties which will be interfered with, but in order to quiet a public opinion which is becoming aroused over the thought that we are going to trespass on the scenic properties of the national parks reserved for the people of Canada I have tried to readjust the boundaries of the park to cut out all the coal areas, with the single exception of one seam of which we know, and of course with the exception of the precious metals which might be discovered. We have a proposed new line which is fairly satisfactory to the government of the province of Alberta and to ourselves, with the exception of some very minor adjustments, which cuts out the Spray lakes, but of course the Spray river which is the outlet from the Spray lakes area, flows down through the Banff national park, past the golf course and the hotel, to enter the Bow river.

I may say that there is some doubt as to the utility of this development, which involves cutting a tunnel through the mountain almost two miles in length. The damming of the area itself is a small matter, but it has been suggested that we might very well establish a power-house up at the location of the dam and allow the water to come down the Spray river. I may say frankly that I object to that suggestion for many reasons, but principally on account of the fact that the water would be used in very severe winter weather; it would freeze all the way down, leaving large blocks of ice lying about the flat area where the golf course has been located by the Canadian Pacific Railway at some very considerable expense. That would destroy the looks of our park for at least the first month of the tourist season, which is the season when our own Canadian people visit the park.

With regard to the development as first proposed, there is no objection in the world; I have said that the Calgary Power Company may have that license provided that for the months of June, July and August we are guaranteed a flow of 350 second cubic feet daily down the Spray river. We believe that is the smallest flow which will provide against the fire hazard and not destroy the appearance of a very beautiful stream. That is the only restriction which has been placed upon the

development of the Spray lakes up to the present time. It will be outside the park boundary and, of course, if this act becomes law it will be under the jurisdiction of the province.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But when will it be outside the park boundary?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): When those boundaries are established.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): When will that be?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Probably at the next session of parliament.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then this bill is not of much value just now.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This bill will place the administration of the Spray lakes under the province, with the exception I have stated. As I have said, we are in agreement with regard to the park boundaries with the exception of a small portion at the northern end of Jasper park; all the other boundaries have been agreed upon by the two governments. There is a small area about which there is a slight difference of opinion and that is the only portion of the boundary upon which we are not in agreement. It has been all surveyed and it is all allotted on the map; except for that one area we might very well have brought in that legislation this session. I anticipate some trouble, of course, because we are putting in force very stringent reservations with respect to mining development and developments of other kinds within the park boundaries, but I have tried to get everything capable of development outside the boundaries of the park.

Mr. BENNETT: Then the act changing the park boundaries will not come down this session?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, but I do want to make it clear that as far as the Spray lakes are concerned, if this bill passes I cannot issue the license for that development, but if the province desires to create a storage dam there it can do so provided we get 350 second cubic feet during the months I mentioned.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it not rather the other way round? The park area is not affected by this bill, and only the minister can deal with it.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The Spray lakes will be outside the park.

Mr. BENNETT: Not this year.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Not until the amending act is passed, but I want to make it clear that we do consider these lakes outside the park area now for administration purposes.

Mr. BENNETT: But they are within the park area now and we are not going to amend the National Parks Act this year, so they will continue to be within the boundaries of the park and this bill will have no effect.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Is this bill dependent entirely upon the Spray lakes or, for that matter, on lake Minnewanka or some other storage basin that may be found later on at the head of the Red Deer river? There are certain sites on the Athabaska river.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The minister mentioned 350 second feet which will be reserved in order to preserve the flow. Is it not a fact that the minister has received a letter from the Calgary Power Company saying that they have no further interest in the matter?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, I have a letter stating that if we go beyond 150 feet they will not be interested.

Mr. SPENCER: Do I understand that the Calgary Power Company will have the opportunity of developing this Spray lakes site?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If the province is agreeable.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I confess that previous to this morning, I had not read this bill, but I think that we are dealing with a very serious question, one which affects the relationship between the provinces and the Dominion. In this bill the Minister of the Interior reserves the right to control the water-powers within the park areas. Under the British North America Act the ownership of the national parks is vested in the provinces.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I would point out to the hon. member that the provinces do not own the park or the land itself; at the moment we are dealing with the property of the Dominion, not with the property of the provinces.

Mr. EVANS: This question is bound to cause trouble in years to come. As I say, the British North America Act does not give the ownership and control of any part of the Dominion to the Dominion government; those areas are all within the provinces and the provinces have the sovereign right with respect to them. Why should this government say that they have the power to restrict the operation of the water-powers and assume con-

trol over those powers within the park areas? I confess that I view this bill with some suspicion. The natural resources should be turned over to the provinces and although we have had many promises that this would be done we are now asked to pass this particular bill before the fulfilment of those promises. A year ago the Prime Minister himself made the promise that the three western provinces would receive their natural resources after the last session of parliament, but we are still in the same position.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Will the effect of this bill be to give to the three prairie provinces control over their water-powers until such time as their natural resources are returned?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is not the intention to transfer the ownership at all; it is administration only.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): But they will have control?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They will have control by administration, yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Subject to the veto of the Minister of the Interior?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This bill is identical with the British Columbia Act.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Civil government—immigration and colonization—salary, $314,505; contingencies, $45,000.

Mr. GARDINER: I notice that there is an increase in the salary of the deputy minister; would the minister explain the basis of that increase?

Hon. ROBERT FORKE (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): It was made by order in council. I suppose the government thought that that was an adequate salary, or at least that the deputy minister was deserving of that increase.

Mr. IRVINE: Is the deputy the only one to receive an increase? There have been no increases issued around the House of Commons at all, or is that within the power of the minister?

Mr. FORKE: No.

Item agreed to.

Immigration outside service—salaries, $1,080,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Would the minister give us the particulars of the increases which amount to nearly $200,000?

Mr. STEVENS: They have amounted to $330,000 in four years.

Mr. FORKE: That is due to the general increase in immigration work in the eastern district on account of the opening of new highways and bridges between Canada and the United States all along the international boundary. It has been found necessary to increase the staff at certain points as follows:

Head office at Ottawa	4
Hamilton	1
St. Leonard, N.B.	1
Niagara Falls	1
Bridgeburg	3
Ellis Island, N.Y.	2
Seasonal immigration inspectors at various points	8
Total	20

Owing to increased immigration in the western provinces it has been found necessary to increase the staff at certain points, as follows:

Winnipeg	3
Calgary	1
Regina, new agency	2
Saskatoon	1
Seasonal immigration inspectors at various points on the boundary line	8
Total	15

Mr. BENNETT: How many new employees would be included in that increase?

Mr. FORKE: Thirty-five.

Mr. BENNETT: That would not use up the whole $185,000; 35 people would hardly average that much.

Mr. SPENCER: I rise to protest against the amount of money that is being spent in the Immigration department. I am not particularly criticizing the minister of the day, but the whole policy for many years past seems to be wrong. I have some figures which I wish to place upon Hansard. Some of them have been given before, but as they are important they are worth repeating. The estimate for the present year is $3,462,900, or an increase of $178,267 over that of a year ago. The census of 1921 shows that Canada had a population of 8,788,000, while the immigrants received in the period from 1921 to 1928 numbered 962,000; the births in Canada from 1921 to 1928 have been 1,939,000, making a total that we should have of 11,689,000 people.

If we deduct from this number the deaths of 824,000 during those years, we should have a balance remaining of 10,865,000. According to the Bureau of Statistics, the estimated population for 1929 is 9,655,000, or a shrinkage in eight years of 1,210,000 people. We have been spending around $3,000,000 a year on immigration and losing at the rate of 1,210 people in eight years, or in other words we have been losing people just about as fast as we have been bringing them in. Furthermore, a number of people who come in do so on their own, and if we charge the whole cost against those people who come in through seeing immigration literature, this would make the figures still worse.

Going back as far as 1881, I find that we have brought in altogether, according to a statement made by the Minister of Immigration as reported in Hansard of March 15, about 5,000,000 people. But we have paid out, according to the departmental figures, to bring in that number of people, no less a sum than $51,618,024. It seems to me that if all our departments pursued the same policy as the Department of Immigration, where we are paying out a great deal of money and not getting results and where, if we are getting the people, we are not keeping them, this country would be about bankrupt. Furthermore, the great effort for many years has been to place the incoming immigrants on the land, which is about the last place that we should attempt to place them, as long as farming is practically the poorest paying business in this country.

The hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) during the budget debate placed some illuminating figures on Hansard. She showed that in 1926, of insurance funds to the amount of some $73,000,000 invested in farm mortgages. there was in round figures a loss of $1,313,000, while at the same time investments made to the amount of $192,000,000 in urban mortgages, or two and three-quarter times as much, showed a loss of only $256,000, or one-fifth the loss that was made in investments in rural mortgages. It has been shown more than once that every $7 invested in agriculture brings a return of $1. Any man who has been in the game for the last twenty or twenty-five years knows, taking everything into consideration, that is practically correct. On the other hand, we find that an investment of $3 in industry brings a return of $2.

I want to comment for a moment or two upon some of the propaganda that is being used. A great deal of it is half true, which is far worse than a direct lie. People who do not know any better are likely to think what is being said is absolutely true and are misled by it. The other day I saw a pamphlet entitled "Boy Settlement in Canada" issued under the authority of the Minister of Immigration, and the following is a quotation from it:

> The settled portions of Canada lie in much the same latitude as do the British isles, except that some portions of Canada reach further south than any part of England. Indeed, the southernmost parts of Canada are further south than any part of France. The seasons in Canada correspond with the seasons in Great Britain, and the practices and customs of the people are practically the same.

That is absolutely correct as far as latitude goes, but climatic conditions in the two countries are entirely different; practices in many ways are also quite different, and the statement is very misleading. I do not think for a moment the Minister of Immigration saw that pamphlet before it went out because I believe enough in his honesty to feel that he would not have allowed it to be issued. This is a further statement from the same pamphlet:

> Why should one select farming in Canada as a life pursuit? Because it offers all the advantages which have already been set down as contributing to real success. There is first the prospect of a good financial return from the very beginning.

That in itself is not true. There have been a few fortunate men who have in a short time probably made a good return on their outlay, but the minister knows as well as anybody else in the house that the majority of people who take up farming, either east or west, do not make a fortune and do not make an easy living in a short time. I should like to quote the following from the speech made by the minister only the other day:

> I say that quite a large percentage of those who started with open prairie under very favourable circumstances have failed.

That is quite different from the statements made in this pamphlet issued under his authority. This is another statement that the minister made:

> Will the population that is at present living in Canada gain by a tremendously increased immigration?

Mr. FORKE: What is the hon. member reading from?

Mr. SPENCER: I am reading from Hansard a statement made by the minister in the house a few days ago. The minister said further:

> But a large immigration does not necessarily mean that we shall be happier or more prosperous.

In that I quite agree with him. Yet he brings in these estimates showing an increase year after year and asks us to pass them without criticism. I should like to refer to another statement that has been issued. I cannot blame the Minister of Immigration in this case, but I picked up a pamphlet issued by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; a quotation from which is as follows in reference to last year's crop:

> Not only has the generality of crop production been uniformly fine and satisfactory but many yields have been recorded which would in other countries be considered exceptional or beyond possibility but to which western Canada in her bumper years has grown accustomed.

There is a misleading statement. It goes on:

> Yields between 50 and 60 bushels to the acre have been fairly common—

That is referring to last year's crop:

> —and there have been many in excess of this, ranging as high as 88 bushels per acre, which, for the extent over which production was secured, is considered a world record.

Nothing could be more misleading. I cannot blame the minister or his department in a case like this, but at the same time I think it is his duty or the duty of his officials to contradict such extraordinarily foolish and irrational statements that are going out supposedly on accepted authority. We all know that there was great promise of a fairly good crop last year, but we also know that owing to a disastrous frost before the crop ripened, the yield was cut down easily one-third and much more in some cases, and the average yield in the province from which I come was 18 bushels per acre instead of reaching to 50 or 60 or 88 bushels per acre.

Not only are we spending this large amount directly under the Department of Immigration, $3,462,000, but under the land settlement board, according to the estimates, we are also spending $1,400,000, and under the Department of Health, we are spending on immigration, $300,000 and I understand that the railways have also paid approximately $1,500,000 to bring in immigrants, or a total of $6,662,000. At the same time, with all this expenditure, we are not increasing our population. It does seem to me that we would be ahead in this country if we closed down for the time being our Immigration department. The work could easily be looked after by, say, the Minister of Agriculture, who would know where agriculturists were needed. The Minister of Labour would also be in a good position to say when more labour was needed in Canada, and probably the work of the Minister of National Health could be increased a little because he has already considerable work to do in connection with immigration. It does seem to me that we are spending a lot of good public money uselessly through this department. I am not going to criticize the minister because I think probably he is doing his work as well as any other minister who has filled that position, but the whole immigration policy of this country for the last twenty years or so has been wrong. Since 1881 we have spent over $51,000,000 and brought in 5,000,000 people, most of whom we have lost. I think that fact proves my contention.

Further, such schemes as are being put forward for forcing more people into this country, and putting them on the land to grow greater quantities of wheat, is another proof that the policy we are following is along false lines. It is only this year that having only two-thirds of the crop we expected last year, with the world's crop being somewhat large, prices have dropped lower than we have had for several years. What would prices have been if our crop had developed as we hoped it would in 1928?

Then we have people—I am glad to know they are not farmers, and they will not be farmers, because they see too clearly the direction in which we are drifting—but people who are not farmers who eventually hope to take advantage of those who are on the land are advocating different immigration schemes from time to time. The minister knows perfectly well that it is a false line of argument to say that we need more people in this country and particularly on the land. What we should aim at is to improve conditions so that there will be a decent standard of living on the farms, and when the man on the land is assured of a reasonable return on his capital outlay and from the labour he expends, then we need not be afraid of not getting enough people into this country; because the job then will be to keep them out. But to-day when those engaged in the basic industry of this country are not enjoying a decent standard of living, and the minister knows perfectly well that they are not—the standard of living of the farmer from the east to the west is not nearly so high as it ought to be considering the amount of capital he invests and the amount of energy he puts into his work—we are going out to seek immigrants, but until we get a decent standard of living for the man on the land, is it worth while to spend any more public money trying to get immigrants to come to this country to farm?

There is one other point. Other hon. members have asked for figures showing how many

Canadians have left this country, but we are always given the reply: "Oh, the figure cannot be stated. The cost of gathering that data is too much, so we have not kept a record." I would ask why cannot the same officials who check the people coming into the country also check the people going out. Then we would know where we stood. At the present time we have to go to the officials at Washington to find out how many people have left this country for the United States. Surely with all the money that is being spent on this department we should have an accurate statement of who is coming into this country, who they are, what they do, and how many leave. I do think that we are making a tremendous mistake spending a huge sum of money every year on immigration, when we are not doing any more than just keeping our population at its present level.

Mr. FORKE: I might make some explanation of the increase in this vote as compared with last year. The vote this year is $1,080,000; last year it was $1,033,955, but owing to a mistake of the accountant that amount was not included in the estimates last year, and so we asked for a supplementary estimate of $138,955 last year, which we did not get. The Minister of Finance told us that we had better try and get through with what we had, and we had to do so. We were accordingly unable to create the organization that we had in mind last year, and we had to carry quite a number of employees as temporaries who should have been on the permanent list. The temporary list will be smaller this year owing to a number of the temporaries being put on the permanent list.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What was the amount expended last year?

Mr. FORKE: We got along with less than the amount asked for. In reality there is not much difference between the vote this year and last. I cannot say just how much the expenditure for temporary help was increased owing to our not having the amount in the estimates last year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Surely the minister can tell us exactly what was expended last year independent of whether these men were temporary or permanent employees.

Mr. FORKE: The actual amount spent was $863,841. I should perhaps make an explanation right here. Although this estimate calls for a certain amount of money it does not follow that that amount has been spent. I think I will be able to show that before I am through.

[Mr. Spencer.]

Mr. MANION: If the minister spent only $895,000 last year why is he asking for $1,080,000 this year? It is over $200,000 more.

Mr. FORKE: My deputy informs me that the reorganization that was intended last year did not go into effect, and the amount of money that we intended to spend last year was not spent.

Mr. MANION: Will the minister explain the reorganization he refers to?

Mr. FORKE: Well it extends all through the service, putting it on a more efficient basis. We may not be getting very many immigrants but we are getting sufficient to require a very efficient service.

Mr. MANION: Does the minister mean that the whole service is to be reorganized, every branch of it?

Mr. FORKE: It has been reorganized. The reorganization is complete.

Mr. MANION: And it will cost $200,000 more to handle it.

Mr. FORKE: I suppose it will.

Mr. GARDINER: What proportion of this vote is purely for the purpose of securing immigrants?

Mr. FORKE: That more properly belongs to the next vote. I think I can give you the details. This is the cost of the permanent outside service.

Eastern district	$521,495
Western district, 109 employees	159,675
Pacific district, 17 employees	61,840
United States, 39 employees	80,855
British Isles and Irish Free State, 115 employees	181,830
The continent, 20 employees	31,820
Womens' division, Canada, 18 employees	29,325
Juvenile immigration division, 7 employees	12,000
Unforeseen expenses	1,070

That makes up the total of $1,080,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Mr. Chairman, I notice in the Auditor General's report that there is given a list of places where the minister has agencies, presumably for the purpose of getting immigrants. Will the minister tell us how many immigrants he gets, for instance, from San Francisco, where he has an agency, or is this just a place where some good Canadian can go for a winter holiday? I am surprised that I do not see in this list such places as San Diego and Florida, although I notice an agency at Manchester, New Hampshire, which is in the Green mountains, or the White

mountains. I suppose that is a good place for a summer resort but not much of a place to get immigrants. Will the minister explain the necessity for an office at San Francisco or Spokane?

Mr. FORKE: I had better read down the whole list.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Just give us San Francisco for example.

Mr. FORKE: There were 132 inquiries, 426 interviews, prospects of 35 farmers, and others who called were 12. Forty-seven heads of families came to Canada, 93 people all told, and they brought in from San Francisco last year capital to the amount of $163,240.

Mr. GARDINER: What was the cost of the office at that point?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The cost of that office was $13,000 according to the Auditor General's report.

Mr. KELLNER: Does that include the oil prospectors and operators?

Mr. FORKE: My deputy handed me the wrong paper. I was rather surprised myself at the numbers that I had to read out. The number of inquiries last year at San Francisco was 1,593; heads of families, 188; number of immigrants, 463; number of carloads of settlers' effects, 2; value of effects, $402,120; good prospects outstanding, 47.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Do I understand that the value of two carloads was $402,120?

Mr. FORKE: That is what it says here.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Well you had better have those figures revised. Would the minister just explain that $402,120, the value of two carloads of settlers' effects?

Mr. FORKE: That is the total brought into the country. They brought in two carloads, and the total effects included cash and everything else amounting to $402,120.

Mr. SPENCER: Where is the office from which we had 47 families?

Mr. FORKE: That was for the same place, but it was only a monthly report.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the minister any information as to what pursuits those families engaged in when they came to Canada? Were they farmers?

Mr. FORKE: I think they were all farmers. I have not the report here. Farmers are the only clas that we are recruiting over there.

Mr. GARDINER: There is no recruiting going on for any other class except farmers as far as that office is concerned

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. KELLNER: Will the minister kindly answer the question I put to him? Why cannot we check up the people going from Canada to the States?

Mr. FORKE: I am not an expert at that. My deputy informs me that to do that would take about double the organization we have.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is that because there are so many leaving?

Mr. FORKE: With regard to the figures we get from the Bureau of Statistics at Washington, I believe they probably overstate the number of people who really leave Canada. The other day I looked over some statistics of the number of people in the United States born in Canada; the number is growing less every ten years, so that if the volume of emigration to the United States was as great as it is claimed to be, the number of native born Canadians in the United States would be on the increase.

Mr. MANION: But a large proportion of those going over from Canada are not native born Canadians. They are people who are naturalized Canadians, and they usually put themselves down as English, Irish, Scotch, French, or whatever nationality they belong to, so that they are not entered as Canadians at all. Now frequently the minister and his officials make precisely the same statement which the minister has just made, namely, that these figures are all wrong which we obtain from the American offices in regard to Canadians going to the United States. On what ground do they make the statement? Surely the United States authorities have no reason for padding their immigration list to show a larger proportion of Canadians entering that country than actually do go in. Indeed, there is far less reason for the United States to pad their immigration figures than there is for the Minister of Immigration here to pad his. Are we therefore to draw the conclusion that the minister is judging the United States immigration department by his own? Are we to conclude that the Canadian figures are wrong and that they are being padded? Unless the minister can prove to us that the American figures are wrong I see no reason why he should question them. We do not keep any record ourselves of Canadians leaving this country, so that the only means we have of finding out is to take the figures given

by the officials of the United States immigration department. And those figures, we are always being told, are wrong. I repeat, unless the minister can prove that they are wrong it is time the government stopped challenging them. I personally have no reason for believing that those figures are wrong. On my desk I have the figures for the past ten years and I can tell the minister that a large proportion of Canadians leaving this country are not native born but naturalized.

Mr. FORKE: I do not like to exaggerate the number of people leaving Canada for the United States.

Mr. MANION: We are not exaggerating; we are giving the official figures.

Mr. FORKE: Instead of making the number larger I should prefer to make it as small as I could.

Mr. CHAPLIN: We find that other ministers take the same view.

Mr. FORKE: Hon. members know that the statistics for past years will show that the condition was much worse years ago than it is now.

Mr. MANION: Never. The worst years we have had have been the past six or seven under this government, and I make that statement without fear of contradiction by anyone. There is no doubt whatever that, according to the figures supplied by the United States, the worst years we have had were those particularly from 1923 to 1927. The last two years have not been quite so bad, but generally speaking the last six or seven have been the worst period we have ever had of emigration to the United States. There is not an atom of doubt about that. I shall be glad to be corrected if I am wrong, but I do not think I can be corrected because I have checked the figures. I resent the implication that we wish to paint things worse than they are; we paint them simply in accordance with the official figures of the United States. I want to tell the minister that we are just as optimistic as he is in regard to this great country; in fact, we are more so, because the other day he uttered a wail of despair about Canada. He took the same attitude as has been taken this morning by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer). We have a country containing immense areas, magnificent resources and vast possibilities, a country with a greater future than that of any other country in the world. To my mind there is not the slightest doubt about that; yet the minister and the hon. member for Battle River throw up their hands and say, "We do not want immigrants to come to Canada." Are we going to put up our shutters and bar our doors and windows against prospective Canadians?

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. SPENCER: Let people come in naturally; don't force them.

Mr. MANION: Every country that wants immigration must take the proper means to see that it gets the right type of immigrant, and to this end there must be some organization. I do not agree for a moment with the hon. member in this regard. I do not dispute the suggestion that there may be too much money spent on immigration for the results we are getting; I am not sure that this is not correct. But I do not see how you can possibly handle immigration without an adequate organization, and certainly I cannot endorse any such idea as that this magnificent country should put up its shutters and close its doors completely, taking the stand, "We have great resources; let us hang on to them and keep other people out." Surely we have a more encouraging conception of Canada's future greatness. I personally do not understand the attitude taken by the hon. member for Battle River and by the minister himself.

Mr. FORKE: It is rather unfortunate that I should be attacked by the hon. member for Battle River and then by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) for entirely different reasons. One complains that I am admitting too many immigrants and the other suggests that I do not admit any. I see that the Toronto Globe makes the statement that I am like Daniel in the lions' den.

Mr. MANION: And just as helpless, I am afraid.

Mr. FORKE: Let us hope the Lord is with me anyhow.

Mr. POWER: The lions roar but they don't bite.

Mr. FORKE: I take second place to no hon. member in my faith in this Dominion, and I do not like to hear the hon. member for Battle River speaking about excessively hard times. According to the speeches heard in 1921 and 1922, there was nothing but ruin and degradation and misery facing us at that time.

Mr. GARDINER: Was that not correct at that time?

Mr. FORKE: But we are all here and just as well off.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister was better off then.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister was one of those who were wailing then.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The item under discussion is an important one; will the minister give the headings of expenditure. What, for instance, is the expense in connection with advertising?

Mr. FORKE: This item is entirely for salaries; I can read over the list if my hon. friend wishes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: No, I do not want the individual salaries. I thought there were some other items besides salaries.

Mr. FORKE: No, this is entirely salaries.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems to me that for a department which is showing as little result as the Immigration department the least we can do is to keep salaries where they were before. I do not see any excuse whatever for increasing salaries in this department. If we are getting somewhere there might be some excuse, but this is a hopeless proposition; it is absolutely impossible; you are wasting money.

Mr. SPENCER: Since the minister has gone over to the other side he has lost touch with agriculture in this country. He knows perfectly well that agriculture has been in trouble for many years, and the hon. member for Fort William will realize this too if only he will look into the matter closely.

Mr. MANION: We have few of the troubles which my hon. friend deplores so much.

Mr. SPENCER: We are spending $51,000,000 and bringing in 5,000,000 people and losing them. Is that good business? I think it is bad business.

Mr. FORKE: We do not spend $51,000,000.

Mr. SPENCER: I am taking your own figures.

Mr. JACOBS: I have been discussing immigration estimates for the last ten or twelve years and I am further behind now than when I started. I am not impressed with the policy of the government; I never was; I have always criticized them and I think rightly so.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But never voted.

Mr. JACOBS: There never was a vote on these immigration estimates in the house.

Mr. CHAPLIN: No? Well, let us have one now. I will support any resolution you propose for reducing this estimate.

Mr. JACOBS: What good will that do?

Mr. CHAPLIN: It will save a lot of money anyway.

Mr. JACOBS: As a matter of fact, I am in favour of spending much more than we spend now. I am in favour of the open door; I want to bring into the country everyone who wants to come and who is white, healthy and mentally and morally fit. That is the party to which I belong and I am sorry to say I have not one follower yet.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): What about the Minister of Finance?

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know what his views are on this point; he is so busy with finance that he cannot bother with immigration.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why not move a resolution with regard to this one-man party you talk about?

Mr. JACOBS: Who will second it? I merely rose to answer the statement made by the hon. member for Fort William. He speaks about the overwhelming exodus from this country, particularly in the years 1924-25. He should know that was due entirely to the quota law of the United States; in 1924 they put into force a very drastic quota law which made it imperative for them to allow Canadians into their country if they were to have any immigration at all. Under the two per cent quota only some 100,000 or 150,000 people from Europe are allowed to enter the United States, but all native born Canadians can go into the United States without let or hindrance, and I should say they are rather a good element to have; they are as good as any immigrants the United States could get and they are equal to any of the people residing in that country now, so it is not at all surprising that they put into force this rule which prevents unrestricted immigration from Europe. This is the only country from which they can draw immigrants.

Mr. BENNETT: Mexico is on the same basis.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The trouble with us is that the whole of Europe is going into the United States through Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: My hon. friend should know that is not what is happening.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do know; I am on the border as much as you are, and that is what is happening.

Mr. JACOBS: I think my hon. friend is on the border of unreason when he makes that statement; we have here the figures showing the number of people who enter Canada. My hon. friend should know how difficult it is for people to come to this country; the rules are being applied in a most drastic manner, because it is the wish of this parliament. It seems to me that the Minister of Immigration should have some support here. We have the hon. member for Fort William on the one hand and the hon. member for Battle River on the other advising different courses; those behind cry "forward" and those in front cry "back", so what is the minister to do? He cannot take the advice of both.

Mr. BENNETT: He can stand still, as he is doing now.

Mr. JACOBS: I am almost ready to admit that that is partly true. I find it rather difficult to agree with anything the leader of the opposition says these days, and even when I do agree I have to look over the proposition carefully to make sure it is not something in the nature of a Trojan horse. Last year, in the agricultural committee, we heard some forty or fifty witnesses, each with a different policy. No one wished to help the minister in anyway; rather their desire was to embarrass him. Perhaps after all these policies are tried out, which will not take very long, they may come back to my policy, which is the policy we had previous to the war, when we let any person enter this country who wanted to do so. If an immigrant is unfit; if he cannot make good; if he is a public charge, send him back to his own country. We have the right to do that, but what object can there be in keeping out people who want to come to Canada to earn their living and help build up this country? I cannot see that there is any logic in that; personally I believe the minister would open the doors wide in the way I suggest if he received any support in this house, but he is not supported. The hon. member for Fort William advocated the other day that we should bring in men and sheep; he wanted to divide the population.

Mr. MANION: No, I did not advocate bringing in sheep; I advocated building up the sheep population by a proper policy.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, bringing in men and bringing up sheep.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. CHAPLIN: You want to bring in the goats.

Mr. JACOBS: No, I want to send the goats back if they turn out to be goats. Up to the present there never has been any difficulty in absorbing immigrants in this country. I venture to say that in the great city of Montreal, which has a population of about 1,250,000, there are not 500 people unemployed, and those people could obtain employment if they went after it. That condition exists in every city throughout Canada, and there is no reason why that should not be so. This country is just on the eve of an immense expansion; we read every day about the mines in the north, the lumbering, the pulp and paper industry and so on, but only certain classes of people will do the menial work connected with these industries. To use the expression of my hon. friend from Fort William, you cannot get red-blooded Canadians to do work that Italians, Czecho-Slovakians and others will do. They will not do it; Canadians have gone up in the social scale and the digging of canals, the building of railways and all that sort of work must be done by the foreigner. In the second generation the foreigner's children will not do that work either; they will want to become members of parliament, university professors and so on, and that is only right. This is a country for ambitious people; it is a country of ambition.

Under our immigration regulations the map of Europe is divided according to racial lines; for instance, an Austrian cannot come to Canada unless the minister permits him to enter, while on the other hand a German has no trouble coming here. It would take a person more clever than many hon. members of this house, including myself, to tell the difference between an Austrian and a German. Why should Austrians be kept out and Germans permitted to enter? I cannot see any reason.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I will tell the hon. gentleman one reason. As a matter of experience one finds that frequently the German is the man who owns, controls or directs a business, whereas the Austrian gravitates towards that lower class of labour to which my hon. friend has referred. That is a very marked difference between the two.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not see why a barber who comes from Berlin is a better man than a barber who comes from Vienna.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): That is not the proper comparison.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, it is; they do not make any distinction between Germans and Austrians in that respect. Then we will not admit Italians. I am not here for the purpose of eulogizing the Italians or any other people, but accepting the theory laid down by the Immigration department, I claim an Italian from the north of Italy is quite as good as a German from central Germany; there is no difference. Why should a man from Italian Lombardy be refused entrance to Canada while a German from Berlin or Frankfort is permitted to enter?

Mr. KELLNER: We get Italian immigrants now.

Mr. JACOBS: We are not getting very many of them.

Mr. FORKE: Mussolini will not let them out; he needs them all at home.

Mr. JACOBS: That is a good reason why my hon. friend will not let them in; he is in alliance with Mussolini.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): They are dodging Montreal, that is all.

Mr. JACOBS: We have room for Italians in Montreal, and we have room for other people from Europe; we have been taking them for 150 years and so has the United States. I say it is silly on the part of this country, which is looking for population according to my hon. friend from Fort William, to refuse admittance to these people.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will my hon. friend say that no Italians enter Canada?

Mr. JACOBS: Italian agriculturists are allowed in, but that is all.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That applies to other countries too.

Mr. JACOBS: That applies to every other country in Europe. Take Russia, a country with 140,000,000 people of stern, hardy stock; I think every one will admit that these are people who should be welcomed to Canada, because they know what work really is. They have been living close to the ground, and that is the class of people we want in a country like this, which is just beginning its expansion and development. These people are not allowed to enter this country except as farmers, and it is almost impossible for them to farm because they have no money. Within the last few years they have been given certain plots of land by the bolshevist government, but many of those people are not satisfied with conditions existing in Russia.

Mr. SPENCER: I would remind the hon. gentleman that 957 Russians entered last year.

Mr. JACOBS: That makes quite a hole in 140,000,000. I venture to say that perhaps of that 957 I brought in 950, and someone else brought in the other seven. Many of those people were coming to join their relatives and friends on this side; fathers and mothers joining their children and children joining their parents, but they are the only class which are permitted to enter this country. It is quite true that these people do not speak English but we can have them avoid Toronto because a person must speak English there in order to talk at any public meeting; we will allow them to come to Montreal. They pick up the language pretty rapidly. It was only just recently that some young lad from Russia, a boy of eighteen years of age, won the oratorical prize in English in some Ontario town.

An hon. MEMBER: It was the Ontario championship.

Mr. MANION: I notice that a French Canadian from Quebec won the oratorical contest at Toronto where my hon. friend from Winnipeg was one of the judges.

Mr. JACOBS: They do not need to go to Toronto to win oratorical prizes; every French Canadian could win a prize in the province of Quebec without exposing himself to the dangers of Toronto. If any member of the committee is sufficiently interested in how these foreigners, particularly Russians and Poles get on in Canada, let him pick up any newspaper published in Montreal this week and he will find that out of 443 graduates from McGill university over 100 were of foreign extraction, and I venture to say that 95 per cent of the prizes won were won by those foreigners. I think that indicates their worth. If you do not want to open the doors wide, open them at least half way and give people of this type a chance. There is no danger of this country becoming bolshevized or Russianized by permitting these people to come in. Take the case of those people out in the west, the Galicians, the Ukrainians and others who have gone on the farms. I do not know of one case where an unworthy foreigner is allowed to remain in this country because he is immediately sent back under the provisions of our deportation laws. I think we are making a serious mistake in enforcing the immigration laws as we do. We have the opportunity of our lifetime right now when the American doors are closed to every form of immigration. For 150 years the United States permitted immigrants to come into that

country, and they have become very great as the result of that policy. They would not have been the United States they are to-day had they depended simply on the plain living, high thinking Puritans who came over in the Mayflower. It is the mixture of the races which has made that country the greatest in the world, and we can stand a little of that mixing here without fear that our whole British system will go under. The second generation of the foreigner is quite as good as the native born Canadian; he has lost his language—perhaps an unfortunate thing—by his attendance at the public schools, and he has taken on the colour of his surroundings. He becomes even more patriotic than the native born Britisher; he sings the national anthem with much more gusto than the man who comes from the Clyde or the Mersey. I am not finding any fault with that because I think it is a fine idea to inculcate these principles into the children. In the second, third and fourth generation these children will be not only as good as the native born, but perhaps better.

Mr. SPENCER: In 1928, 166,000 people were brought into the country, of that figure 81,000 were brought in from countries other than Great Britain or the United States.

Mr. JACOBS: They were intended for the farms.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is a pretty wide open door.

Mr. JACOBS: It is not a wide open door. I would like to have the figures of the Russians and Poles and Czechoslovakians who came to this country not intended for the farm.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Apparently you blame Toronto for not allowing these people to come in.

Mr. JACOBS: Not at all.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why pick upon Toronto; I am not from Toronto, but I would like to know why the animosity towards Toronto?

Mr. JACOBS: A regulation was passed in Toronto recently declaring that no one could speak at a public meeting except in English.

Mr. GEARY: It was not a municipal regulation.

Mr. BENNETT: The constitution of the United States says that.

Mr. JACOBS: That is the impression that has got abroad, that they cannot talk in their own tongue where they hold public meetings; they will be refused a permit unless they talk in English, or perhaps also in French.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. BENNETT: That is a police regulation.

Mr. JACOBS: A man may be talking in his own tongue and they may think that he is talking sedition while he may be eulogizing the king. Does the hon. member say that foreigners can hold public meetings and talk in their own tongue?

Mr. GEARY: They do it every day in the week.

Mr. JACOBS: What about the municipal regulations?

Mr. GEARY: I do not know whether or not the hon. member was in the house when this matter was discussed, or whether he is simply indulging in a popular form of amusement by attacking Toronto.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is all.

Mr. JACOBS: That has been an amusement which has been consecrated by years of usage.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If you are not satisfied with the immigration laws why do you not attack the government?

Mr. JACOBS: I have been attacking the government; this is my form of attack.

Mr. FORKE: He attacks me every week.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He is afraid to attack, that is all.

Mr. JACOBS: I always have attacked the government; perhaps I have made a mistake.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In that case, why do you not vote in the right way?

Mr. JACOBS: There was one occasion when I was not present in the house, but if I had been here I would have voted for my hon. friend. He should not cast that up to me, but should reckon it unto me for righteousness. I do not believe that any remarks I make, no matter how often they are repeated, will be of any utility in causing the government to change its views, and the reason is quite plain. Every government keeps its ear to the ground, this government as well as other governments. The Union government had exactly the same rules in force as the present government.

Mr. MANION: They apparently did not hear very well.

Mr. JACOBS: Probably not, or they might have been in power to-day.

Mr. MANION: They must have had wadding in their ears.

Mr. JACOBS: Or perhaps they did not have any brains behind their ears.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member may have his brains behind his ears, but most of us have ours in front or above.

An hon. MEMBER: Or in between.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know very much about the human anatomy.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the hon. member make that suggestion with reference to the present government, about their brains being behind their ears?

Mr. JACOBS: Not at all, I would be hurried to the tower if I did. Influence more powerful than I possess would have to be used in order to bring this government, or any government which may succeed it, into line with my ideas. My hon. friend from Fort William talks very glibly about what he would do, but I want to tell him that were he in power, which the Lord forbid, he would take the same view—

An hon. MEMBER: It won't be long now.

Mr. JACOBS: —which the present Minister of Immigration has taken.

Mr. MANION: Not at all.

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps he would change it by adding a few more sheep.

Mr. MANION: Those sheep seem to be worrying my hon. friend. I could understand that if it were pigs he was objecting to, but I do not know why he should object to sheep.

Mr. JACOBS: I may say with regard to the pig, it never crosses my lips; it must not, but as regards sheep, I think we can be on common ground.

Mr. BALDWIN: I shall have to take the hon. member to task. It has appeared in Hansard for many years that the hon. member for Stanstead has said that he is willing to allow to come to Canada everyone who is law-abiding and prepared to work. It was such a policy that built up the population of the United States to more than 75,000,000 before they imposed any restrictions even upon public charges who had to be cared for by municipalities. In this country we have very much better climatic conditions, and from a geographical standpoint we do not have, as they do, the Mexicans to the south, of whom there have come into the United States something like 5,000,000. They are getting quite numerous in the great city of Chicago. I would not have any barriers whatever against people coming into Canada from any other part of the world, because our climatic conditions would prevent the coloured races coming here to any great extent. I have no apologies for making the remarks that I have made in past years, and those remarks have been quoted by former ministers of immigration. To-day I would pursue the same policy. I would not allow one dollar of a vote in the estimates of the department under consideration if every Canadian when he was at home or abroad would tell of the beauties of this great country and of its wonderful opportunities, inviting people from every other part of the world to come here and enjoy our great resources as regards soil, mines, fisheries and timber. We have in this immense country resources such as no other country in the world possesses. We have, in the develoment of our great hydro-electric industry, vast possibilities. At the present time we have in this Canada of ours, from the centre to the circumference, a wonderful period of development. Not one person within the realm may go without work and we could invite thousands, tens of thousands, aye, even hundreds of thousands of people to come here and go to work on their own initiative.

I believe a policy of assisted immigration brings to this country a pussy-footed, spineless people who are not worth while. If we would just advertise to the whole world that this is a most wonderful country, there would be no difficulty in getting people to come here. Enthusiastic Canadians travelling through the greate centres of the United States and letting it be known that the Canadian abroad is a live wire; that he can speak for his country, can do far more for immigration than a dead-wood official sitting in an office in Manchester, New Hampshire, San Francisco or other places. Such officials have not enough life to show that they have a soul of their own, to say nothing of their being ambassadors to bring people to this country. It is a shame and a disgrace—and I do not care what government undertakes it—to assist certain immigrants to come to this country to the exclusion of others. As I said before, I would allow everyone to come here, and I am against voting a dollar to assist people to come. Let our wonderful resources be made known, perhaps by advertising. Let people know that they can come here, enjoy the full rights of Canadian citizenship and take up, on their own initiative, some business that will make them rich and successful. We have many examples of that, but this pussy-footed, sissified, spineless people whom we are assist-

ing to come to this country are not worth two cents either to Canada or to themselves. They will become public charges and I am against a dollar being voted on their behalf. Let us take down the bars and invite everybody to come here. There is no danger. The hon. member for Stanstead has been quoted perhaps as saying that he would put some restrictive measures against the coloured races. I am not strongly opposed to them. I have seen black people with white hearts and I have seen people with white skins who are black and dirty-hearted.

In the Niagara belt they have not enough people to gather the fruit. Sometimes we are eating cherries canned in the United States while our own cherries, peaches, strawberries and other fruits are lying on the ground an inch thick in the Niagara belt. It is sad to think that intelligent members of parliament will cavil over immigration restrictions. The charge should go back to the Union government for their work in keeping Scandinavians and other good people out of Canada, but I am glad the war period is over and the results of the harsh words that were said here in those days are dying out. I feel keenly that such a vigorous, virile people as we are with such a vast and amazing country, are not making greater strides in regard to population. As was said by the previous speaker, the United States were keen on putting a quota restriction against other countries while they left an open door for Canadians and Mexicans. The reason why they leave an open door for the Mexicans is that there are vast stretches along the Santa Fe and the Union Pacific where a white man cannot work with the thermometer running from 110 to 120 degrees for months, so that they gladly welcome the Mexican to that labourious work in the intense heat of their southern climes. It seems to me too elementary for parliament to be talking about immigration restrictions as they have been since I came here twelve years ago. I want the hon. member who preceded me to remember that that I have always advocated, as he has done, that no one should be prevented from coming to this country.

Mr. MANION: There has been a discussion for some time as to the number of Canadians going into the United States. and their racial origin. I have under my hand figures sent me at my request by the Immigration department of the United States, and it is worth while giving them because I think they should be on record. The heading is:

Immigrant aliens admitted to the United States from Canada (last permanent residence for a year or more)—

[Mr. Baldwin.]

So they do not have to be naturalized in Canada. It is just the permanent residence here for a year or more.

Mr. JACOBS: They must be born in Canada to be allowed in under the quota.

Mr. MANION: Let me read the statement. The heading is:

Immigrant aliens admitted to the United States from Canada (last permanent residence for a year or more) during the ten fiscal years ended June 30, 1919 to 1928, by principal races or peoples, showing annual average with comparative per cent, as specified.

I will take just the year 1928:

African (black)	161
Armenian	43
Bohemian and Moravian	51
Bulgarian, Serbian and Montenegrin.	27
Croatian and Slovenian	41
Dutch and Flemish	800

The next few items I am going to read constitute the sad part for Canada:

English	24,253
French	14,227
Irish	10,672
Scotch	13,077

Mr. JACOBS: Any soda with those Scotch?

Mr. MANION: Well, they do not take Scotch and soda over in the United States now; they make it up fresh.

Finnish	79
German	3,005
Greek	64
Hebrew	1,761

That is the race my hon. friend should feel sorry about. I am sorry, too, because they are good friends of mine, and I have a lot of them in my riding. To continue:

Race or people	1928
Italian (North)	256
Italian (South)	148
Lithuanian	65
Magyar	158
Polish	474
Roumanian	82
Russian	228
Ruthenian	221
Scandinavian	2,242
Scotch	13,077
Slovak	271
Syrian	78
Welsh	474
All others	196

Mr. JACOBS: That was on the two per cent quota. They only permitted two per cent from those countries, but in England, Ireland and Scotland the two per cent is very much larger based on the population in the United States previous to 1890.

Mr. MANION: That is possibly correct. The total for 1928 was 73,154. I will also

put on record the totals of those leaving this country for the United States for the ten years, as given by the United States officials.

1919	57,782
1920	90,025
1921	72,317
1922	46,810
1923	117,011
1924	200,690
1925	100,895
1926	91,019
1927	81,506
1928	73,154

The years 1923, 1924, 1925 and 1926 were the big years.

Mr. FORKE: For some of those years Newfoundland is included.

Mr. MANION: This does not include Newfoundland.

Mr. FORKE: Newfoundland is included from 1920 to 1925.

Mr. SANDERSON: Has the hon. member the figures of those who returned to Canada from the United States during the last three years?

Mr. MANION: No. I have asked for those figures, but none of those who leave this country for the United States are entered there as Canadians, and none leaving the United States are entered as Canadians. They are entered according to nationality. For instance, it gives the number of American citizens leaving.

Mr. CAHAN: Mostly tourists going through Canada.

Mr. MANION: No. The figures I have given are people who have gone over there to live and to make their permanent home in the United States.

Mr. JACOBS: As the hon. gentleman remarked, there was a large increase in 1924.

Mr. MANION: Yes. The worst year was 1924, and the four worst years were 1923, 1924, 1925 and 1926.

Mr. JACOBS: That was after the quota law was put into effect.

Mr. MANION: Possibly that is to a certain extent true, but it is also true that times were worse in this country then than they are now, and that more people were going across. I gave these figures the other day but not for the separate years, and I showed that from 1919 to 1921, for which the Conservatives were responsible, the number leaving this country for the United States averaged 66,000 people, and for the six years during which the Liberals were in power from 1923 to 1928, the average was 111,000 a year.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, we are still dealing with immigration. I wanted to take two or three minutes to finish some figures that I had, but I gave the figures to Hansard and I have not yet received them back. I have sent for them. The point that I want to make is that the United States statistics as to our emigration to the United States, in addition to giving the number of people coming over from Canada according to nationalities or races also gives them according to occupations, and I notice that out of the 73,000—I think that was the figure for last year—who went to the United States, there was a large proportion of skilled artisans and professional men. In other words, of the 73,000 who crossed to the United States there were about 23,000 who were skilled artisans or professional men. That is my recollection. If that figure is not correct I will correct it when I get the figures.

Mr. CAHILL: Canadians?

Mr. MANION: Of those that went from Canada. They were English, Irish, Scotch, French and other nationalities. That means that out of those thousands there are 23,000 men whom we have trained to be either skilled or professional men. The cost of training a boy to a profession is tremendous in this country to-day. I know it rather well myself. It runs into a large amount of money, when you think of a boy growing up to eighteen or so and then going to college for at least four or five years; it means probably the expenditure on the part of the parent of something like $10,000. That is what is spent by the parent, but what of the money being spent by the provinces on educational facilities, universities and so forth? I have tried three or four times to estimate, if possible, the amount it costs this country to educate a boy to some profession, and we are losing some thousands of these men to the United States. While the skilled man is not perhaps so costly to the country yet the professional man is terribly costly, and the skilled man is certainly costly as well, when everything is taken into consideration, and we must bear in mind not only the cost but the loss to our

country of those men who have gone to another country to produce wealth for that country. We are losing very heavily. I merely wish to impress that point. I have sent for the papers; they are not down yet, but I will let the figures go as such, and if they are wrong I will correct them when the papers come down.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: I think I would be very remiss in my duty, Mr. Chairman, if I did not take this opportunity to deal with certain phases of the question of immigration, especially in view of the insidious insinuations and provocative statements that have been made by many of our newspapers in Canada, and by many of our public men, with respect to the alleged belligerent attitude of our so-called foreigners in Canada, and the implied inference as to their unfitness to qualify for Canadian citizenship.

My desire to take a little of the time of this house has been greatly stimulated by a sheet called The Advocate of the National Association of Canada, published at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, dated February 15, 1929, in which all the vituperative vitriol at the command of Bishop Lloyd has found vent in a bitter denunciation of the central Europeans, in fact, of all foreigners in Canada. I cannot regard the subject matter printed in The Advocate in any other light than as a frame-up against the central European, an attempt to make him the goat of all our social ills, and to credit him with all the dirty work committed by somebody else. And while I am not prepared to prove the neurotic and unchristian Bishop Lloyd as the chief instigator of all this business, I am safe in saying that this kind of propaganda meets with the hearty approval of this false apostle of the Prince of Peace.

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to read a letter which Bishop Lloyd sent to the ministry of the Protestant churches of western Canada. I am not so much concerned with the first part of his letter. He has made one statement, however, to which I wish to direct attention. He has said:

> These dirty continentals coming in are out of all proportion to the British immigrant.

I have some statistics here, given me by the Minister of Immigration which proves that this statement is absolutely untrue. In the year 1926-27 we had coming into Canada 122,966 immigrants. Of those 49,000 were from the British Isles; 30,000 were from the Scandinavian countries, and only 42,000 were from other countries. In 1927-28 the immigrants from the British Isles numbered 50,872; from the Scandinavian countries 30,702; and from other countries such as the central European countries 42,000. In 1928-29, 58,880 immigrants came from the British Isles; 29,000 from the Scandinavian countries, and 48,703 from such countries as the central European countries. Those figures disprove the statement made by Bishop Lloyd in The Advocate.

The second part of the letter reads as follows:

> The Ottawa committee recommended to parliament the nonrenewal in its present form of the existing railways' agreement expiring in 1930. But why should this western country be inflicted with another three years of these dirty, ignorant, garlic-smelling, unpreferred continentals as we have been in the last three years? Surely this country ought to be able to govern its railways rather than let the railways demoralize our population.
>
> It is no use appealing to the Roman Catholic clergy to help, because they, as well as the poor type politicians are the profiteers. The best work in this connection is being done by the National Association of Canada, but whether you lend your assistance in that way or not, at least you might write your individual protest to the government and approach your municipalities and urge them to take some step to mitigate this national nuisance.
>
> Believe me to be,
> Yours very faithfully
> (Sgd) George Exton Lloyd,
> Bishop of Saskatchewan.

That is a letter from Bishop Lloyd to the ministry of the Protestant churches of the western provinces dated June 29, 1928. Six months later The Advocate published a news item which read as follows:

> The "Unpreferred European" Question
>
> We have copied from the "Saskatoon Star-Phoenix" the following special telegram. It is probably quite correct and indicates that the National Association of Canada are in for a great battle to maintain these three western provinces as really "British" territories. It also clearly indicates the length to which these "continentals" are prepared to go under the guidance of the agents of the railway and steamship companies:—
>
> Central Europeans in the West to Petition Ottawa—Object to rule
>
> Articles in Wide Range of Languages Issued On Prairies
>
> Special to The Star-Phoenix
>
> Winnipeg, Man., Feb. 6.—Central Europeans domiciled in western Canada are preparing to deluge Ottawa with petitions protesting against what is termed "The discriminatory ruling against the entrance into Canada of more than a very limited number of central Europeans".
>
> 50,000 signatures
>
> The first of these petitions is signed by 50,000 naturalized Ukrainians and is to be supported by at least two other national groups, the Hungarians and Czechoslovakians, who also are said to be getting petitions under way.

Articles discussing the reduction planned in immigration from the non-preferred countries by the department of immigration are circulating throughout the west in Ukrainian, Polish, Czechoslovak and Hungarian papers. One of these articles carries the following:

"The department's gratuitous insult to a fine type of solid and thrifty Canadian citizenship will require a great deal more explanation than has so far been forthcoming, before it can be accepted as justifiable by any class of Canadian in any part of Canada."

Ukrainian petition

The Ukrainian petition will carry a preamble, it is understood, pointing out that the Ukrainians form the third largest racial group in Canada; that they were good enough to produce a goodly portion of the national wealth; to contribute their full share of the taxes; to serve in the war and to support the Red Cross; that, in fact they were considered good enough to assume and carry their share of the responsibilities of the country and now the government turns around to say that their relatives are not good enough to be admitted to Canada.

The petitioners will point out further, it is understood, that in 17 ridings they can elect their own candidate to the federal house if driven to unite on an issue of sufficient importance as to affect their very existence in this country. The petition forms are expected to be in circulation within a very few days.

Mr. Chairman, the surprising thing about this whole shady affair is the fact that this same news item appeared simultaneously together with much editorial comment in many of our chief newspapers throughout Canada. It looks to me very much like a conspiracy to bring the foreign born Canadians into conflict with the native born Canadians. On February 26 I asked the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) whether he had received any of those alleged petitions and his reply was emphatically in the negative. Anticipating, however, the passive attitude which I knew would be taken by our press, I immediately sent a copy of Hansard to all those newspapers that had given so much publicity to the aforementioned false rumours. Not one single newspaper in Canada so much as mentioned my question of February 26. On April 18 I again asked the Minister of Immigration concerning the receipt of any petitions from Ukrainians in the west, and needless to say I was told that no such petitions had been received. Relative to the question I asked the minister on February 26, I beg to place on Hansard two editorials from two Ukrainian newspapers in the west. The first editorial, under the caption "Ukrainian protest re immigration", which appeared in the Ukrainian Voice of February 13, 1929, reads:

The Free Press Daily, February 6th, 1929, published a sensational news item, wherein certain unnamed Ukrainians planned to deluge the government at Ottawa with protests against the restriction of Ukrainian immigration. It is noted that 50,000 Ukrainians contemplate signing those protests reinforced by further petitions from Hungarians, Czechoslovaks, and other nationalities. The Ukrainian protest is supposed to proceed from the premise that the Ukrainians are the third nationality with respect to numbers in Canada; that they were materially instrumental in producing a large part of the wealth of Canada; that they paid their share of the taxes; that they did their bit in the great world war; that they supported the Red Cross; that they performed all their duties as citizens— and now the government repays them by disallowing their relatives entrance into Canada. It is noted further that said protest contemplates threatening the government, should said government not ease up on the matter, with a reorganization of Ukrainian forces, with a view to electing their own members in 17 electoral districts.

All our efforts with respect to acquiring information as to just which Ukrainians plan said protest, have met with no success. It appears therefore, that 50,000 Ukrainians are planning a protest, and a threat of electing 17 members to parliament; but no Ukrainian knows anything of this matter, and if he does know anything he has not the courage to admit it. The Free Press, alone, evidently is cognizant of the matter. Nevertheless, this did not prevent this daily newspaper from forwarding to the Ukrainians some fatherly advice wherein they were dissuaded from doing anything foolish, and wherein it was also noted that neither the Ukrainians nor any other nationality from central Europe resident in western Canada, had any real grounds to register any grievance against the recent departmental restrictioon on the number of immigrants from central Europe, and neither has another daily newspaper, the Winnipeg Tribune, been backward in its reprimands. This daily offers the following question to the Ukrainian leaders: Do you protest as Ukrainians, or as Canadians? In view of your threat to elect 17 members it behooves us to reinforce our own strength and make every effort to safeguard ourselves from any further danger in this respect.

Irrespective of what our views may be on restricting immigration from central Europe, we wish to state most decidedly that not one of the responsible Ukrainian leaders in Canada has had anything to do with the news item in the Free Press; and that if mention is made anywhere of any action contemplated therein, such action in our opinion, is tantamount to mere bluff and provocation.

The second article, entitled, "Insidious insinuation", appeared in the Canadian Ukrainian of February 20, 1929:

Some time ago a sensational news item appeared in the Winnipeg English newspapers with respect to a concerted action of Canadian Ukrainians, protesting against the recent immigration restrictions, adding that 50,000 persons of Ukrainian, Hungarian and Czechoslovakian origin are planning to deluge Ottawa with petitions, and that in the event of a refusal the Ukrainians would elect their own members in electoral districts of Canada. This mysteriously originated item, promulgated with lightning-like rapidity through the length and breadth of Canada, evoked many various comments in the Canadian press.

The most noticeable thing in the whole affair is the fact that everyone else seems to know something about the matter except those who should be primarily interested, namely the Canadian Ukrainians. It thus becomes very evident that some unknown person who has an axe to grind wishes to further his interests at the expense of the Ukrainians. This can be inferred from the extreme haste with which this false rumour was so widely propagated; it can be detected in the awkward manner in which two contradictory lines of action are contemplated, including as it does in this fantastic manoeuvre the Hungarians and Czechoslovaks, and finally concluding with a foolhardy political threat.

We believe that the new immigration restrictions will not hurt the Ukrainians very much since they will, notwithstanding, still be able to bring in their relatives and friends to Canada on affidavits or special permits; and that only those central European nationalities would be affected which had none of their own farmers in Canada.

Notwithstanding this, however, we understand that certain interested factors are furthering their efforts in the same direction with a view to finding real facts to prove their untenable theory. It is therefore, quite possible that some group of impostors, posing as "representatives of the Ukrainian population", for certain considerations will allow itself to be utilized in the above-mentioned scheme, even going so far as to actually rallying our citizens in western Canada with a view to deluging Ottawa with petitions in the interests of the Ukrainian people.

We therefore most decisively wish to note that this whole affair is the initiative of some non-Ukrainian body; that nobody has the right in such an irresponsible manner to abuse the good name of the Canadian Ukrainians. The new immigration restriction with respect to farm labourers from central Europe will do us little harm if our farmers make an early effort to secure permits for their relatives and friends and thus give them an opportunity to arrive here early in the spring.

This thoughtless Free Press item has done much to compromise us in the eyes of the Canadian public, arousing as it does the fictitious menace of a political separatism. Canadian Ukrainians should therefore shun any move that would harness them to the wagon of hostile and false interests.

Hon. members will agree with me, after hearing these denials, that there is some sinister power in Canada whose main purpose is to engineer a so-called pogrom against Ukrainians in Canada, to compromise them in every possible manner, and whose despicable plans have no doubt gained the sympathy and unqualified support of the Advocate and Bishop Lloyd, the would-be Bismark of Prince Rupert, who has this to say in the Advocate:

> Here in Saskatchewan we have a score of nationalities kept within barricades to prevent their becoming full Canadians, a little Ruthenia here, a little Latvia there, a ltlle Slovakia, a little Roumania, a little Poland and so on.

[Mr. Luchkovich.]

It is a crime against these people that they should be thus kept prisoners within their national compound and prevented from full assimilation as Canadians.

Yes, and it is a crime against Christianity, against civilization and against Canadian unity when a bishop, who should be following in the footsteps of the Prince of Peace and preaching the gospel of eternal love and the brotherhood of man, can see nothing better in Central Europeans than a class of "dirty, ignorant, garlic-smelling, unpreferred continentals." Notwithstanding this indictment by the "saintly" bishop, does it not seem passing strange that from amongst these "dirty, ignorant, garlic-smelling, unpreferred continentals" have sprung such world figures as Paderewski, the world's greatest pianist; Tolstoy, the world's greatest philosopher and humanitarian of the nineteenth century, and from whom Bishop Lloyd might learn many a lesson in humane and temperate conduct; Madam Curie, the lady who discovered radium, an element which some day may help to cure even so hard-crusted a personage as Bishop Lloyd; Caruso, whom Bishop Lloyd would no doubt designate a dirty, ignorant, garlic-smelling, unpreferred dago, but the records of whose golden voice may even now be giving supreme pleasure to the goodly bishop, if such a thing be possible to one of such warped sensibilities—and a host of others whom the time limit set on my speech will not allow me to mention.

I do not think it is necessary for me to reiterate my views on immigration. These views were fully covered in a speech I delivered on June 7, 1928, and it would be superfluous for me to repeat what I said on that occasion. Suffice it to say that I am heartily opposed to the subsidizing of immigration because I believe it is based on a vicious principle. I do not believe in too great an influx either, because I do not believe the economic conditions of Canada today warrant such an influx.

In the few moments left at my disposal I do not intend to deal with any general arguments with regard to immigration, but I do intend to flay and flout the ignominious references made by Bishop Lloyd to the central Europeans. The central Europeans are neither dirty, ignorant nor unpreferred, and as for being garlic-smelling, I consider such a weakness a thousand times better than filling one's mind with the hideous and discriminatory epithets I have mentioned, which appeal to the mentality of, and could be uttered only by, a moron. I repeat most

emphatically, Mr. Chairman, that the central European is not what Bishop Lloyd would make him out to be; his opinion is an insult not only to the central European but to humanity in general. It is true that most of these central Europeans are rather poor when they come to Canada, but they make up for this "disqualification"—and I would put that word in quotation marks—by their thrift, their sturdiness, their perseverance and their determination to reclaim homes for themselves on our prairies.

Once these Europeans come to Canada they stay here; they are stickers in the fullest sense of the word. It does not take them long to fulfil their homestead requirements; it does not take them long to pay off their debts and obligations, and that is more than I can say for a number of those so-called preferred European immigrants. In the old country their fare was the simplest and poorest, yet they finely thrived on it; they had very few home comforts as we know them in Canada, yet they dearly loved their rude dwellings. They were family men in a much closer sense than is usually known on the North American continent; they lived, they loved, and their whole world was the land on which they worked. They retain in Canada those fine characteristics for which they were noted in the old country, and unquestionably Canada has been a gainer thereby. One can draw this conclusion from the speech of no less an authority than the Minister of Immigration, delivered in this house on March 15, 1929, as follows:

> To prevent misconception I want to pay a tribute to the people who have come from those countries. They have made contributions of permanent value to the life of the Dominion; they are taking an active interest in Canadian problems and government, as witness members of local governments and one member of foreign birth in the Dominion parliament. They have worked in our lumber camps, helped to build our railways and highways, dug our ditches and given good service for wages received. They have cleared thousands of acres of our scrub land in the northern part of the prairie provinces and have made the wilderness blossom as the rose. They have built their modest homes; in many instances they have every modern item of equipment on their farms and have purchased more machinery and equipment in recent years than other agriculturists, and they have added to the wealth of the country by the production of millions of dollars' worth of farm produce. They have not lagged behind in other respects; they have sent their children to high schools and universities, fitting in this young and growing nation.

Then, Mr. Chairman, one of the hon. members opposite referred to certain Russian boys who have received prizes in different lines of endeavour. I could name hundreds of those boys and girls in Canada who have received prizes in public and high schools as well as universities. Only two years ago a young girl, whose name I have forgotten but who originated in the southern part of Russia, received the highest marks obtained at one of the Toronto universities.

Arvo Vaara was sent to gaol for uttering in Canada certain seditious sentiments and in his charge to the jury Mr. Justice Wright had this to say:

> —was the article calculated or intended to excite ill between different classes of the King's subjects, because that comes within the definition of sedition—

If Vaara, because of this article, was sent to gaol for six months I contend that Bishop Lloyd should be sent to gaol for six years, because his reference to the different races in Canada was just as bad as the article written by Vaara in the paper which he edited somewhere in Ontario.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to immigrants from Europe I do not believe there should be any of this humbug and tommyrot we hear about the superiority of one race over another. I challenge any member of this house or any scientist to prove biologically that one race of people could not do as well as another race under similar circumstances. What does our Minister of Immigration have to say on this point? Allow me to read another passage from his speech:

> A good deal of controversy exists in regard to continental and British immigration. I have never agreed, Mr. Speaker, that there are superior and inferior people. There are backward and forward people and backward and forward nations. We all know, looking into the dim past, that geat nations have existed and have passed away, and left little more behind than a name. In more recent times, we also know that nations have reached the peak of progress and civilization and have then faded out of the picture, as it were, and other nations have taken their place. That is what has happened in the past and doubtless the same will happen in the future. Some nationalities, however, are much more easily absorbed than others, and we have to take that into consideration in considering this question of immigration.

Doubtless there is a good deal of truth in that statement, but the last sentence is open to challenge. Measured by any standard whatever, I fail to see wherein and how it takes longer to make a desirable Canadian citizen of the central European than is the case with any other European. He learns English just as fast; he educates his children just as well; he serves on school and municipal boards just as readily, and in the matter of paying off his debts and obligations he

need not take off his hat to anyone, be he a foreign born or a native born Canadian citizen.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, having these facts in view, I think it is not fair to classify these immigrants as non-preferred. Supposing the Minister of Immigration were to call the members who sit to the left of the Speaker the non-preferred party, would the Conservatives like it? They certainly would not, because deep down in their hearts the Conservatives feel that they are just as good as the members who sit to the right of the Speaker, and perhaps better. It is only human nature for any man to think he is just as good as the other fellow, and it is also human nature for him to resent the insinuation that he is in some way inferior. That is what this stupid classification does; it differentiates; it discriminates; it prejudices; it provokes and, in a word, it tends to stimulate a bitter antagonism among the newcomers to Canada.

Mr. FORKE: I would like to just point out to the hon. gentleman that there is nothing in the Immigration Act or in the regulations which speaks of preferred or non-preferred immigrants. That is a common expression, but it is not embodied either in the act or in the regulations.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: Perhaps not, but that is what it amounts to in practice. Now, think of the future; suppose you were the Hungarian or Ukrainian or Bohemian or Czechoslovakian father of a couple of intelligent, athletic and alert young men who were just beginning university courses, to whom it was remarked by their Anglo-Saxon fellow students that they were a couple of bohunk sons of an unpreferred immigrant. You would not like the reflection; neither does the immigrant. I say again we must think of the future; why should future posterity suffer because of the folly of the present generation? Whilst it may be true that a rose by any other name smells just as sweet, still I do not think it would be very flattering to the rose to call it garlic. So why not give the immigrant his due and call him by the name he deserves? The discriminatory application of the words "preferred" and "non-preferred" can do nothing to bring about that unity without which no country can become really secure and great.

I would like to deal with a suggestion made by Bishop Lloyd's Advocate with regard to the segregation of our immigrants in large colonies as being inimical to their complete absorption as Canadian citizens. When I speak of the susceptibility of the immigrant to assimiliation and his readiness in accepting our laws and our constitution, I know I am dealing with a subject which is of grave concern to those whose patriotic fervour and ardent love of country foresee in the existence of any foreigners within our borders a potential menace. It is little wonder that the advent of any newcomers to our shores is a signal for a great stir in our social, educational and political circles, directed, no doubt, with a view to finding the best method of coping with the problem of welcoming the immigrant and making of him, in the shortest time possible, a desirable citizen sharing with us all that such citizenship entails. There are some good people in Canada who would come to the aid of the immigrant purely from an altruistic, humanitarian point of view; others would exploit him to the limit or else help him for practical opportunistic reasons; while people of the type of Bishop Lloyd would herd all our immigrants on one ship and then let it sink in the middle of the ocean.

The Advocate foresees a great menace in the segregation of immigrants in large colonies and, therefore, I would infer that as an alternative measure it would sandwich all our newcomers in with the rest of the nationalities; but would Bishop Lloyd be willing to have Hungarians, Poles and Ukrainians as neighbours? Not on your life—no dirty, ignorant, garlic-smelling, unpreferred immigrant is going to be permitted in his back yard; and here we have the key to the whole situation. The idea of mixing the races in this way is a good one so long as each race is willing to tolerate the other; but when you have a situation where one element is offensively trying to lord it over the other you create the germs of a dissension which is bound to keep the races apart no matter how willing each component element may be to do its part in the attainment of one common ideal. The rest of us tolerate the immigrant only in so far as he looks up to us, but as for accepting him into our social circle, that is another matter. It is another matter to the immigrant also. If he has any gumption at all, and he usually has, he will discern the discrimination and he will resent it. How? Simply by leaving the community in which he resides and moving to a district where he knows he has an even chance, or in other words, where he knows he will find his own level. All this talk of assimilating the immigrant without extending to him a helping hand, without meeting him half way and without giving him a square deal is mere cant; it simply cannot be done.

There is no question in my mind that the best way to deal with assimilation is to leave

it alone. Let us remember that the psychology of our immigrants cannot be changed in a generation but that this metamorphosis will come about only by a slow and gradual process as man becomes inured to his new environment. Our would-be reformers lose sight of this fact when they charge the immigrant with the retention of what one would call a certain sentimental bond with the land of their birth. This, in my opinion, is not a regrettable propensity. It is a universal and spiritual quality which has manifested itself in mankind the whole world over for countless ages; it is the natural impulse which transports in imagination or in actuality the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) to his little village in Wales; our Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) to his wonderful Scottish highlands; our Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) to his beloved Leicestershire; and our Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan), the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Brady), and all other Irishmen in the house, to their beautiful lakes of Killarney.

I once had as a neighbour an adorable old Scotch lady. Unaware of her presence on her veranda one evening I put on the gramaphone an old Scotch song, "The Bonnie Banks o' Loch Lomond." When she heard the strains of what was to her a very familiar old melody, she came right over to our porch and made me play it over and over again, crying after each time I played it as though her dear old heart would break. It is because of this innate quality inherent in mankind that I think we should be very careful how we meddle with the sensibilities of other people; for if you take away what is human and natural in a person without replacing it with something better or at least something just as good, you destroy his usefulness, not only to himself but to his newly adopted country as well. For this reason I believe that the best way to deal with assimilation is to leave it alone. Our immigrants know very well that it is futile to try to swim against the current and so they are not offering the resistance which our would-be professional reformers claim they are.

I am very well acquainted with this ambitious reformer type. He or she usually is a dogmatic university graduate, or a hard-boiled crank like Bishop Lloyd, who imagines that the future welfare of the world rests on his or her shoulders. They start out by concocting a tailor-made scheme for the complete absorption of the foreigner, believing that the remedy can be applied in the same manner as feeding the machines in our great industrial plants. They overlook absolutely the personal and human element with the result that their efforts are met with the righteous indignation and hearty contempt of those they so thoughtlessly wish to help. You cannot treat an immigrant as a menial and expect him at the same time to accept our citizenship wholeheartedly and unqualifiedly. If shown sympthy he will reciprocate; if shown antagonism he will react toward it. The only method which should be followed is that of absolute fair play. Let us meet him half way and extend to him a helping hand and give him a square deal. This is the one and only way of assimilating the immigrant.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, I desire to give the correct figures which I promised the committee I would let it have. During 1928, 18,730 skilled labourers and 3,884 professionally trained people left Canada for the United States, making, in round figures, 23,000, which was the figure I gave. To illustrate the heavy drain this is on the country, I would like to point out that in 1924, the heaviest year of emigration, we lost 41,345 skilled labourers from Canada, according to the American figures.

I would like to make a correction in regard to Hansard. I stated that Hansard had the papers I required and they had not been returned, but I find that they had been placed in a closed envelope on my desk and I had not noticed them. I do not wish to do Hansard any injustice in this regard.

I think the whole house has listened with a very great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I believe the people of Canada can take pride in the fact that one who, although born on this continent came of Ukrainian parents, has been able to deliver, as member of this house, a speech of which any hon. member might well be proud.

The hon. member quoted from the remarks of the Minister of Immigration and I would like to supplement what he said with regard to foreigners, or what I choose to call new Canadians, by saying that many such statements also have come from this side of the house. I would like to warn the hon. member and some of his friends against the tactics which were employed in past elections, and particularly in the last one. A man who had no connection with this house, who was not a candidate for election, but who was a Conservative and who happened to get up on a platform to speak at a Conservative picnic, criticized the so-called foreigners and that speech was used throughout the whole of western Canada as a criticism which was made by this party. The speech was printed and

sent to all sections of the western country where there was a newcomer or foreign population, and used with such marked political effect that it cost our party many thousand votes. It has been stated many times that the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen himself lost his seat because of that very statement for which he was in no way, by any stretch of the imagination, responsible. I just wish to point out to my hon. friend, for whom we all have a great deal of respect, that he, enlightened, educated, able to put forward his ideas as he is, would be well advised to inform those of his people who have not had his opportunities, to be just a little careful at times in blaming a whole party for the irresponsible statement of somebody who has no direct connection as a candidate or a member of that party.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to suggest that this emanated from me?

Mr. MANION: Certainly not. I did everything I could to compliment the hon. member. I had no intention of doing anything else.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Before one o'clock we were discussing a certain item, and the minister told us that the expenditure on the same item last year amounted to $863,000. Now he is asking us to vote $1,080,000 or an increase of more than $200,000. I wish to point out some items that appear in the public accounts of Canada. We are, for instance, maintaining an office at Detroit. Imagine keeping an office at Detroit at an expenditure of nearly $15,000 when we could have an office on our own grounds at Windsor, only half a mile away. Imagine keeping an office at Saginaw, Michigan! The minister may say: Well, this has been done before. In that case it is time for a change. Imagine keeping an office at San Francisco, another at St. Paul and another at Spokane! Is the committee aware that in the whole of Germany we have only one office, at Hamburg; only one office in France, one in Holland and one in Riga, Latvia, but we have forty in the United States. If a United States citizen wants to come to Canada, does he need to go to Detroit, if there is Windsor across the river to come to? The thing to me is absolutely absurd. From the results which we are receiving from this office there is no occasion for the minister to ask us to vote $200,000 under this item. I therefore beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Fort William:

That vote No. 54 be reduced by the sum of $200,000.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. WARD: We have for several days been treated to a feast of—I do not know what you would call it—from the opposition as to why we should spend a sum in the neighbourhood of $300,000,000 on an immigration scheme according to the resolution of the hon. member for North Vancouver.

Mr. MANION: That was not the resolution. That was his suggestion.

Mr. WARD: I notice the hon. members all supported it. It occurred to me that we might erect along this wall in very large letters just opposite my hon. friends across the floor, the motto "Consistency". During the last eight years, while I have been in the house, we have had a number of new theoretical ideas as to how or why we might improve conditions in this country, but of all the illogical, half baked, ill-digested theories that have been presented to the house in those eight years, the scheme of the hon. member for North Vancouver is the worst. It was clear evidence of a man with no practical experience whatever. To those of us who have had experience in the clearing and settling of land, it was so ridiculous that—well, I give the party credit for almost withdrawing the motion yesterday.

We have now the spectacle of the hon. member for Lincoln moving a motion to reduce this item by $200,000; although a few days ago his party were prepared to force the country into an expenditure of $300,000,000 on a scheme that would have cost us another $300,000,000 to get the people out of the difficulties into which they would have fallen had we ever attempted to carry out that scheme. Surely it is time we commenced to grasp the facts, to get two feet on the ground and to consider these matters in the light of the best interests of Canada and not to run off at tangents as hon. members opposite have been doing all through the debate. I very much favour the philosophy of the hon. member for Vegreville, and I want to congratulate him on the excellent speech he has just made. No other member during the whole debate kept two feet closer to the ground and discussed the matter in more fundamental terms than he did.

I am opposed to assisted immigration of any character. I have often said that I think we should have a policy of an open door, with certain restrictions so that no man would be admitted to Canada unless he was financially—

An hon. MEMBER: Consistency!

Mr. WARD: My hon. friend over there says: Open the door and let them come in from any part of the world. If we opened the door and said that no man should be admitted to this country unless he had at least $5,000, $6,000 or $7,000, which it costs today to establish oneself on any kind of a farm, we would perhaps secure a different class of immigrants. As the hon. member for Vegreville says, in our present condition the people of central Europe are about the only ones who can establish themselves upon a farm. The people from Great Britain cannot unless they are pap fed, unless we provide them with $5,000, $6,000 or $7,000 to buy a farm and equipment and then educate them along farming lines. I am opposed to a system of assisted immigration to this country whether the people come from Great Britain or central Europe. I think the system is vicious, but if we intend to continue a system of assisted immigration, we might very well say that we shall open the doors to all the white nations, but under certain restrictions, physical, mental and financial, so that we shall get a class of citizens who will take care of themselves when they come to Canada.

Mr. ARTHURS: My hon. friend stated that the estimates presented by the minister amounted to $3,000,000. As a matter of fact, they amount to $3,462,000, in addition to which there is before the house an estimate for the Soldier Settlement Board amounting, so far the Department of Immigration is concerned, to $1,400,000. This department some years ago, was started for the purpose of settling returned soldiers in Canada and by degrees it has become a part of the Department of Immigration, so much so that in their report of 1927 they make this statement:

There has been continued development during the year of the strictly colonization features of the board's work. Land Settlement branch officials have undertaken:

(1) Settlement and establishment on the land of families brought forward by the Department of Immigration and Colonization under the 3,000 British family scheme.

(2) Settlement on farms of continental families brought forward by the railways under the government continental family scheme.

(3) Placement and aftercare of married and single British farm workers recruited by the Department of Immigration and Colonization, including trainees from British training farms.

(4) Investigations of the bona fides of nominations made by residents of Canada in favour of residents of Great Britain, and aftercare of British farm workers, married and single, brought forward by the Department of Immigration and Colonization, as a result of such nominations.

(5) Aftercare of British farm workers brought forward by the Colonization departments of the two great Canadian railways, and by the Ontario government.

I would like to call particular attention to this last. This is a charge against the Department of Immigration under the vote of the land settlement board, now so-called.

(6) Investigations concerned with applications to the Department of Immigration and Colonization, for the admission to Canada of alien immigrants.

Last year this was a subject brought forward very prominently before a committee of the house and apparently it had been investigated by a subdepartment of the Immigration department itself.

(7) Investigations of the settlement conditions of foreign farm workers, brought forward by the railway companies.

These are two items under the railway companies' agreement.

(8) Investigations of applications for commutation of pensions.

(9) Surveys to ascertain lands available for colonization.

(10) Reception of distinguished guests from Great Britain and other countries, who desire to report to their governments on settlement opportunities.

In other words, this department is attempting to conceal the fact that they are spending under another guise practically $1,500,000 each year, which is not included in the estimates of the department but is attributed to the Soldier Settlement Board.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member has accused the department of trying to conceal expenditures or publishing them under false pretences. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. ARTHURS: I am not. The minister admits that this money has been expended by the department.

Mr. FORKE: By the land settlement board, under the Department of Immigration.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is only camouflage.

Mr. FORKE: It is not camouflage.

Mr. ARTHURS: As a matter of fact, has this sum been expended or not by or for the Immigration department?

Mr. FORKE: It has been spent by the land settlement board for the Department of Immigration.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is all I said in the first place.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. gentleman said that the expenditure was camouflaged under the Soldier Settlement Board.

Mr. ARTHURS: Yes, I said that, and I believe it yet.

Mr. FORKE: Let us be fair. All the work that is carried on under the Soldier Settlement Board is charged to the board. Then we have a land settlement board, under the Department of Immigration.

Mr. ARTHURS: There is only one board, and the minister is now talking of that board as the Soldier Settlement Board. That is what I complain of. There is only one board, and the minister calls it the Soldier Settlement Board.

Mr. FORKE: If the hon. gentleman would only allow me to finish, I have no wish to mislead anybody. The land settlement board has the same personnel as the Soldier Settlement Board. When the Soldier Settlement Board is dealing with the soldier settler, it acts as a board under the act. When it acts as the land settlement board, it is under the control and direction of the Immigration department. There is no attempt at all to conceal the facts. The first item under the Soldier Settlement Board estimates is for Soldier Settlement Board work, and the second item is for land settlement board work under the Department of Immigration. There is no camouflage at all.

Mr. ARTHURS: I said most distinctly that the first item was under the Soldier Settlement Board.

Mr. FORKE: But the hon. member said the expenditure was camouflaged.

Mr. ARTHURS: And the minister has confirmed everything that I said. In the twenty or thirty times that he has mentioned that board just recently he called it, as Hansard will confirm, the Soldier Settlement Board. As a matter of fact, two-thirds of the activities of that board are land settlement work which is directly attributable to the Department of Immigration and has no connection with soldier settlement at all. While the vote for soldier settlement this year is $1,000,000, the vote for immigration is $1,400,000, but every dollar of the overhead of this department is charged against the Soldier Settlement Board.

Mr. FORKE: No, that is absolutely wrong.

Mr. ARTHURS: Show me where I am wrong.

[Mr. Arthurs.]

Mr. FORKE: I have tried to explain, but I cannot furnish my hon. friend with the intelligence to grasp it.

Mr. ARTHURS: The estimates speak for themselves, and I am willing to put my intelligence up against that of the Minister of Immigration. The vote reads, $2,400,000 for the Soldier Settlement Board. Now $1,000,000 of that is for soldier settlement purposes, and $1,400,000 for immigration purposes. The minister agrees with that. He has not denied it in any particular, but every bit of the overhead is charged against the soldier settlement.

Mr. FORKE: To show how absurd the position of the hon. gentleman is and how he has not grasped the situation, let me say that the last part of vote 60 reads, "Amount required for general land settlement advances," and $690,000 of that is British money that was advanced.

Mr. ARTHURS: The estimates do not show that.

Mr. FORKE: It is the fact all the same.

Mr. ARTHURS: I am talking of the estimates as they appear. I have already pointed out that the Soldier Settlement Board themselves state in their report of last year, covering the year 1927-28, that their principal activities, 65 to 70 per cent of their activities, were directly attributable to the Department of Immigration. I have mentioned some of them, and I will read a little further. If the minister wants a little more, I will give him all he wants.

Mr. FORKE: The total vote for land settlement administration is $600,000 for administration instead of $1,400,000. Perhaps we can straighten this out better when the soldier settlement estimates are up.

Mr. ARTHURS: The point I am trying to make is, why does not the minister bring down these estimates under his own department?

Mr. FORKE: They are under my own department.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why are they not shown under the Department of Immigration, and why is this document I hold in my hand not one of the documents distributed to hon. members by the distribution office at the House of Commons?

Mr. FORKE: The land settlement branch of the Department of Immigration issues a statement along with the Soldier Settlement Board statement.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why are they not issued under your department?

Mr. FORKE: That is a matter of detail.

Mr. ARTHURS: No, it is a matter of convenience. I venture to say there are not fifty, perhaps twenty or even ten members of this house who have received a copy of this report which I hold in my hand.

Mr. FORKE: That may be true.

Mr. ARTHURS: It is not distributed to the members of this house.

Mr. FORKE: Oh, yes.

Mr. ARTHURS: No, it is not. The minister is absolutely wrong in that. I had to send for it. I want to go a little further, Mr. Chairman, I am quoting now from the report of 1927-28:

> The relative importance of these strictly colonization activities is shown in the diaries of the field supervisors of the board. The diaries show that more than 65 per cent of the time of field officials, during the period from April 1 to September 30, was spent in connection with general land settlement as distinct from soldier settlement. During the period under review, 27,561 visits were made in connection with soldier land settlement, while 48,413 visits were in connection with general land settlement and departmental investigations. The total mileage travelled was 1,167,265, and of this a total of 406,849 miles was on visits to soldier settlers and 760,460 miles in connection with other settlers.

This proves conclusively, Mr. Chairman, that the major portion of the activities of the Soldier Settlement Board—so called by the minister, not by me—relate to the Department of Immigration, and obviously their estimates should be presented by that department, and presented in the ordinary way. There is no question that the reports of this board are not issued in the ordinary way by this government, but separately by the department itself. They are not distributed in the way that the estimates, or the report of the minister himself, are distributed.

Mr. FORKE: Oh, yes; I laid those reports on the table at the commencement of the session, and they are available to every member of the house.

Mr. ARTHURS: I did not say anything about that. I simply said that they were not distributed in the ordinary way as are the reports of the Department of Immigration, and the minister cannot deny it.

Mr. FORKE: I do not know anything about the distribution. I know they are laid upon the table and are available.

Mr. ARTHURS: They are not available unless you send for them. I said before that the expenses of the Immigration department were approximately $3,000,000. As a matter of fact the estimates for this year are practically $5,500,000. There is also an estimate for the land settlement board, about which we have just been talking, of $1,400,000. We also have an expenditure by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and have had for many years, of $750,000, and about the same for the Canadian National. All these grants come directly or indirectly out of the people of Canada. There is also a vote for quarantine, directly attributable to immigration, of about $200,000 or $250,000. There is also the rent, upkeep, and so forth, of buildings in connection with this department. In other words there is a total vote for immigration outside of the railways, amounting to about $5,162,900, and the railways are paying about $1,500,000 in addition, all of which comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Canada.

Then we must remember that we have in Canada certain provinces at least which are directly interested in the immigration question. Ontario, the province from which I come, expends quite a considerable sum annually, and maintains an office in Great Britain. In 1928 Ontario paid $176,128.92 on account of immigration, according to the public accounts. Then we have various other agencies. We have the Church of England council of empire settlement; we have the Church Army of the Church of England; we have the Salvation Army; we have the Catholic emigration society; the orphan homes of Scotland; the Doctor Cossar homes; Fegan's home; Church of England waifs and strays society; British immigration and colonization association; Doctor Barnardo's homes; National Children's Home and Orphanage; Middlemore's homes; and a whole lot more that I am not going to enumerate. Every one of these institutions is supported by church organizations, or supports itself. The minister is attempting to delude—I do not want to be called to order—the house into the belief that he has brought into this country a certain number of immigrants during the last fiscal year. As a matter of fact, nine-tenths of these immigrants have been brought in through the agencies to which I have referred, agencies which have no part or parcel in the estimates of $5,100,000 of the Department of Immigration.

I remember two or three years ago that the minister had a little squabble with the Salvation Army. I will not say that he sent his officers, but his officers went for the ex-

press purpose of trying to make trouble with this particular organization. As a matter of fact the Salvation Army were able to cure the whole evil, and to prove that they had done nothing irregular or contrary to the law. They have had had the direct support of the province of Ontario, and they have brought into Ontario during the last two years over 2,000 boys under nineteen years of age. I am glad to learn that the minister has withdrawn his antagonistic attitude towards this particular organization, and is now supporting it, in some degree at least. I might mention that Ontario is supporting this particular organization more than any other agency so far as they are concerned, they are contributing to the Salvation Army at the rate of about $17,000 per year, or about one-eighth of their total expenditure, being satisfied that they are bringing the right kind of immigrants into Canada.

The minister in his defence some days ago stated that we were receiving more immigrants than we deserved. He did not exactly use the words I have just spoken, but he said that he did not want any more immigrants to enter Canada unless they had opportunities afforded to them before coming to Canada. The members for Marquette, Rosetown and Southeast Grey have practically told the government that they should cease all activities so far as immigration is concerned. But in spite of the advice of their friends—because they are their friends—the government continues to make expenditures.

The minister has stated—I have not the figures under my hand at the moment—that we have received from the United States upwards of 33,000 returning Canadians. We have in Canada 245 constituencies, which would mean that there would be an average of about 150 returning Canadians to each constituency. I defy any man in this house to get up and state on his word of honour that 150 of those who went to the United States from his constituency have returned to that constituency. I am speaking only of the average. So far as I am concerned I have not found one come back. What occurs is this: a native Canadian coming back to Canada from the United States for the summer, or to visit relatives, is asked when he gets to the port of entry, "How long have you been out of Canada?" He may answer, six months; then he is asked whether he intends to remain in Canada. The reply is, "Certainly, if I can get a job"; and he is marked down as a Canadian returning to this country.

[Mr. Arthurs.]

But the fact is that these men are not coming back to Canada and never will come back so long as the present policy continues under this regime. What we need in this country is to provide work which will attract back to Canada those boys and girls who have gone to the United States. Provide sufficient employment and you will not only keep in the country those who are already here but you will bring back others who have left.

A good deal has been said about the colonization of the west and considerable criticism has been made of the hon. member for North Vancouver. Some hon. members to my left and others opposite have pointed out that the western provinces were not populated by people from the British isles or by people directly from Europe. The backbone of the whole opening of the west consisted indeed of settlers from the older provinces of the Dominion, and we believe that if you will give to the native Canadian in Ontario and Quebec and in the maritime provinces the same opportunity you are now offering foreigners, or attempting to offer them, you will get all the settlers you desire or need in the western provinces.

Last year there was before the committee a motion which I regret that the minister did not include among the recommendations. That motion asked that provision be made for a survey in each province of the land and opportunities available, and that cooperation be made easy; officials to be appointed by the provinces and the Dominion. It was also recommended that a list be furnished in each province showing the opportunities available for acquiring land for farming, as well as the opportunities in regard to industry. It was further requested that details be furnished the house annually with respect to the operations in the provinces. Under a proper scheme I do not think it would be at all difficult to keep in Canada those who would otherwise emigrate, the young men growing up on the farms. The young man on the farm is under a handicap, because if there are two or more sons on the farm only one can remain, as a general rule. In the past there were two exceptions to this rule: In the first place there was vacant land near the farm where the boys resided, and in the second place there was a subdivision of land, because agriculture and industry went hand in hand and many of the farms, especially in Ontario and Quebec, were being subdivided from 200 to 100 and then to 50 or 40 or 30 acres. That condition does

not exist to-day, so that if there are two or more sons on a farm one remains and the others must necessarily leave either to go into some other line of business or to take up agriculture elsewhere. I submit that we should give to these young men the opportunities we are affording the foreigner to-day.

Mr. KELLNER: We have had suggestions from various sections of the house regarding the manner in which the Department of Immigration has fallen down in not bringing more farmers in. It seems to me a logical question to ask—what is the matter with the Canadian farmer? If we look up the statistics we shall find that the Canadian farmer to-day is making more progress than the farmer of any other country the wide world over. For instance, at this very moment the United States congress is holding a special session for the purpose of introducing measures for the relief of American farmers. No one has ever heard of this parliament doing any such thing for the Canadian farmer. In the British Empire the farmers have been relieved of practically all taxes. Nothing of the sort has been done for our farmers. On the other hand, the per capita production of the Canadian farmer is greater than that of the farmer of any other country in the world. So that I believe we have in Canada probably the most competent aggregation of farmers to be found anywhere in the world. I would ask, therefore: What do you expect to do by bringing in from other countries a lot of farmers who are not so competent as the farmers at present in Canada? Take the price of grain to-day, which is lower than it has been at any time in the past fifteen years. Certainly it would be economically unsound to bring in a lot more farmers and have them grow more grain without making provision for an additional market. Dairy production in Canada has been very rapidly falling off in the last three years and will depreciate still further. On the other hand, the Canadian farmers are helping to support the agricultural implement manufacturers, who charge a good deal more for their implements than do the manufacturers of any other country. So that the Canadian farmer has reached the distinctive position where he can get along without government assistance and even in spite of the handicap in regard to the purchase of implements.

The hon. member (Mr. Luchkovich) made a very strong plea for fair treatment to all the farmers we have in Canada and particularly to those of the same racial extraction as himself. I wish to make a plea for what I may term the native-born Canadian, the established farmer in Canada. I do not think I can bring the matter out more definitely than by citing a certain case that occurred in my own constituency. There we had an Indian reserve which the government intended to take over in order to place immigrants from the 3,000 British family scheme. The residents of that district made strong complaint. They claimed that there were many native-born Canadians there who were anxious to get land and were entitled to a certain portion of the reserve. The result was that the land was divided fifty-fifty, part of it being used for immigrants under the British settlement scheme, the rest being sold to residents of the district. The land purchased by native Canadians and established farmers was sold by public auction. There were a large number of real estate dealers there who bid on the land, with the result that it went up to three or four times its actual value. When that land was brought under cultivation the purchaser had to fence it, plough it and provide his own equipment. On the other hand, the land given to the immigrants was not sold at all; the government simply billed it to them at what it cost to take it over and improve it. The land was broken, fences were erected and buildings put up and the immigrant was brought in and placed, although he had not a single dollar. Compare the situation of the native-born Canadian who had to buy his land, improve it and provide his own equipment at market price, and then enter into competition with the man who had not a dollar. Furthermore, the equipment for those settlement farms was purchased through the soldier settlement scheme and the price paid was 20 to 30 per cent less than that paid by the average farmer. So this situation prevails: If an established farmer goes to price exactly the same implements he will be asked at least 10 per cent and on some implements from 20 per cent to 30 per cent more than is paid by the immigrant. I do not think it possible to maintain the enthusiasm or patriotism of the Canadian farmer if he is treated in this way. I do not think there is any question but that the farmers we have in Canada now are just a little superior to any farmers we could bring in from other countries, but without a doubt we are going to lose a number of our farmers if we refuse to give them the same treatment we give our immigrants. So far as nationalities are concerned, we get the good and the bad from all countries, but generally speaking I think we produce people in

Canada a little better than we get anywhere else. It is my contention that any special privileges which we give to immigrants from any other country should be available to our native born Canadians and to the established farmers at present in Canada.

There is one other matter I would like to discuss in connection with the assisted settlement scheme. If we should come to a period of extreme depression, which undoubtedly is coming in the agricultural industry, and these fellows get a little behind with their payments, consider the difference between their situation and that of the man who is dealing directly with the implement agent. The ordinary farmer must deal either with the bank or with the implement agent, and when his note is due it must be paid; if he cannot pay it he will be sold out. The case of the immigrant who is working with government assistance, however, is different. A government collector comes around; certainly it would be a serious thing to sell out one of these immigrants and let that advertisement go abroad, so as a result he does not pay at all. If that is carried to a logical conclusion and we come to a period of acute depression, it seems to me that one of two things must happen: Either this great agricultural industry of ours will be carried on as a government undertaking with these immigrants as the hired men of the government or, if the people of Canada will not subscribe to that scheme, eventually a lot of real estate sharks will go in and buy out and operate these farms. Then, instead of having individual farmers who own their own land we will have a few big operators for whom the farmers will be working. It is worth remembering that particularly in England and I think in every other country in Europe there have been a great many fights and a good bit of bloodshed in order to remedy that situation, and it does not seem reasonable that at this late date Canada should evolve a scheme which will carry her into the pit from which the countries of Europe have had such a hard time escaping. I believe that before we engage in a scheme of immigration too ambitious for this country, that matter should be considered.

Then we must consider the question of markets and the further question of special privileges which are granted to our immigrants but are not granted to our established farmers. I think if we put these facilities at the disposal of the farmers we have now it would be only a short time until the production would greatly exceed any prospective markets we may have for farm produce.

[Mr. Kellner.]

The proposals which are being considered in the United States at the moment undoubtedly will hurt the western farmer. There is no doubt that butter, which is very largely produced in northern Alberta and sold across the line, will be practically shut out of the American market. On the other hand we have the competition of butter from Australia and New Zealand; these countries ship butter to Canada under a duty of one cent per pound, and their governments pay a bonus of about five cents for every pound of butter exported. So I feel that Australia and New Zealand butter will come into the larger cities of the west, particularly during the winter months, just as cheaply as Alberta butter can be produced, because the bonus given the farmers in Australia and New Zealand just about covers the cost of transportation. It must be remembered also that butter produced on grass alone can be produced much more cheaply than is the case where cows must be winter fed for six or seven months. When this parliament gets down to consider the real problems which confront the Canadian farmer to-day I think we might be in an intelligent frame of mind to deal with the situation, but it seems very illogical to me that we should advocate a huge influx of immigrants without considering what they are going to do if they get here and how we are going to dispose of what they produce.

I want to compliment the hon. member for Lincoln on moving a reduction in this vote; his attitude is quite different from that taken the other night by the hon. member for North Vancouver, who suggested an expenditure of $300,000,000. The absurdity of that suggestion apparently is becoming plain, and now we are offered a suggestion which, all things considered, is much more intelligent.

I want to make just one or two comments with regard to the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the minister who is in charge of it. I think probably he has done a service to Canada by falling down on the job, to use a term we often hear; I am satisfied that it would have been a sad thing for Canada if he had made a success of his job. We have here a department which is of no practical use at all; since we have that kind of department the best thing to do is to put in charge some one who will make a failure of it, because in that way it will be the greatest success.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think the minister has had a good rest in listening to these speeches, so now I would like to ask some questions and obtain some information with respect to his department. He has told us

that on the continent of Europe we maintain seven examination stations. What is the procedure by which an intending immigrant who has received a permit from the department may find his way to one of these examination stations?

Mr. FORKE: I understand that he comes down to the port of embarkation, where we have an officer who conducts the examination.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Surely the minister can see that there is a great hiatus in that procedure. If we have no offices on the continent how does the immigrant get his information and his instructions with regard to his examination?

Mr. FORKE: He is directed by the transportation companies, who are doing the recruiting, and I might inform the hon. member that this is one of the great hardships in connection with the whole immigration matter. Most of the immigrants are given a preliminary examination by their own doctor, perhaps 600 miles from the port of embarkation; they are passed as being healthy, but when they come to the port, say Riga, the medical officer of the department examines them and one member of the family may be turned down. That is one of the hardest propositions the department has to meet. The family sell out and come down to the port, where they find that they are forced either to leave one behind or go back to their home town. The department does not do any recruiting on the continent; that is all done by the transportation companies, who are supposed to be careful to see that no one is brought forward who cannot pass the examination at the port.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Our expenditure there is wholly in the interests of the transportation companies?

Mr. FORKE: Our expenditure there is wholly in the interests of Canada, to prevent people coming here who should not be allowed to enter the country.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): We are carrying on these examinations in order to aid the transportation companies?

Mr. FORKE: It is really to prevent a hardship being imposed on the people when they arrive at Quebec. We could make that examination at Quebec but the hon. member knows what would happen; it is much better to stop them on the other side and for that purpose we send over our medical officers to make the examinations in order to prevent all possible hardship.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Are you preventing it?

Mr. FORKE: To a very large extent.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister compare the two sets of figures for the two different years, 1927-28 and 1928-29, in connection with the rejections? He will find that the rejections are arising only in two places, in Great Britain and Italy.

Mr. FORKE: I should have mentioned that there is both a medical and a civil examination, and I think the examinations have been more rigid during the last year or two, which may account for the difference.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In spite of all that you have still three hundred rejections at the ports of Canada. I am trying to find out what improvement has been brought about through this changed method. I can find no difference except in Great Britain and the examination of the Italians; as far as the other countries are concerned, there has been no reduction whatever.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member knows that that matter comes under the Department of Health, and when those estimates are up the minister may be able to give a better explanation than I can with regard to these examinations and rejections.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am only asking for information respecting the report of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Mr. FORKE: What page is that?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is on pages 27, 28 and 32.

Mr. FORKE: I have no doubt it is correct.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I claim that we are making that expenditure in Europe in the interests of the transportation companies. Under the law if a transportation company brings an unsuitable immigrant to Canada it must return him, but we are placing upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of Canada this large expenditure in order to maintain these offices simply in the interests of the transportation companies.

Mr. FORKE: I beg to differ with the hon. member.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I doubt very much if this is having the result expected, because they are still coming to the ports of Canada and suffering the great indignity of which the minister speaks in being rejected here. They are rejected at the Canadian ports in spite of the examinations carried on by the medical

representatives of Canada in Europe. The minister says that we are doing a great deal of good, but I think a great deal of harm is being done. After having these immigrants passed by our own Canadian examiners we turned back some 300 in one year, and 500 in the other. I cannot explain that, and I would like the minister to offer some explanation. If it is a great injustice and hardship to be turned back, say at the port of Amsterdam or Rotterdam, it is a much greater hardship to be turned back at the ports of Quebec, Montreal, St. John or Halifax, after having been examined by our own Canadian medical examiner. We are making this expenditure for no other reason than that of saving the transportation companies some money.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The hon. member is wrong when he says that we are merely trying to save the transportation companies some money. As a matter of fact, an immigrant coming to this country has three or four barriers to get through. The transportation companies do soliciting in Europe by means of their own officers in the different communities from which the immigrants come. They make their selections with the knowledge of the barrier which has to be passed at the port of embarkation, and they are very careful in making those selections, knowing that they will be liable for the return of the individual free of charge should he be refused entry into Canada. During January of this year there were some 1,444 examinations reported. Of that number, 1,349 were passed, 3 were certified in class (a), 36 in class (b); 49 in class (c), 2 in class (k), 4 in class (m), and 2 awaiting further report. This makes a total rejection of 96 of the number which came forward at that time. From his own medical knowledge the hon. member will know that to receive all who arrive at the port of Quebec would be impossible. A boy or a girl who has passed the physical examination may develop an epileptic fit while on board ship. That case is reported by the ship's surgeon to the officer at the port of debarkation. Tracoma may be discovered on board ship, which may have been overlooked in the examination, and these cases are all reported. As I see it, the advantage of this system is that we see the individual in his home country and make our selection there. Oftentimes a man may be able to earn a living although he has some physical defect which has been certified to, and he is admitted. To say that this work is being done in the interests of the transportation companies is entirely outside the fact.

[Mr. A. E. Ross.]

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister explain the various classes he mentioned?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These are included in the Immigration Act. The classifications are as follows:

(a) Idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane at any time previously;

(b) Persons afflicted with tuberculosis in any form or with any loathsome disease, or with a disease which is contagious or infectious, or which may become dangerous to the public health,

(c) Immigrants who are dumb, blind, or otherwise physically defective,

(d) Persons who have been convicted of, or admit having committed any crime involving moral turpitude;

(e) Prostitutes and women and girls coming to Canada for any immoral purpose and pimps or persons living on the avails of prostitution;

(f) Persons who procure or attempt to bring into Canada prostitutes or women or girls for the purpose of prostitution or other immoral purposes;

(g) Professional beggars or vagrants;

(h) Immigrants to whom money has been given or loaned by any charitable organization for the purpose of enabling them to qualify for landing in Canada under this act, or whose passage to Canada has been paid wholly or in part by any charitable organization—

And so forth. That is outside of the medical field. Then we have;

(k) Persons of constitutional psychopathic inferiority;

(l) Persons with chronic alcoholism;

(m) Persons not included within any of the foregoing prohibited classes, who upon examination by a medical officer are certified as being mentally or physically defective to such a degree as to affect their ability to earn a living.

That includes all the classes, I think.

Mr. SPENCER: Of the numerous questions that are asked an immigrant, I understand one is: What religion do you belong to? What gain is there in the departmental officials finding out what religion a man or woman believes in? I know the question is obnoxious. It is not liked by many who have to answer it.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think the statement is ever published. It is taken for statistical purposes. Probably it serves a useful purpose to know what the religion is of people coming into the country. Even a minister of immigration is always learning something and I found out just lately that Protestants are supposed to say what denomination they belong to. I think, if the classification were to be made as to Roman Catholics and Protestants or something like that, it would be quite sufficient. The way I found that out was that a very good friend

of mine who is a Protestant but who does not belong to any denomination, was asked the question: What church do you belong to? He said that he did not belong to any: that he was a Protestant.

Mr. GARDINER: How did he get in?

Mr. FORKE: I do not know, but he got in. I think the two divisions are sufficient. Of course there are rationalists, agnostics, and so forth, but the two main divivions, Protestants and Roman Catholics, might be sufficient. I am only giving that as an opinion because I have not looked very carefully into the matter. My deputy informs me that the different churches are very anxious to obtain these statistics. They look after the people when they land and the information serves a useful purpose in that way. For instance, the Anglican Church look after immigrants belonging to that faith and the churches do valuable work in taking care of immigrants after they land in this country.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am not quite satisfied yet in regard to these medical officers examining intending immigrants at continental ports. While I am not opposed to a medical examination, yet I think we are assuming a responsibility which perhaps we have no right to assume, I would sooner have these men retained at St. John, Halifax, Montreal and Quebec and have their rigid examination there than have the poor immigrant put to the injustice of being examined overseas by a medical man of our own selection, a man who, according to this report, has been especially selected. The Minister of Immigration is not responsible for this, but the Minister of Health is. It is stated that these medical men are specially selected—I do not know what the special selection consists of—they are trained specially and in spite of that, several hundred people have been sent back not on account of all the excuses that have been put forward to-day because we have a list of the reasons for their deportation. The examination falls down because, so far as I know, the medical men are not supposed to look into the civil causes of deportation.

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Therefore the department is not preventing that immigrant from coming here. A history of criminality is one of the great factors as regards deportation and that escapes the department. We are paying for a partial medical examination; the other examination is foregone and the immigrant comes here. I think Canada could not only well afford to reduce this item by $200,000 but cut out the medical examination, bring these officers back to Canada and let them make a rigid examination at our ocean ports. In that case you would not have this long list you have of reasons for deportation, such as anaemia, asthma and arthritis. I could quite understand trachoma and venereal disease springing up on the date of embarkation, but here are a dozen or so diseases which have escaped detection, and these people have come to this country and been sent back. Consequently we are bearing an expenditure that I think is absolutely unnecessary. I really believe that a place has been made over there for some fellows who have political leanings of some kind, and they have gone over there to take these jobs. I think there should be fewer cases of returns than have been showing in the last two years, or there will be still stronger condemnation of the medical inspection.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: In considering this subject of immigration it had been, and indeed still is, my purpose to confine my remarks mainly to the subject of land settlement, and with that end in view I propose to reserve them until that particular item is before the house. I have been driven, however, to making a few remarks by an apparent misapprehension on the part of members of this house, a misapprehension which has been expressed a good many times and on a good many occasions, as to the attitude of those in our corner of the house, and of the farmers we represent in regard to immigration. I think perhaps the whole misapprehension may be epitomized in the words used by the hon. member for Fort William, that we were ready to close the shutters and lock the door, and, as it were, put a no-admittance sign on Canada—please keep out.

Mr. MANION: I did not speak of the party as a whole. I was speaking of my hon. friend from Battle River (Mr. Spencer) and of the minister himself.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I appreciate that his remarks were directed towards some remarks that had been made by the hon. member for Battle River, but the hon. member for Battle River was expressing in his way, as we all do in our own way, a feeling which is very generally held not only in this corner but also amongst the farmers whom we represent. That feeling is this, not that we should lock the door and tell people to keep out, but that we should not go out into the streets

and into the highways and byways in an endeavour to compel people to come in. In other words, we want to have the door open simply with the policemen at the door, if you care to put it that way, to see that only those enter who will make decent inhaibtants of the house when they get in.

There is another exception which is taken by the farmers of my riding, and I presume of many others, but in my province particularly, to the immigration policy as it is at present enforced, and that is that they cannot nor can I see why farmers alone should be encouraged to come to Canada, why the farming profession should be picked out as the one profession whose requirements demand a greater population, and as the one profession apparently into which an influx of people will do, not harm, but good.

Mr. FORKE: May I point out to the hon. member that the regular fare from Great Britain, which is £18, has been reduced to £10 for all parties, no matter who they are. That is under an arrangement between the Imperial government and the shipping companies. The Canadian government has nothing to do with it. These people are coming out cheaper than the actual cost of their passage.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Precisely. I have no desire to place the hon. minister or the policy of the government in any wrong light, but it is obvious that so far as encouragement is given, and so far as any distinction is drawn—and that distinction is drawn in countries other than Great Britain—the farming class is what you might call the preferred class; I am not using that term in any unpleasant sense. In other words, such encouragement as is given, is given primarily to those who are prepared to engage in agriculture.

Why is that? There are several reasons advanced, some of which are reasonably sound and some of which, in my opinion, are not. One opinion is that agriculture in a country such as Canada, with fairly large areas of good land, and without exaggeration I can say that we have fairly large areas of good land in Canada still not brought under cultivation, farmers are more likely to make a success than immigrants of any other class because they are not dependent upon being hired or engaged by other people but have a reasonable opportunity, and a greater opportunity than that offered to other professions, to become self-supporting citizens and to make good for themselves and be an asset to the country.

Another reason that is advanced is this, that in agriculture alone and in agricultural products alone the law of supply and demand does not operate as it does in other industries. That is, the impression is held by many that it is impossible to over-produce on the farm. Those who share that point of view recognize that the market for manufactured goods of almost every kind and the opportunity of labour to find a place for itself in any other industry is fairly well limited, that you cannot increase the production of manufactured articles without damage unless you see before you a market that is capable of absorbing that increased production. But in the case of agriculture so many people, men in public life, men writing in the press, and men discussing it in private life, seem to be under the impression that this law of supply and demand does not operate in connection with farmers, and that no matter how much the farmers produce it will not affect their well-being or the prices they receive for the products they produce, that we can absorb almost an infinite number of farmers in this country without affecting adversely those who are already engaged in the business in this country. To my mind that is altogether a mistake and an erroneous impression. The market for foodstuffs, just like the market for all other goods, is limited exactly by the effective demand for that produce; that is, not only by the desire or the need which may exist for that produce, but by the ability to purchase as well as to consume that production. The effective market is limited in the case of farm products just as it is in the case of all other products. It certainly is my impression, an impression which I think is borne out by irrefutable facts, that at the present time we are fairly close to the point of producing all that we can consume without so congesting the market as to bring financial distress on all those engaged in the industry.

There is another reason, and this is not one which is advanced but one which is certainly held by many people. They feel that any increase in our population is good in itself, no matter what may become of the people who come here, no matter in what circumstances they may find themselves, no matter what effect the presence of those people may have on other people now here. There is the feeling that population in itself is an end, an objective to be attained, and not merely one of the means to attain an end. With those people I take decided issue. I think with them that the greater the density of population, the better, so long as that population can find work or can produce, and produce at a profit, and live comfortably on a decent standard of living. I say at once that I agree

with those people that the greater the density of population, under those circumstances, the better for Canada and the better for those already in Canada. In saying that I am looking back some forty years to the time when I as a small boy went with my parents to western Canada at a time when western Canada was, not an unknown wilderness, but still in the embryo stage, and when settling as my family did in what is now the most densely populated part of Alberta we found ourselves with our nearest railway station in Calgary, 100 miles away. We know and I know the hardships, the discomforts, the physical and financial disadvantages which faced us through lack of population. We had no roads, no schools, no churches; we had no social life, and the handicaps and the hardships imposed upon us by the mere fact that so few people were there induces me to believe that other things being equal a comparatively dense population makes a better country to live in than a country that is empty and vacant.

I am not referring now to the taxpaying ability of the new immigrant. I think that that is one of the most absurd arguments that could be advanced to induce people to come here, to say that we welcome them because they will shoulder a percentage of our debt and assist us in reducing our taxation. In another way density of population works to the good not only of those who are here but of those who come because by increased tonnage on the railways we can properly reduce our railway rates and provide better roads and better facilities for all. That is good for all of us here. But I repeat that that again is limited. All these advantages are swept aside, they do not exist by mere population alone, but by population plus the ability of that population to produce at a profit, to build up homes for themselves and to live decently.

The next reason that is advanced is this. We want population to improve our traffic conditions, to provide more money for the banks, to increase the market for our manufactured goods. We find it impossible to bring in any large supplies of labour because the labour organizations are so strong and so effective in their united voice that they will not permit it. We cannot bring in large delegations of professional men because the professional organizations now here would certainly raise very strenuous objections. We cannot bring in more retailers and people of other classes because those already engaged in the business in this country, speaking with united voice, would make that political suicide for any government. But we can bring in more farmers, because through their lack of unity in the past they were unable to render or articulate their disapprobation or to express resentment in any practical manner.

In saying those things I am not finding fault with the present minister or the government for holding those views, but I am trying to show that many people who speak on platforms and write in the press, and advocate in private increased population by mass immigration, hold this view in the bottom of their hearts. That was true a few years ago. It is becoming less true day by day and I say that the farmers have found themselves, they have found each other, and they are now able to speak articulately and unitedly as to their needs. And who has a better right Mr. Chairman, to speak on this subject, or to hold views on this subject than the western farmer? He belongs to a class comparatively small in numbers, it is true, a percentage only of the total population, but he is primarily interested in any scheme of immigration on a large scale such as suggested, or in any scheme of colonization on a large scale which is suggested and which has as its object the placing of more farmers in the prairie provinces. The farmers already there are expected to accomplish wonderful work in the way of assimilation. Assimilation is to them, not a phrase but an absolute reality. They will be the people who will be affected adversely or beneficially by this influx of people. The farmers, through their provincial governments must supply the means of education, must supply hospitals, must supply roads, must supply all those things which the people need. Those men and women are the ones par excellence who should have a voice in our immigration policy.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the hon. member tell the house what he thinks of the speeches delivered by the member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) in the last ten years about people leaving the farms?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Well, I may say at once, of course, that although I think highly of the member for Rosetown I am not responsible for him, nor am I his interpreter, and perhaps you will pardon me if I express for a few moments my own opinion instead of commenting on his. He is perfectly able to explain his own views at any time. But it is a fair question, why the people leave the land, and I was coming to it in a moment.

I have been going over the reasons Mr. Chairman, why so many people advocate immigration on a large scale, and why those same people think in their minds all the time of an influx of farmers into this country, and

particularly the western provinces, and naturally, as my colleague says, they have no particular intention of following their own advice and going out there themselves and building up one of those happy, free, independent homes.

I was endeavouring to point out that the farmers themselves were entitled to hold very strong views on that matter, and I was endeavouring to show that there was a misconception as to their motives, and a misconception as to their actual statements of fact. The statement of their policy, as I can see it—and it is not contradicted by anything said by any member in this corner of this house—is this: We are prepared to leave the door open to immigration under reasonable restrictions as to placement and the quality and kind of people who come here. We say, come here if you think Alberta is good—and we think it is—come here, take things as you find them, work your way up, act upon your own initiative in coming, follow your own line when you get here, and take upon yourself responsibility for your failure or success. That is what we say, but that is a long way from the policy of maintaining either agencies or publicity departments or any other factor to induce or morally to compel people to come here. That is the difference between my interpretation of the farmers' attitude towards immigration and the interpretation placed upon their attitude by others who are not so familiar with their views as I am myself.

Mr. FORKE: Most of the immigration from central and southeastern Europe last year was based upon a direct request from the farmers of the three prairie provinces for farm help.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Precisely.

Mr. FORKE: We simply tried to fill the demands of the farmers of the three western provinces. It might be news to the hon. member for Red Deer to say that I had a request from Alberta just a few days ago, asking if we could possibly supply six hundred more farm labourers for Alberta.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That covers two points. I can assure the minister, however, that I am not trying to make any unfair statements on the matter at all. I quite appreciate the fact that a large number of people from certain countries, people who otherwise could not enter, are permitted entry on the personal nomination or personal application of farmers in western Canada. If a farmer in western Canada has made good, if he thinks that his brother coming out can also make good, and if he is prepared to find employment for him, then I say that that is the best kind of immigration policy we can have, and the immigration policy as far as publicity is concerned that we have always advocated. But when the hon. the minister speaks of 600 labourers, that perhaps brings up a slightly different point. If those 600 were individual applications from men who themselves were prepared to offer employment then all right, but if it was simply an estimate placed upon the potential needs of a district by people who perhaps are not qualified to have an opinion, then it is a very different question altogether. . I am fairly familiar with the workings of the department, because I have tried to follow the work in its different branches, not in an antagonistic spirit but in order to work with them if I can for the betterment of conditions here. And in doing that I found myself up against that very thing the minister has spoken of; the intimation to the department by individuals, or groups of individuals, that there will be certain mass vacancies, and that certain districts can absorb so many hundreds, or so many thousands of farm help, which is a very different thing from personal nominations, and while I approve of the one I am far from approving of the other.

Just one more point in that particular connection; I have indicated our attitude, or my conception at least of our attitude, towards the subject of immigration itself. And I have indicated that we are not opposed to immigration as such, but we are only opposed to what is commonly called assisted or encouraged immigration, that is over-encouraged. We are willing to have people come in if they are decent people, but we are not so far gone in Canada that we must give approval to the idea of going out into the highways and byways morally compelling people to come. We are particularly opposed to that because those who are compelled to come are almost invariably people of our own class whom we will have to assimilate, and our condition will be adversely or beneficially affected by them. Again I say that if any in Canada have a right to speak on immigration it is those who will have to shoulder the burden of immigration, the burden of assimilation, and to whom assimilation is not a mere sounding phrase but a natural matter of everyday life in connection with neighbours for whom they have had no responsibility and in the selection of whom they have had no choice.

That brings me to the next point. I read with a great deal of interest, and followed

very carefully the discussion in the agriculture committee of last year, and I studied, so far as I could study, the recommendations. The recommendation there which struck me as being the soundest and the most sensible, and offering the greatest potentialities for future success in our work was that simple suggestion that to the provinces themselves should be delegated a greater part of the responsibility, a greater part of the authority as to how many and what classes should come into those provinces.

Mr. FORKE: But how can you get them to take it? They do not like to.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Possibly they do not like to, but I am inclined to think, from such knowledge as I possess of the views of one at least of the provincial governments, that if given that right and given it without strings—given that right so that they would be not merely expressing an opinion but taking action—they would undertake it. And more than that, I believe it is the only method whereby you will properly provide for immigration; for, after all, once the immigrant crosses the portals of this country he ceases to be a responsibility of the government who brought him out and becomes a direct responsibility of the province, who have had no say as to whether or not he should be here. And that to my mind is wrong.

Working with our municipal authorities, discussing the matter with our own government, I have found this. We have the very finest machinery in the world for ascertaining how many people can be properly and profitably absorbed in a province during the year. We have information on which a competent committee decide as to where people may properly go, as to the kind of people who are desired, as to the occupation which will afford them opportunities. Through all the various municipal councils in the provinces the authorities can supply, and I am sure, from applications to myself, that they would be willing to supply, full statistics as to any possible vacant farm which may lie within their boundaries, as to the amount of capital that would be necessary to enable a farmer to go on that farm, as to the kind of people they would like to have in the district—and this depends partly on the class of people already settled there. They could furnish the government with that information, and I am sure they would.

I have a suggestion to offer, and I do not claim that it is particularly a constructive one or particularly a new one. However, let that suggestion come from whichever side it may, it should be tried out partly from time to time—and in this lies our only hope of mastering the problem of increased population. My suggestion is this: The provincial governments, through municipal machinery, know what employment is in sight for the year; they know what lands are available; they know what the effect of increased population on the farming industry generally will be in the province; and they might make a reasonably intelligent report. On that report the Department of Immigration here could act through its agent, admitting any desired number of immigrants, seeing that their destination was wise, advising them as to the parts of the country to which they might go, giving them all information possible as to the means of reaching their destination, and supplying them with information as to the best way in which to carry on after they had arrived. There is a great work for the Immigration department to do in the elimination of the unfit and in giving information and advice to those people who come to the country, often bewildered and ignorant of our habits and sometimes of our language. The department could do a splendid work in that way. And it should give to the provinces some at least of the authority which should go with the responsibility that becomes theirs the moment an immigrant enters Canada.

My time is almost up, but I was asked a question which I shall try to answer. The question is: Why are so many people leaving the farms? In the first place, it is undoubtedly a question of dollars and cents; that is what strikes one primarily in looking into the matter. Is farming a congenial business, is it a profitable business? Well, the minister knows that while it is one of the finest forms of life—and I believe this because I have followed it all my life—farming is a life that imposes upon the man who pursues it a great many hardships. He has to face hard physical labour; he has to work out in the snow and rain and cold winds; he has to take a sporting chance as a gambler with nature, as to whether or not he will have any results at all from his year's toil. He has to face all these conditions; he has to work hours longer by far than those which are put in in any other industry. except possibly in this house; he has to work under conditions more uncertain than those that prevail in any other occupation; and frequently he has to work in loneliness and deprivation so far as social comfort is concerned. And when you add to all this the fact that no farmer—no farmer, at least, of whom I have knowledge

—ever made more than a decent living, while many farmers, to my knowledge, in spite of honest and earnest effort have failed and gone down, you can see the reason why farmers leave.

But there is another reason and perhaps it is more fundamental still. To my mind it does not make very much difference in the long run how profitable farming is; you are bound to have an exodus from the country to the cities, and for this reason. During my lifetime in that province—and I am still a comparatively young man—the productive ability of every man has increased four or five times through the introduction and use of labour-saving units of machinery. The result is that it is requiring a smaller and smaller percentage of men to produce the necessary amount of food. While that does not apply absolutely to all Canada—because we feed other countries than our own—it undoubtedly does apply to agriculture as a whole, and there is no question that it must and will apply to Canada generally as time goes on. A smaller and smaller percentage of men will remain on the land and a larger percentage will go to the centres, because in these centres are new industries providing for all the new wants, and luxuries which, deplored by some, are in my opinion a dispensation of Providence in that they absorb the labour continually thrown off from the basic industries by the adoption of larger and larger units of machinery. Throughout the world, therefore, and in this country as well—for Canada is not immune from the law of supply and demand—no matter how profitable farming may be, no matter how agreeable the conditions may be made, no matter how hard men may work, it will happen inevitably that a larger percentage of men will be found in the cities and a smaller percentage on the land. But while that is true it does not mean that we should add thereto the factors of economic uncertainty and lack of economic reward.

I must apologize for having spoken at greater length than I had intended. I got up in the first place simply to correct a misapprehension with reference to our attitude towards immigration, and I did not expect to be led into so long a discourse as I have made. My chief interest at the moment is to direct the attention of the committee to the question of land settlement, a question regarding which I have some knowledge, with which I have been fairly closely in touch, and on which I hold some fairly strong opinions. However, I shall leave that until the proper item comes up. In the meantime, I repeat for emphasis —because apparently it is an exceedingly difficult thing for other people sometimes to appreciate the fact—that we are not opposed to people coming into the country but that we are opposed, for the credit and for the economic future of Canada, to the idea of going out and inducing or assisting them to come here.

[Mr. Speakman.]

Mr. FORKE: Some of the remarks that have been made lead me to believe that this is an opportune moment to make a statement as to the actual cost to Canada of immigration. We have heard the figure of five millions stated, and I have seen six and a half millions reported as having been suggested in a public speech not very long ago. I have the figures for last year and I will give them. The cost of securing immigrants for Canada was $1,404,463.30; that is the actual cost of our immigration offices and the seeking and securing of immigrants. The care and placement of these immigrants after landing in Canada was $196,294.12. This makes a total, for recruiting immigrants and taking care of them after arrival in Canada, of $1,600,757.42.

Mr. BENNETT: Does that include everything?

Mr. FORKE: That is the cost of bringing them to Canada and looking after them.

Mr. ADSHEAD: In what way do you take care of them?

Mr. FORKE: Well, getting the immigrant a situation, if he is farm help, or getting him placed if he is a farmer.

Mr. ADSHEAD: There were some immigrants who came to Alberta for whom the province had no responsibility but who were brought out by the minister's department. They were stranded in Calgary and we had to take care of them. Hospital bills were incurred amounting to some $1,000 towards which we asked the department to contribute, but they washed their hands entirely of responsibility in the matter. Will some of the money to which the minister has just referred be used to take care of these immigrants? Will his department pay that bill?

Mr. FORKE: I do not know who those immigrants were:

Mr. CHAPLIN: Do the figures which the minister has given include cost of civil government?

Mr. FORKE: No, they do not include civil government.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is not that part of the cost of immigration?

Mr. GARDINER: The minister said it cost $196,000 odd to take care of immigrants after landing. Will he explain exactly what he means by taking care of them? How far does that go?

Mr. FORKE: Under the care and placement of immigrants we have the following:

Women's division	$ 34,141 01
Grants to societies	14,750 00
Inspection of juveniles	27,542 47
Agencies	119,860 64

I presume that latter item has to do with the placing of immigrants under the three thousand family scheme, single farm labourers, juveniles and so on. I cannot itemize it, but is the money actually spent in Canada looking after immigrants?

I did not finish my statement; to make up the total vote of last year there is also an amount of $784,742.66 for the preventive service. I think everyone will recognize the face that even if we had no solicited immigration we would still have those people coming to Canada who are willing to come on their own, and they would have to be examined. Then there is another thing which the house may have forgotten. During the last few years and particularly during the last year the United States made a great clean up, I think every crook in that country has headed towards Canada lately, and if we had not possessed a good preventive service we would have had a large increase in our population made up of that kind of people. Some people cannot understand why there should be any immigration inspectors at all, but not a day passes without some undesirable characters being turned back at the border. Then there is the administrative service, amounting to $480,165.36, making the total estimate for last year of $2,865,685.44. In order to obtain the total amount spent by the department there must be added $600,000 which was charged up to the land settlement branch under the Soldier Settlement Board, and that will give a total of about $3,400,000 as the actual amount spent last year. I do not know where my hon. friends secured the figure of $6,000,000; I cannot see where that came from at all.

Mr. LUCAS: Does that include medical inspection also?

Mr. FORKE: No, the medical inspection accounts for another $300,000, but that would have to go on even if there were no immigration. We might have a smaller staff, but we would still have medical inspection.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Then there would be the medical inspection overseas, which would account for another $300,000, and that would bring the total to nearly $4,000,000.

Mr. FORKE: Probably that would be correct.

Mr. GEARY: I do not understand that, when the total as shown by the Auditor General's report, page 836, is only $3,065,000.

Mr. FORKE: That is for 1927-28?

Mr. GEARY: Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: I should like to follow up the question I was asking a few moments ago, with regard to the immigrants being required to state what religion they profess. The minister suggested an amendment to the regulation so that the immigrants would not need to give so many details, but then he said this information was useful both for the census bureau and for the churches, which were glad to get it. First I would like to ask the minister if this information is passed on to the churches?

Mr. FORKE: If they ask for it.

Mr. SPENCER: Whether they ask for it or not I know that representatives of the churches usually meet the immigrants at the port of debarkation and ask them personally as to their religion. I passed through the immigration sheds at Quebec in 1927 for the purpose of seeing how this was done. I found different ministers asking the immigrants personally to what churches they belonged, so I think it is quite unnecesary to ask that question if it is done only for the purpose of supplying information to the churches. As far as the census goes, we get all the information we need from the census statistics, so I think we would be well advised not to ask that question at all. I take it for granted that no one of good character will be refused entry because of his religion, so I do not see why the question should be asked at all.

Mr. FORKE: These facts are all recorded in the index book on board ship before the immigrant lands. All the religious societies have agents at Quebec, and some at Montreal.

Mr. GARDINER: So there is no escape at all.

Mr. FORKE: I think they do very good work there. The representatives of the churches are given an opportunity to look at the index book, and they look after people of their own denomination when they land. They get in touch with the friends of the immigrants, tell them they have landed and when they will arrive at their destination, and taken altogether I think a useful purpose is served. There is no publicity; this in-

formation is never published but is simply obtained for those people who are anxious to get these figures. As I said before, I do not think anyone would be turned back if he simply said he was an agnostic, with no religion at all, so long as his moral character was all right.

Mr. SPENCER: But does the minister realize that many people object to being cross-examined in that way?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): What is objectionable about it?

Mr. SPENCER: The hon. member who just interrupted may not object, but certain people of whom I have knowledge do object.

Mr. FORKE: As a matter of information we think the benefit outweighs any objection which might be taken to it, and the statistical bureau gets that information also. This is not done in order to annoy or restrain these immigrants; it is largely for the benefit of the different religious denominations who like to get that information and really, from my own experience during the last three years, an immigrant is much better off if he is looked after by a religious society, regardless of what denomination he belongs to.

Mr. BARBER: In these figures there are certain amounts set aside for the repatriation of Canadians.

Mr. FORKE: It is not in the vote.

Mr. BARBER: I have the Auditor General's report, and on page 23 of part H, under "colonization," I find a sum amounting to about $35,000. Under that there appear salaries and wages, $9,204.19 and travelling expenses $25,081.61. In the first instance, the salaries were paid to fourteen clergymen and the travelling expenses were paid to eighteen clergymen. This question was up in the house some time ago and we were advised by the minister that this was for the purpose of repatriating Canadians.

Mr. FORKE: What year is the hon. member quoting from?

Mr. BARBER: 1927-28. Are those clergymen still employed by the government?

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. BARBER: What has been substituted for that service?

Mr. FORKE: We have been cooperating with the provinces and have offered to pay 50 per cent of any amount expended on repatriation. The only province which is actively engaged in this work is the province of Quebec, but one of the maritime provinces is thinking of taking up the work. The same offer stands open to every province of the Dominion.

Mr. BARBER: What was the amount expended last year?

Mr. FORKE: We set aside $50,000 as the maximum for any one province.

Mr. BARBER: Was that expended?

Mr. FORKE: My deputy informs me that we expended $29,680 last year.

Mr. BARBER: In one province?

Mr. FORKE: And the province of Quebec spent $46,000, so apparently part of their expenditure must have been in colonization work. I discussed this matter first with Premier Taschereau when he was here a year ago last summer, and then the Minister of Mines and Forests came here and we entered into that bargain. I could not see my way clear to do anything for the province of Quebec which would not be open to all the other provinces. I expect that one of the maritime provinces will go into repatriation work in a short time in an endeavour to bring back some of their people from the New England states. I think the money is well spent, probably bringing in the best results of any money we spend upon immigration.

Mr. MALONEY: In connection with this question of repatriation, I would like to read a letter which I received from New Bedford, as follows:

I have just read your speech in the House of Commons on immigration in Canada. I was specially interested in that part of your speech in which you refer to the French Canadians of New England. Let me tell you that if the government of Ottawa would only lend to a family, say, $1,000 you would have a train going to the Peace River every two weeks of good farmers of Canadian stock who wish to go back to their country and make a home once more on the farm. The Quebec government offers us money to go to the Abitibi district. We don't want to go there, we want to go to the west. We are starving in here and our government does not want to help us get to our mother country. I know quite a number of my friends who wrote to the government in Ottawa asking them for help to go back and every time the answer was "We have no right to do so."

Believe me,
Yours truly,
J. Vachon.

Mr. CAHILL: Where is that from?

Mr. MALONEY: New Bedford.

Mr. FORKE: A French Canadian who has been residing in the States for a number of years and who wishes to return to Canada is granted the same rates on the railroads as an immigrant from Great Britain.

An hon. MEMBER: Why not better rates?

Mr. FORKE: He gets the immigration rates. It is the railways which grant those rates. The hardship arises through the fact that a French Canadian who has remained in his own province has to pay the full rate when he desires to go to the west, while the French Canadian who has gone to the States and wishes to return is granted the cheaper rate.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We were told earlier in the session that the government would not continue to extend aid for highway development or for technical education upon the ground that it was a vicious principle for the federal authorities to subsidize the provinces. I would like to ask upon what principle the government is now subsidizing the provinces in order that they may carry on this immigration scheme?

Mr. FORKE: I do not think it is in the nature of a subsidy. They have settled some twelve or thirteen new parishes in the province of Quebec, and I think the money is well spent.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not suggesting that the money is not well spent, but I do suggest that the principle is one which was called a vicious principle earlier in the session and I am anxious to know how it is being justified in this case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I say to the hon. member that immigration is one of the two subjects which are placed under the joint control of the federal and provincial governments by the provisions of the British North America Act.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That does not touch upon the principle.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is the constitution.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The principle of one body raising funds and the other body distributing them.

Mr. VENIOT: There are jointly interested.

Mr. BELL (St. John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, in discussing this immigration question I shall deal with it almost entirely as it concerns the population, colonization and settlement conditions in my own province of New Brunswick. As you are aware, that province, like the other maritime provinces, has suffered from the migration of its people to the United States and to the six western provinces.

In 1901 we had a population of 321,120; in 1911 this had increased to 351,880, and in 1921 it had increased to 387,876. It might be well to note at this point that the province of New Brunswick has an area of 27,895 square miles. As the greatest migration was from 1921 to 1928, it is doubtful if there has been any increase in population during those years. While the other provinces suffered a loss of population by migration to the United States during that period, New Brunswick and the other maritime provinces suffered an additional drain by migration to the west and to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. While we regret the conditions which forced our people to leave their homes, that regret is tempered, to some degree, by the fact that many of them remained Canadians by locating in other provinces. There is not this feeling towards the other migration as the New Brunswickers who have gone to the United States are lost not only to New Brunswick but to Canada. It is quite possible that in the New England states and the six Canadian provinces west of the maritimes the New Brunswickers and their descendants outnumber those who remain in their native province. This is not as it should be. New Brunswick is a province of varied and valuable resources. Sixty per cent of it is valuable mixed farming land; there are great pulp and timber resources, valuable water-powers, never-failing fisheries, excellent transportation, and its products are at the Canadian outport for the European trade.

Through St. John many European and British immigrants enter Canada, but the only ones who remain in New Brunswick are those specially selected and brought there by the local government. Do not think that I, as a New Brunswicker—and I believe I represent the prevailing sentiment in that province—am jealous of the expansion in population, wealth and development of Ontario, Quebec and the west. We do not ask the government to relax its work in colonization and settlement in those provinces; in fact, we urge even greater efforts in their behalf. We welcome Canadian development in every part, but we do ask greater consideration, greater activity, better results in retaining our own people, repatriating those who have gone to the United States, and more satisfactory efforts in adding to our population from the people of Great Britain and Europe, who

would conform to our laws, customs and ideals and stimulate development, thus increasing our population, production and wealth.

I believe our local government is more effectively dealing with colonization than any other provincial administration. The New Brunswick government has entered into an agreement between the overseas settlement committee of the British government and the Canadian government. Under this agreement it is proposed to settle 500 British families on semi-improved farms in New Brunswick during the next five years. The provincial government buys the farms, which are sold to the settlers at actual cost, the amount being repayable over a period of twenty-five years with interest at 5 per cent amortized, the first payment begining two years from the 31st day of October next following the date of the agreement. The interest accruing between the date of the settler taking up the farm and one year from the 31st day of October next following is added to the purchase price of the farm and amortized as stated. The British government advances an amount not exceeding £300 for initial payment on farm and for farm stock and equipment. This amount is amortized on the same basis and under the same agreement as the purchase price of the farm to the provincial government. The payments made by the settler from time to time are applied pro rata to the amount owing to the British government and the New Brunswick government. The Dominion government, through its organizations in the British isles, makes the selection of the settlers and the provincial government receives them on their arrival, places them on the properties to which they have been allocated, and gives them the necessary care thereafter. The British and Dominion governments, under an agreement with the steamship companies, provide reduced rates whereby a settler can be brought to the province at minimum cost.

Under this scheme it will be noticed that one hundred new families will be added to the population each year. The full complement was placed last year and the province is now working on placing the same number of families this year.

In addition to this scheme the New Brunswick government has made with the Dominion government an arrangement whereby, under the extension of the three thousand family scheme, New Brunswick is to receive fifty British families per annum, thus bringing the whole quota up to 150 families annually to settle in the province. In addition the New Brunswick government contributes towards the Cossar farm, through which British boys are brought to Canada and placed in homes. There were 124 of these boys placed on the farms of New Brunswick last year through this agency.

The province of New Brunswick is also bringing in Scandinavian settlers. In this work the province cooperates with the railway offices, the federal government having no offices in Scandinavian countries. In 1927 the province brought in 451 Scandinavians, including thirty-six families, and in 1928, 444 Scandinavians, including forty-one families. These are excellent settlers, many of them purchasing farms on their own account and others being assisted by the government through its farm settlement board. New Brunswick is the only province having a farm settlement board giving assistance to its own people to purchase farms. Prior to the 31st of October, 1928, the government had purchased 633 farms, mostly for New Brunswick people. Of this number 336 had been paid for in full at that date.

This will indicate the activity and the effective colonization policy being pursued by the present administration. British families are being brought in and placed on the land, as also are Scandinavian families, and many New Brunswickers are being assisted in the purchase of farms. As I stated before, I believe the New Brunswick government is dealing more intelligently and effectively with the migration settlement problem than any other administration in Canada.

The province of New Brunswick can carry a much larger population than it has at present. With its agriculture and timber lands, its water-powers, fisheries and industries, there should be in that province, at least, 1,000,000 people. The necessity of increasing the population not only of New Brunswick but of the maritime provinces generally, which have suffered from loss of population and increased debts, is plainly apparent. There must be more population, greater development, production and wealth to place them on a sound financial and prosperous basis. The provincial government, with its limited resources, being what it is, I appeal to the Dominion government to increase its active cooperation towards settlement in New Brunswick. Surely the efforts of the New Brunswick government, which are so outstanding, should receive strong recognition from the federal government.

The financial resources of New Brunswick for settlement purposes are necessarily limited. The Dominion government has transferred to the provinces the full financial responsibility

for technical education and highways; in addition, the provinces must face the burden of fifty per cent on all old age pensions. It is true that New Brunswick has not yet adopted the old age pension scheme, but this is a problem to be dealt with in the future. With the drain to come on the provincial treasury for technical education, highways and old age pensions, there cannot be any large sum for settlement and colonization.

There is a further consideration. The federal government proposes to deal very generously with the four western provinces in the financial returns necessary to be made in the transfer to them of their natural resources. New Brunswick hopes the federal government will deal generously with these provinces. But it surely must be realized that the same generosity has not been displayed towards New Brunswick and the other maritime provinces. If the same provincial subsidies and terms are granted to New Brunswick as are proposed for the four western provinces, this will relieve the financial stringency and permit of greater efforts in colonization.

I believe that the conditions, as I have stated them, which confronted the government of New Brunswick, and the active efforts on the part of that government with its limited means to increase the population of the province, demand greater efforts on the part of the federal government towards the same end. Our people feel keenly witnessing the thousands of British and Europeans disembarking at the port of St. John and travelling west to the other provinces, and none remaining in New Brunswick. New Brunswick is essentially a mixed farming country. It seems to me that we have not had the corresponding development in mixed farming that there has been in grain production. New Brunswick is particularly fitted to produce cattle, horses, hogs, sheep, poultry and dairy products. Would it not be as well, without reducing our efforts to develop the grain-growing areas of the west, to stimulate the development of the mixed farming areas both in the west and in the east? It does not appear right to me that we should have imports from other parts of Canada into the maritime provinces of meats when we have in those provinces every requisite for their production. In addition, we are on the sea, and any surplus production should readily find a market in Europe. There would be little railway transportation required, and therefore the cost of placing the meats and dairy products of the maritime provinces on the European market would be lower than from any other part of Canada.

The New Brunswick government recognizes and gives credit to the cooperation of the Dominion government in settlement and colonization. But our conditions are peculiar, and we believe that that cooperation should take an even more practical and generous form. We do not ask that our people who have gone to other parts of Canada be urged to return to their native province, but we do ask that an effort be made to repatriate some of our people from the United States, and that these be supplemented with British settlers and settlers from other European countries who are adapted to the conditions which exist in our province.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BARBER: Under the heading of "Great Britain and the continent of Europe, Miscellaneous," I find an item of some $8,000 spent for the packing and distributing of Canadian peonies. What was the object of sending those Canadian peonies overseas?

Mr. FORKE: That was in 1927.

Mr. BARBER: I think I may ask for an explanation of this item even if the expenditure took place in that year. Why was this expenditure made?

Mr. FORKE: It was in commemoration of confederation year. These peonies were sent from Canada to Great Britain, and were exhibited all over London and throughout the United Kingdom. To show just how well these peonies were preserved, they were sent over to London, were distributed from the railway offices, from Canada House and all the principal buildings in London and throughout the United Kingdom, and some of them arrived back in Canada in perfect condition after having crossed the ocean twice. I think that was money well spent. It was one of the best pieces of advertising that has been done for Canada.

Mr. CAHILL: Under vote 55 I notice an item for Canadian boys. I would like to know what percentage of this item was spent last year, and what is proposed for this year.

Mr. FORKE: None of this money has been spent. The department has been trying to make an arrangement with the different provincial government similar to that made with the Imperial government, and if the provincial governments would come through, I think that there would be no trouble in getting the Dominion parliament to meet them. The British boys are supposed to have saved $500, to have lived and worked on a farm, and must show that they were capable, industrious and intelligent. Then the

British government will advance to them a loan of $1,250 and the Dominion government a like amount, making a total of $2,500, which with the $500 already saved gives the boy a capital of $3,000 on which to start farming. If the provincial governments would come through and meet us in the same way as the Imperial government has done, I have no hesitation in saying that we would make a similar arrangement with them. I am longing for the time when we can do for the Canadian boy exactly what we are doing for the British boy.

Mr. CAHILL: Was there an item in the estimates last year for this same purpose?

Mr. FORKE: Yes, but we have never been able to make an arrangement with the provincial governments.

Mr. CAHILL: No money has been spent?

Mr. FORKE: No. There is a great deal of talk about the tremendous amount of money that has been spent on immigration and assisting people to come here, but all that we are spending in that direction is our share of the assisted passages for people who are going on farms. This government has never contributed one dollar of cash towards any settlement of land up to to-day.

Mr. BENNETT: I think it is very desirable to make that statement because the position is much misunderstood in the country. Perhaps the minister would amplify it.

Mr. FORKE: When the British government offers a loan of $1,500 to the British boy if we will provide a like amount, it is very difficult to say that we will have nothing to do with it. A vast amount of money has come into this country and been spent under that scheme.

Mr. BENNETT: How much altogether?

Mr. FORKE: I could not say offhand, but the deputy will look it up. We hear a great deal said about the large amount of money that is being spent on bringing people in from outside in comparison with what is being spent on the settlement of Canadians. What we are spending is for the assistance of these people after they come here, giving them assistance and advice along the lines the hon. member for Red Deer spoke about. I think the house has a wrong impression as to the amount of money that is being spent by the Canadian government to bring immigrants to this country. I want all the facts brought out. I have nothing to hide, and if the house does not like the facts—

[Mr. Forke.]

Mr. BENNETT: You have a majority behind you anyway.

Mr. FORKE: It seems rather difficult to get them in line this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS: The minister said a while ago that if the provinces would come forward and provide loans for the Canadian boy as the Imperial government is doing for the British boy, the Dominion government would pay its share. What would be the position if an individual took the place of the province in putting up the amount of money required to settle Canadian boys? Would the Dominion government put up an equal amount?

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

RIGHT OF MARRIED WOMEN TO ESTABLISH DOMICILE

The house resumed, from May 21, consideration in committee of Bill No. 75, respecting the domicile of married women in proceedings for divorce—Mr. Ward—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 2—Married woman separate from husband.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, this bill brings before the house a very interesting question on constitutional law. The question is, have we the right to do something or not? What are the rights of this parliament, and what are the rights of the legislatures in each province?

Sometimes we have every sympathy for a sad case, or for some people who are in trouble. If a beggar goes to another man and says "I am destitute, I want some help, I badly need assistance," and the other man gives him a counterfeit one hundred dollar bill, that is no help at all for the beggar, because if he goes to a store and tries to change that bill the merchant will have him arrested and sent to gaol. The help, therefore, that we give to people must not be counterfeit help, so to speak, but help that really does assist. I heard some of my colleagues in the house relate some very sad divorce cases. For instance, the husband goes away and leaves his wife in charge of a family without any money. What can the wife do if the domicile of the husband is where he is, and if he does not happen to live in the country

in which the couple had resided then where is the domicile, or where can the wife have a domicile in order that she may be able to take divorce proceedings against her husband?

There are some very sad cases indeed. But Canada has a constitution, granted by the imperial parliament, and we can help people who are in trouble only in accordance with our rights under that constitution. In order to know what kind of help we can give to people in such destitute circumstances, or to know whether we can give them any help at all, we must refer to the British North America Act, enacted by the imperial parliament in the year 1867. Section 92 of that act, paragraph 13, reads as follows:

> Exclusive powers of provincial legislatures.
> 92. In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say,—
> 13. Property and civil rights in the province.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Read marriage and divorce in section 91.

Mr. POULIOT: I will read what I have to read, and when my hon. friend wants anything read he will do it himself.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: Read what Taschereau says about it.

Mr. POULIOT: I will tell you later what happened at the interprovincial conference, and it will be a good lesson for you. Section 146 of the British North America Act, relating to the admission of other colonies into the Dominion, reads thus:

> It shall be lawful for the queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the Union, and on address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's land and the Northwestern Territory, or either of them, into the Union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this act;—

"Subject to the provisions of this act," therefore subject to section 92.

> —and the provisions of any order in council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

There is also the following provision in the British North America Act, 1871, 34-35 Victoria, chapter 28, section 4:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time make provision for the administration, peace, order, and good government of any territory not for the time being included in any province.

When the province of Prince Edward Island entered confederation the following address was passed, as found in the schedule to the order in council of Her Majesty in council admitting that province into the union in the year 1873:

> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects. . . . humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing:
> That the constitution of the executive authority and of the legislature of Prince Edward Island shall, subject to the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, continue, as at the time of the union, until altered under the authority of the said act, and the House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island existing at the date of the union shall, unless sooner dissolved, continue for the period for which it was elected.

So that we see that even after confederation, after the British North America Act was passed, an order in council was issued by Her Majesty in council, in which reference is made to that act; and the statement appears that when Prince Edward Island entered the Canadian confederation it should be subject to the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867. It will be seen, therefore, that the constitution has not changed and that this parliament is vested with certain powers and rights exclusively, while the legislature of every province is similarly exclusively vested with peculiar rights and powers. But what is most important to know is the fact that in that part of the act which refers to the powers and rights of the provinces there appear the words "exclusive" and "exclusively". This means that the provinces may do certain things which this parliament cannot do. And the fathers of confederation were wise when they incorporated those provisions in the act inasmuch as they obviate conflicts in law.

What member of this house will dare to say that domicile is not a question of civil right? Domicile is the place where a person, in the legal sense of the word, has his place of business. The domicile of the head of a family is the place where that man is supposed to have permanent residence, the place where he lives all the time. Domicile comes from the Latin "domus," meaning a house or home. Domicile therefore is the place where a man has his home. A man has only one domicile, and it is not only the place where he can exercise civil rights under the law; it is also the place where he may be found when anyone wishes

to sue him in any case in which he is the defendant. Domicile is the place where he conducts his chief business and where he lives.

Now with regard to the family: the wife has the same domicile as her husband. I could cite some old precedents to that effect, not only from the history of the province of Quebec but also from that of England. For example, I could cite the case of Queen Marie Henriette of England, who was a daughter of Louis XIII. That queen of England was born in France where she lived for twenty-five years, and she was Queen of England when she died. Her heirs claimed the right to her estate, amounting to 100,000 crowns, and they would have been entitled thereto had the French law applied in England. But it was decided that she could not have any other domicile than that of her husband in England. This case is reported in Phillimore's Law of Domicile, pages 28 and 29.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What edition?

Mr. POULIOT: I have not a note of the edition. This is an old case, but there are other cases decided by the privy council. Now I submit that the fact that domicile is a question of civil rights, the fact that the exercise of civil rights comes within the purview of the province exclusively, shows very clearly that even if we were of the same opinion as the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ward) it would be impossible to carry his point of view because we have no power to pass any such act.

But there is something else of considerable importance. I have here a very interesting book called Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, prepared by the clerk of this house, who is an authority on questions of constitutional procedure. I have taken some notes from that book and now I wish to refer to Beauchesne, Rule 520, page 154:

> When the chairman of a committee has been ordered to make a report to the house, he shall leave the chair without question put.

Therefore the amendment moved in committee on May 7 by the hon. member has been sent to the chairman of the committee of the whole who has been ordered to report, but the amendment is not attached to the bill and is not before the committee. I may quote further from Beauchesne, rule 409, at page 129:

> No member may amend his own motion, but with leave of the house he may withdraw it and substitute another.

The hon. member cannot amend his own bill except by unanimous consent, even though his amendment is supported by our charming colleague, who is not in the house at present; I refer to the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail).

We are confronted with a very peculiar situation. The hon. member for East Toronto said some time ago that the bill should be amended so that a woman could not obtain a domicile outside of Canada for divorce purposes, and my hon. friend from Swift Current moved an amendment which was to the effect that the words "or otherwise" should be struck out. My hon. friend from Dauphin came along with a further amendment, which he read, but there is no amendment before the committee now. Instead of putting questions the hon. member for East Toronto should renew his suggestion; in any case the hon. member for Dauphin might get a friend to bring in a proper amendment, or if my hon. friend from East Toronto thinks it is so important to have that amendment made he should see that it is done properly. So I ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether the bill is amended as it is now before the committee?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): The amendment is moved by the hon. member for Swift Current, and not by the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. POULIOT: Was the question put on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): No.

Mr. POULIOT: Then is there an amendment before the committee now?

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): There is an amendment before the committee, which has been read.

Mr. POULIOT: Who seconded the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): There is no need of a seconder in committee.

Mr. POULIOT: Then let me take this opportunity of congratulating you, Mr. Chairman.

Now, to sum up, this is a serious situation. I do not wish to obstruct this bill but I would like to state my views in connection with it. The question is very simple. There are some sad cases of women who are in despair because they have been abandoned by their husbands, but what does this house do in the case of divorce? This house cannot legally impose any charge upon the guilty party, and we have had some very interesting discussions in connection with this question This house cannot impose such a charge be-

cause those are civil matters relating to the provinces, in which we have absolutely nothing to say. So if that argument is sound when we speak of alimony it must be sound when we speak of domicile, because the question of domicile is a question of civil rights just as much as the question of alimony. In addition there is something more serious, the question of the children belonging to the family. The children should be looked after and protected, and I think every member of this house will agree at least in principle with the eloquent presentation of this problem which was made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Labelle.

Now I would like to take up the question put me by an hon. member opposite, who asked, "What did Mr. Taschereau do in that case?" Let me tell the committee that at the last interprovincial conference the question of amending our constitution to meet the new requirements of the country was fully discussed. Some premiers, members of the conference, thought the boy who was growing up could not always wear the same clothes.

Mr. SPENCER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member who is now speaking discussed this subject for fifteen minutes last Tuesday night, and it is not fair to the rest of the members of the committee that he should be permitted to speak more than forty minutes altogether.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not wish to take up too much time, but I believe this is a most serious question.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): On the point of order, I think the hon. gentleman has a right to speak more than once in committee. He has not yet exhausted his forty minutes to-night.

Mr. POULIOT: At that interprovincial conference some premiers held the view that the constitution should be amended by unanimous consent to meet the new requirements of the country.

Mr. DUNNING: Speaking further to the point of order, I think the hon. gentleman now speaking actually had the floor at the conclusion of the hour devoted to private bills the other evening. In that case surely he cannot continue now for another forty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): I am sorry to disagree with the Minister of Railways, but another member spoke after the hon. member for Temiscouata.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): The hon. member for Lisgar spoke, I believe.

Mr. POULIOT: I spoke for only five minutes on Tuesday last. Some other premiers at that interprovincial conference held the view that the constitution should not be amended. Others stated that the constitution should be amended to meet the new requirements of the country, but the premiers of Ontario and Quebec were of the opinion that the constitution should not be changed in spite of those new requirements. I sincerely believe that the day the guilty party is forbidden to remarry we will have much fewer divorce cases before this parliament, but that cannot be done without amending the constitution. It will be a very good thing when that is done for that purpose because we will probably have only one-half the cases which now come before this parliament, and I do not think that any member will complain about that change for the better.

Mr. GEARY: Mr. Chairman, although I am opposed to the bill, either in its original or its amended form, I think every opportunity should be afforded for its discussion by the house. I need not go into the constitutional aspect of the question, because the question of what constitutes domicile is well settled. With all due respect to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Pouliot) domicile is not what he says it is; it is not where the husband happens to be, but is an entirely different thing. It depends a great deal on intent to remain and to make the place where he happens to be his domicile.

Our divorce jurisdicition is operated under the laws of England as they stood. I think it was, in 1870, and the laws of England regarding divorce are indissolubly connected with our jurisdiction. I need not go back to the time of Louis and Catherine in order to refer to the case cited by my hon. friend, because we have more recent cases decided by the privy council, notably—Lord Advocate of Scotland versus Jaffray, which was followed in the Cook case. I view with a great deal of disfavour any attempt to make a special ruling in regard to the law of domicile. That is a matter of private international law or common law, and has been too well established to be interfered with lightly. As far as I know this is the first time that it has been proposed to pass legislation directly affecting what is or what is not to be a domicile. The law has grown up after years of consideration and I think it may be taken to be firmly established. The husband's domicile is the domicile of the wife, not only because

she has agreed to live with him but because of the unity which came into effect with the marriage tie. I think the Jaffray case is perhaps the leading authority on this question. In that case the domicile of the husband had been transferred to Australia, and notwithstanding the fact that a separation under the English law might have been ordered under the circumstances, and the court said that there was no reason why a divorce could not be obtained if the action had been taken in the proper place, that is Australia, the court saw no reason to interfere with the well established law applying to divorce by making any variation in that part of it which related to domicile.

It seems to me that the amendment is very loose, and I do not see how this house can pass it. Apparently it is proposed that for the purpose of securing a divorce—

Mr. THORSON: Only.

Mr. GEARY: —for the purpose of securing a divorce a domicile may be obtained by the wife. She must be deserted by and live separate and apart from her husband for a period of at least two years, but the bill does not say how that is to be determined. I suppose an action will have to be taken or the matter settled in a legal tribunal to determine whether or not she has acquired a domicile and whether or not she has been deserted under the circumstances set out and has lived apart from her husband for a period of two years.

Mr. THORSON: In petitions for divorce it is a necessary part of the evidence to establish domicile. Under this particular act a separate domicile may be acquired by a married woman and it will be necessary for her in her action for divorce to establish, in the first place, that she has been deserted, and, in the second place, that she has acquired a separate domicile, in order to give the court jurisdiction to pronounce a decree of divorce.

Mr. GEARY: I do not think that anyone who has read the act will doubt that it will be necessary for some tribunal to determine that the woman has acquired a domicile, a domicile for this one specific purpose. If my hon. friends had wanted to enable the wife to sue in certain jurisdictions, it seems to me that it might have been effected by leaving out all reference to domicile, and then it would have read:

—and lived separate and apart from her husband for a period of two years and upwards, and is still living separate and apart from her husband, may commence an action for divorce in the province praying that her marriage may be dissolved, and that the courts of that province shall have full jurisdiction in the premises.

I view with a great deal of distrust any interference by statutory enactment with this well established principle in divorce, because there are so many complications which might follow, such as successions after death and so on, and it would be very difficult for us to guard against every eventuality which might occur where the wife could be given by statute a particular domicile.

I do not think we are concerned with the question of whether or not it is a matter of civil rights. This house has jurisdiction in the matter of divorce. We have a bill here which will give a domicile to a deserted wife in the place where she is living, and not in the place where her husband's domicile may be. We are not concerned with whether or not the provinces desire to assume the responsibility for enacting such legislation with regard to their own court.

Apart from all this, I would say that without any question this bill would simplify the obtaining of a divorce.

I do not understand the attitude of my hon. friends opposite who profess that they do not want to see an increase in divorce in this country, but still object to giving the province of Ontario the right to have a divorce court. Everyone knows that where a divorce case is tried in open court, subject to all the rules of evidence and the careful scrutiny of same, there is very little likelihood of a divorce being granted in a mistaken case as may happen before the Senate committee, rushed as it is. I do not agree with the actions of that committee in many ways; I think it is overpressed and it is not a tribunal properly set up to look into the evidence and make a proper adjudication thereon. Each province should have its own divorce courts where these actions could be tried in the usual way, and, as I said before, I do not understand the attitude of my hon. friends opposite who, professing to a desire to restrict the ease with which a divorce may be obtained, still vote against a divorce court being established in the province of Ontario.

I agree thoroughly with them that we do not want anything which will make it easier to obtain a divorce. In regard to the marriage tie there has grown up a sort of premeditated uncertainty which is endangering the social life of this country. I think we are making it much easier to obtain divorce by passing such a law as is here suggested, and for that reason, aside from the interference with the private international law and common law

of the country, I am absolutely opposed to this bill. As I said before, the domicile of husband theory is not based only upon the fact that the wife has agreed to live with the husband, but one of the members of the court, I think, it was the late Lord Chancellor, said in the case to which I have referred:

"It is quite possible there may be cases in which the husband may deprive the wife of her remedy by changing his domicile" but this application of the law of domicile which has been invariably adhered to in the English law regarding the dissolution of marriage "preserves that unity of idea and fact with regard to the domicile of the married parties which has hitherto always been upheld by the law."

I believe that should be maintained in this country; that parliament should not interfere with that well-established principle, and, therefore, that the amendment should be negatived.

Amendment agreed to on division: Yeas, 36; nays, 28.

Section 2 as amended agreed to on division.

On section 3—Retains domicile of husband until she acquires domicile of choice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not want to repeat what I have already stated three or four times in my opposition to this bill, but may I direct the attention of the committee to the fact that the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George said the other day that we would establish a Reno in Canada, or a number of them? This, however, is going to be worse than Reno, because residence in Reno for three months is necessary in order to acquire a domicile for the purpose of securing a divorce, whereas under this bill a woman may go to Manitoba or Saskatchewan and say: "I am going to establish my domicile here for my divorce", and she will start divorce proceedings the next day. That is much worse than Reno, and it is what my hon. friend is asking for.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister is entirely in error.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am not in error.

Mr. BENNETT: It is a matter of judicial determination whether or not the two factors of fact and intention exist. Unless the court decides that there is an intention to remain in that jurisdiction forever, together with the fact of residence, no domicile is established, and the judicial determination takes the case out of the Reno class.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is entirely wrong. He need only read the amendment to see that. It says that a woman, after she has been living separate and apart from her husband for a period of two years, may go to any province in Canada in which there is a court having jurisdiction to grant a divorce, and she may there establish a domicile of her own choice for the purpose of instituting proceedings.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In Reno she would have to stay three months. In Manitoba or Saskatchewan she need stay only one day.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely the minister knows the law of domicile better than that. For a domicile to be established, a judge in the forum in which she appears must be satisfied (a) that she has gone there with the intention to remain there forever as her home, and (b) that the fact of residence has been established.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend is right, the bill is entirely unconstitutional because she would have to go there and establish a domicile. Only the province has jurisdiction in that matter. We, the federal government, have no jurisdiction. We must bring the bill within the question of divorce solely and absolutely; if you go outside of that, you go outside the jurisdiction of this parliament. My hon. friend by his amendment has sought to bring the bill within the jurisdiction of this parliament by not touching the question of domicile as a whole but confining the bill to establishing domicile for the purpose of divorce and for that purpose only. It is stated in the bill, "a domicile of her own choice," for that reason, and she can acquire that domicile in a day, while at Reno it takes three months.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Has not the minister overlooked the fact that section 3 begins with the words "for the purposes of this act"?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know that.

Mr. THORSON: The amendment provides that sections 2 and 3 of the bill as printed are deleted, and the amendment is substituted for those two sections. The amendment has been carried by this committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is the amendment that I am discussing.

Mr. BENNETT: The amendment has been carried.

Mr. POULIOT: Can this parliament by any act change the nature of domicile?

Mr. THORSON: This parliament undoubtedly has the right to lay down the conditions for divorce, one of which at present is that the parties to the divorce action shall be domiciled in the province in which the court is exercising jurisdiction. This bill proposes to give to a married woman who has been deserted by her husband the right to acquire a separate domicile as one of the conditions for bringing an action for divorce. I think there is no question as to the jurisdiction of this parliament to pass an act of this sort.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think so. I do not say no.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): May I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the amendment is substituted for sections 2 and 3 of the bill? That amendment has been carried, and therefore the bill is carried. This discussion therefore is entirely out of order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I agree, but it was because you called section 3, Mr. Chairman, that I spoke.

Preamble agreed to, on division.

Title agreed to, on division.

Bill reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 24, to amend the Precious Metals Marking Act, 1928.—Mr. Letellier de St. Just.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Immigration contingencies and general expenses, including grants to immigration societies, women's hostels, provinces, and loans for stock, equipment, etc., for Canadian boys, as may be authorized by the Governor General in Council, $1,300,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Would the minister be good enough to tell the committee how that grant was spent last year? I suppose he has the particulars handy.

Mr. FORKE: I can read the items if required.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the minister would not mind doing so, because there is a great deal of interest taken in this vote. I do not desire to weary him too much, but if he will read the memorandum it will be greatly appreciated. Perhaps he could put part of it on Hansard.

Mr. FORKE: There is an amount of $400,000 for publicity. The vote includes provision for advertising in Great Britain, the Irish Free State, the United States and certain countries on the continent of Europe. It also provides for all immigration literature printed for distribution in the above named countries. The items are as follows:

Advertising, $141,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that both in and out of Canada?

Mr. FORKE: Yes. It takes in Great Britain, the Irish Free State, the United States and the continent of Europe. The item is made up as follows:—

Advertising	$141,000
Literature	183,000
Lectures and shows, exhibition motor cars and miscellaneous.	76,000
	$400,000

General printing done by the King's Printer for the service outside of Ottawa in Canada, $10,000.

This is to provide for the printing of books, manifests, cards, indexes, forms, questionnaires, letterheads, printed envelopes, etc., for use at the various immigration agencies, immigration hospitals, at immigration halls and at our boundary inspection offices all over Canada.

Stationery supplies obtained through the King's Printer for the service outside of Ottawa in Canada, $15,000.

This amount is to provide for the stationery supplies required for our various agencies, seaport officers, detention hospitals, immigration halls and boundary inspection offices throughout Canada. These supplies consist of typewriting machines and supplies, dictaphones, envelopes, writing and wrapping paper, pens, ink, pencils, erasers, rubber bands, fasteners, writing pads, blotting paper, calendars, parliamentary documents, etc.

Salaries of temporary employees in Canada chargeable to contingencies, $100,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Are they appointed by the Civil Service Commission or not?

Mr. FORKE: Oh, yes, they are appointed by the Civil Service Service Commission. The temporaries may be permanents employed in a temporary position.

This item is to provide for the salaries of temporary clerks, stenographers, office boys, inspectors, guards, caretakers, firemen, matrons, charwomen, maids, deportation officers, etc., employed at headquarters in Ottawa, but especially at our various seaport agencies, inland agencies, at immigration halls and at boundary inspection points. The item also covers the salaries of about 157 customs officers acting as part time immigration inspectors all

along the boundary line between Canada and the United States, who are paid salaries varying from $50 to $400 per annum for their extra services. The aggregate salaries for these customs officers being about $22,110 per year.

Contingencies and general expenses in Canada, $21,000.

This is to provide for the travelling expenses of investigating officers, for legal expenses in connection with cases of prosecutions or habeas corpus under the Immigration Act; for miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses not provided for under any specific service.

Postage, telegrams, cablegrams, telephones, freight and express charges in Canada, $20,000.

This is to cover the cost of postage on letters, pamphlets, atlases, parcels, etc., mailed to points outside Canada; for telegrams, cablegrams, long distance telephone calls; freight and express charges on books, forms, manifests, maps, atlases, pamphlets, stationery supplies shipped to points in Canada as well as outside of Canada.

Inspection of British immigrant children, $23,000.

This item is to provide for the expenses of inspection of children emigrating to Canada under the auspices of various homes and societies in the British Isles, and also brought to Canada under the provisions of the empire settlement scheme.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the total of that last item?

Mr. FORKE: $23,000, inspection of British immigrant children.

Expenses of seaport agencies, detention hospitals and halls, $25,000.

This is to provide for the expenses of administration, upkeep and maintenance of agencies and offices at the various seaports: St. John, N.B.; Halifax, N.S.; Boston, Quebec, Montreal, Vancouver and Victoria; and also for equipment, administration and maintenance of immigration detention hospitals at St. John, Halifax, Montreal, Vancouver and Victoria.

The expenses consist of cost of uniforms; salaries of cleaners and charwomen; telephones, laundry, medical supplies, bed sheets, mattresses, pillows, pillow slips, towels, blankets; of cost of board of detained immigrants and deports; travelling expenses of officers attached to these agencies. Most of these detention expenses are, however, recovered from the steamship companies according to the provisions of the Immigration Act.

Inland agencies and maintenance of immigration halls in the west, $48,000.

This item is to cover the expenses of our various inland agencies like Toronto and Hamilton in the east and Winnipeg, Edmonton, Calgary in the west and other small agencies throughout Canada; also for the equipment and maintenance of immigration halls at various points in the west. These expenses consist of cost of uniforms, telegrams, telephones, freight and express charges, wages of cleaners, laundry, pillows, blankets, sheets, towels, medical supplies and hospital expenses; cost of board for immigrants and deports temporarily maintained in our buildings; and for other miscellaneous expenses necessary for the upkeep and maintenance of these agencies and halls.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that the cleaning charges right here in Ottawa?

Mr. FORKE: No, that is in the west.

Mr. RYCKMAN: What is an immigration hall?

Mr. FORKE: It is a place where the immigrants get off and perhaps stay for one or two nights until they are distributed.

Deportation expenses, $65,000.

This is to cover the travelling expenses of our deportation officers; the cost of uniforms; meals for deports on trains; rail and ocean transportation of deports in cases where the railway and steamship companies are not liable for free transportation, etc.

Boundary inspection expenses, $90,000.

This item is to provide for the cost of uniforms of boundary inspectors, for living and travelling expenses of travelling or relieving inspectors; for overtime on Sundays and statutory holidays; for meals and lodging of inspectors when away from headquarters and for miscellaneous and incidental expenses incurred for the maintenance of offices at certain points on the boundary line between Canada and the United States.

Contingencies and general expenses in the United States, $135,000.

These expenses consist of rent of offices; furniture, typewriting machines, stationery supplies, printing of cards, letterheads, envelopes; postage, telegrams, telephones; freight and express charges; light and fuel; office furnishings and equipment; living allowance of agents of certain grades at the rate of $500 per annum; temporary assistance; travelling expenses of agents; expenses and salaries of a certain number of field men, etc.

There are seventeen emigration agencies at the following places:—Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Omaha, Fargo, Great Falls, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Manchester, Saginaw, St. Paul, Spokane, San Francisco, Woonsocket, Columbus, Buffalo, Minneapolis.

Contingencies and general expenses in Great Britain and Irish Free State, $165,000.

This item is to cover the expenses of equipment and maintenance of our agencies established in the British Isles. These expenses consist of rent of offices, furniture, taxes, light, fuel, stationery supplies, printing of books, letterheads, forms, envelopes; postage, telegrams, cablegrams, telephones; freight and express charges; salaries of temporary employees; travelling expenses of agents and officers, typewriting machines, etc. Ten agencies are in operation throughout the British Iles at the following points:—London, Birmingham, Bristol, Liverpool, York, Glasgow, Inverness, Belfast, Dublin, Cardiff.

Contingencies and general expenses on the continent of Europe, $35,000.

This is to provide for the expenses of equipment and maintenance of our offices established at certain points on the continent of Europe for the purpose of the vise of passports and civil inspection of immigrants coming to Canada. The expenses consist of rents of offices; taxes, light and fuel; furniture, office furnishings; salaries of temporary employees; freight and express charges; telegrams, cablegrams, telephones, stationery supplies and printing of books, forms, letterheads, envelopes; travelling expenses of officers and inspectors, etc. The offices established on the continent are six in number at:—Antwerp, Belgium;

Rotterdam, Holland; Hamburg, Germany; Danzig, Poland; Riga, Latvia; and Paris, France.

Expenses of women's immigration division, $40,000.

This is to provide for the expenses of conductresses accompanying on trains parties of girls coming to Canada to engage especially in domestic service; for uniforms of women officers; for grants to women's hostels maintained in the principal cities in Canada for the temporary assistance and welfare of immigrant women; for an allowance at the rate of $1.50 per day to these hostels for the free accommodation accorded by them to immigrant girls and women, such free accommodation not to extend in any case to more than 48 hours; for travelling expences of women officers outside of Ottawa, etc.

The statement in regard to colonization expenses and grants to immigration societies is as follows:

Colonization expenses, $60,000.

This item is to cover grants and expenses in connection with colonization and especially to cover expenses re repatriation of French Canadian families from the New England states.

Colonization agents—

Rev. J. Hamelin, Peace River district.

Rev. P. M. Roussel, Northern Ontario.

Grants to immigration societies and to provinces, etc., $35,000.

This item is to cover the cost of cooperation with provincial governments in their training schools for immigrant boys and for other grants in connection with immigration work.

Unforeseen and miscellaneous expenses, $13,000.

Mr. STEVENS: In order to get an idea as to just how the money is being spent, I have been looking up the Auditor General's report for the year ended March 31, 1928, and I find page H-23 under "Miscellaneous" an item for advertising, Desbarats Advertising Agency Limited, Montreal, amounting to $61,865.09. What would that be for?

Mr. FORKE: That is for advertising in the United States. That advertising agency works on a percentage basis, and the advertising is done in a number of farm journals. This year we are giving the work to the Advertising Service Association of Toronto.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the total amount being spent in the United States? I have it in the report in a score of items but it is difficult for me to get the total cost. Can we be given that?

Mr. FORKE: I am sorry to say it would take some time; you would have to get all the salaries, office expenses and advertising.

Mr. STEVENS: I would refer the minister to the office in Fargo, North Dakota, the expenses in connection with which amount to $14,767.53; the one at St. Paul, Minnesota, amounts to $19,829.56; the one at Spokane, Washington, amounts to $11,076.11, and the one at San Francisco, California, amounts to $13,301.68. Now if we turn over to the European agencies we find that the agency at the port of Hamburg, which is the point of departure for most of the European immigrants, amounts to $7,483, while Riga amounts to $5,509, and Rotterdam, $6,176. There is a marked difference between the amounts paid to these agencies respectively. The offices in the United States are costing very large sums, whereas these main embarkation offices in Europe are costing about one third of what we are paying to the American agencies, notwithstanding that quite obviously they are giving much greater results so far as numbers are concerned. Can the minister explain the reason for the difference?

Mr. FORKE: I do not think you can very well compare the work done by the United States offices with the work carried on by the continental agencies. The continental offices are merely inspection points. They carry on no propaganda of any description but simply pass the immigrants. I had the pleasure of seeing a shipful of immigrants examined at Paris and as I watched the performance it occurred to me that the inspection was rigid enough for army purposes. However, I suppose it is absolutely necessary to be careful in these examinations. The United States offices, on the other hand, are engaged in an active campaign in immigration and maintain a considerable staff. Immigrants from the United States brought in last year, in the way of cash and effects, property to the value of $14,971,670. They are a good class of immigrants.

Mr. STEVENS: Does that include the two cars which carried $400,000?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: What would they be bringing in—diamonds?

Mr. FORKE: This represents settlers' cash and effects.

Mr. STEVENS: Did they bring the cash by freight?

Mr. FORKE: My hon. friend will have his joke, of course.

Mr. McGIBBON: How many new offices have been opened in the United States in the last two years and how many closed?

Mr. FORKE: Two have been closed but no new ones opened.

Mr. RYCKMAN: What two were closed?

Mr. FORKE: One in Indianapolis and the other in the east.

Mr. McGIBBON: How many immigrants from the United States have been sent back by the American patrol at the border?

Mr. FORKE: I cannot give that information offhand.

Mr. McGIBBON: That is important, is it not?

Mr. KENNEDY: I notice in this item, in the statement of the purposes for which the money is being voted, a reference to loans for stock, equipment and so forth, for Canadian boys, which loans may be authorized by the governor in council. I listened carefully while the minister was making his statement and I gathered that no money was advanced last year for this purpose by order in council.

Mr. FORKE: It comes under the grant for immigration or colonization societies, amouunting to $35,000.

Mr. KENNEDY: And that has been actually advanced?

Mr. FORKE: Not one dollar has been spent yet. As I explained before dinner, the boy will have to have $500 and must work long enough on the farm to show that he is possessed of intelligence and industry and is capable of managing a farm. The land settlement board will have to decide that. After that question has been settled—I am referring now, of course, to British boys; I will discuss Canadian boys later—$1,250 is advanced by the Dominion and $1,250 by the imperial government. This makes a total of $3,000, and the money will be spent under the care and direction of the land settlement board.

I spoke about the Canadian boys; I made the statement that the Dominion government would be ready and willing to advance the same amount to Canadian boys provided we could get any of the provincial governments to grant an equal amount, either by way of a farm or in cash, to take the place of the grant by the imperial government. Last summer I took up this matter with the governments of the three prairie provinces and their excuse was that they did not have their natural resources; they said if their resources were returned to them they might be able to come to some arrangement along that line, so that is how the situation stands at present, although I hope in the future to be able to come to something definite. In regard to the British boys not a dollar has been spent as yet; it may be years before the money is expended, but it has been and will continue to be provided. As to this item for Canadian boys the chances are that the money will not be spent this year, although I hope we may come to some arrangement.

Mr. LUCAS: Before six o'clock I questioned the minister as to the attitude of the department in case a private individual agreed to assume this responsibility in place of the province.

Mr. FORKE: In that case the province would have to agree to assume the aftercare of the boy. That is not new; the question has been discussed from that angle also, but nothing has been accomplished as yet.

There is nothing like speaking plainly at times. With the exception of some in the province of Quebec there has not been any great desire shown by Canadian boys to go farming. I do not say there are not some boys of this kind in other provinces, but the same desire is not shown elsewhere that we find among the young French Canadians. At least two-thirds of the boys growing up on our farms in western Canada—and I can speak for Manitoba if not for the other provinces—have no intention of continuing farming. I would like to see the boy who wants to farm given every possible encouragement by the government.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the minister tell us if the government has considered reversing its decision with regard to allowing Barnardo boys of school age to enter Canada?

Mr. FORKE: Barnardo boys over fourteen years of age.

Mr. McGIBBON: I was referring to Barnardo boys of school age.

Mr. FORKE: Fourteen years is the limit.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the minister tell us for what reason?

Mr. FORKE: I think almost every society dealing with juveniles has recommended that the minimum age be fourteen

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the minister be good enough to name these societies?

Mr. FORKE: The child welfare societies of the different provinces have made that recommendation, together with the provincial governments. Really I have seen no great desire to have the minimum age lowered except on the part of the Barnardo people and the Marchmont homes, which are operated by the Cadbury people, who make cocoa and chocolates and so on. I had the

pleasure of having dinner with Mr. and Mrs. Cadbury, and I could never hope to meet finer people; if I could have done anything for anyone I would have done it for the Cadburys.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely a good meal would not influence the minister?

Mr. FORKE: It might help; and we had chocolates also.

Mr. McGIBBON: Surely the minister recognizes the fact that for years this work has been carried on successfully. He must recognize that the best citizens of this country are our own people; the second best are the British, and the most successful of those British born citizens are those who come to Canada at school age, which permits them to be educated in the institutions of this country and moulded into the political, social and economic life of Canada. I have been credibly informed that only one society has objected to bringing out these younger children. They are being sent to Australia; there is no objection to them in that country, and I have been told that of the thousands of these children brought to Canada less than two per cent have been charged with any crime. To-day many of these boys are occupying positions in this country with great distinction, and it does appear to me that when an organization will bring children to Canada, pay for their keep in this country with money raised in the old land, educate the boys and girls to be Canadian citizens and have them inspected every three or four months, you have an organization doing the very work this government wants done. The Barnardo people have told me that they know of only one organization in this country which has objected to the admission of these children, and if the minister knows of others I think he should give the names.

Mr. FORKE: I have mentioned the child welfare societies and the provincial governments, and the British government itself does not encourage the emigration of children under fourteen.

Mr. McGIBBON: That movement is going on between England and Australia at present.

Mr. FORKE: Not to a very large extent.

Mr. McGIBBON: It has been transferred from Canada to Australia. Perhaps the minister might say whether the Ontario government officially objects to these children being brought in?

[Mr. Forke.]

Mr. FORKE: My deputy says he does not know that the government of Ontario has officially objected.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister said so.

Mr. FORKE: Probably I was mistaken.

Mr. McGIBBON: If you were mistaken with regard to the Ontario government perhaps you were mistaken with regard to the other provinces.

Mr. FORKE: There are the provincial child welfare associations.

Mr. McGIBBON: That is only one organization, and I am told it is the only association which has made any objection.

Mr. FORKE: With the exception of the one of which my hon. friend spoke I do not know of any organization that has asked that children under fourteen years of age be brought to this country.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am not asking for those who have requested the government to take this action; I want to know those who have objected.

Mr. FORKE: It is a matter of opinion. I have no doubt the hon. member thinks it would be a good thing to bring in children under fourteen years of age, but in the department we have taken the opposite stand, believing it to be in the best interests of the young people themselves, and these welfare societies have taken the same view. Possibly we may be mistaken, but it is thought that children of tender age coming to a new country might find themselves in uncomfortable surroundings, and it has been deemed advisable to draw the line at fourteen years of age. It may be a mistake, but we think it is best in the interests of the children themselves.

Mr. McGIBBON: I have no hesitation in telling the minister that in my opinion it is a mistake. This policy has not been in force in Canada for many years; this is a recent change. I can safely say that I have observed hundreds of these boys in my own district; I know one family which has had thirty-five of them. These boys and girls are brought to Canada; they are educated here by money collected in the old country, and without that education I believe you cannot lay the foundation for the very best Canadian citizenship. A boy coming to Canada above school age is barred from entering any of the professions here because he has not the necessary primary or secondary education; the girls cannot become nurses; these children cannot enter our

universities and take professional courses. They are handicapped in many lines of business, and I claim that the minister and his department have deliberately shut out the very best type of immigrant we can get. They are British; they are young, and without expense to the government they are inspected, every three months with regard to girls and every four or five months with regard to boys. An inspector is sent to their homes, and if necessary they are brought to Toronto where they are not subject to any outside influence and where they can tell exactly how they have been treated. This government has deliberately reversed the policy which was in force for many years and under which some 280,000 boys and girls were brought to this country, of whom over 98 per cent made good; less than 2 per cent of the immigrants were declined. I am credibly informed that no provincial government has objected to this policy. Objections were made by one organization, headed by a lady who had no doubt good intentions but who probably does not know very much about bringing up children. I think the minister should give us a little more information than he has up to the present.

Mr. FORKE: My deputy suggests that in the morning I give you all the resolutions which have been passed by different societies and sent in to the department.

Mr. McGIBBON: Let it go until the morning.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I asked the minister where the two offices in the United States which were closed were located, and he could not tell me at the moment.

Mr. FORKE: They are at Harrisburg and Portland, Maine.

Mr. RYCKMAN: What were the grounds for closing those offices?

Mr. FORKE: They were closed upon the advice of the officials.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Did the officials justify the continuance of the other offices? Does the minister say that all the other offices in the United States are productive of good in the immigration policy of Canada?

Mr. FORKE: I have the list here.

Mr. RYCKMAN: You have read the list already.

Mr. FORKE: I think they are rendering very good service. Of course I do not want to hide behind my officials, but I think everyone will recognize the fact that a minister has to trust to his officials to a large extent in matters of this kind. These offices were closed and the territory in respect to other offices was widened out.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Are those offices inspected regularly?

Mr. FORKE: Oh, yes; we have a commissioner of colonization who inspects them regularly. If results are not being obtained an explanation is requested.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the minister tell us why the Detroit office could not be as efficiently carried on in the city of Windsor?

Mr. FORKE: It is a matter of opinion, but I do not think so. The Detroit office is a good office and has been producing very good results. Some complaints were made this afternoon about the San Francisco office. The agent there, Mr. Roche, is an elderly man and perhaps a younger man would be able to obtain better results in that office.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Has the minister ever been in Detroit?

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister does not know the relative situation as between Detroit and Windsor?

Mr. FORKE: I have looked at the map.

Mr. CHAPLIN: They are only five or six minutes apart by ferry or by bridge. Does the minister not realize that one who wished to come to Canada could go to the office in Windsor just as conveniently as to the office in Detroit? We would thus be carrying on the business in our own country instead of in the United States.

An hon. MEMBER: You would not be able to get the Detroit gunmen.

Mr. FORKE: I think the United States people are more likely to go to the Detroit office than to come over to Windsor.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Anyone wanting to come to Canada would come to the city of Windsor to ask for information.

Mr. CAHILL: They would be in Canada then.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That would be too bad.

Mr. FORKE: That office has been in existence for quite a long time.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Then I suggest that the minister consider making the change.

Mr. FORKE: All right, we will take it into consideration.

Mr. KELLNER: The minister states that the government has not spent any money to provide land or equipment for the immigrant. When the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Barber) was speaking last evening he complained about the high prices which an immigrant had paid for land, and the minister said that nothing was being paid at the present time. If the government has not advanced any money why is the hon. member for Fraser Valley complaining about the payments being so high and the minister stating that they were not being made?

Mr. FORKE: Those people came in under the three thousand family scheme on money supplied by the British government. The Canadian government undertake to collect that money and pay it over to the British government; they are not collecting the money for themselves.

Mr. BARBER: It is being charged up against the people just the same.

Mr. CAHILL: We are collectors.

Mr. McGIBBON: I must object to the minister coming before the house in the last days of the session and knowing absolutely nothing about his own department. Whenever we ask a question the minister replies, "I have not the information, I will give it to you later." I think that attitude is a discourtesy to the house.

Mr. FORKE: If the hon. member states that it is done through ignorance, I am quite willing to bow under the yoke.

Mr. McGIBBON: Do not put words into my mouth.

Mr. FORKE: But I do not consider that it is a discourtesy, because I will give the members every courteous answer I can.

Mr. McGIBBON: The trouble is that we cannot get information.

Mr. FORKE: I think you are getting a fair amount.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Has the minister any information with regard to domestics entering this country? Can he tell us how many remained here after the second year?

Mr. STEVENS: And how many got married.

[Mr. Forke.]

Mr. FORKE: The following domestics came in under the assisted passage scheme during 1928-29, and were received at the following places:

Halifax	8
Montreal	728
Toronto	1,445
Winnipeg	125
Regina	146
Calgary	207

The department have made arrangements with the following organizations to receive houseworkers who are also placed by the employment service:

Nova Scotia, Halifax: Catholic Women's League.

New Brunswick, St. John: Young Women's Christian Association; Rosary Hall.

Quebec, Que.: Young Women's Christian Association.

Montreal: Catholic Women's League Hostel.

Ontario, Ottawa: Young Women's Christian Association; King's Daughters Guilds; Rosary Hall.

Kingston: Young Women's Christian Association.

Toronto: Catholic Women's League Hostel.

Hamilton: Young Women's Christian Association.

London: Young Women's Christian Association.

Saskatchewan, Saskatoon: Teacher's Hostel accommodating girls for British Women's Emigration Society.

Manitoba, Winnipeg: Catholic Women's League Hostel.

Alberta, Edmonton: Church of England Hostel; Young Women's Christian Association; Catholic Women's League Hostel.

British Columbia, Vancouver: Young Women's Christian Association; Queen Mary's Coronation Hostel.

Victoria: Young Women's Christian Association.

Kelowna: Joyce Hostel.

Those are the numbers of domestics that come out and the different organizations that look after them.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Can the minister tell us the possibilities of finding these girls within two years?

Mr. FORKE: Our officials have endeavoured in every case to follow up and find out what becomes of these girls. No doubt a number of them disappear. Many of them do not stay where they are placed but drift into other lines of work. The Salvation Army is the only organization I know of that claims they keep all their women just where they place them. Women's immigration is probably more difficult to conduct than men's. More care is taken to look after women when they arrive at Quebec or Montreal. They are taken charge of by conductresses and conducted to a distributing centre whence they

are sent to the place where they are required. We have found by experience that many of these women come with two addresses, the one to which they are ostensibly going, having been recruited for it by the Immigration department; the other to which they want to go and to which they will eventually go if possible.

Mr. McGIBBON: When these domestics come here, say from northern Europe, or, indeed, from any country, what provision does the government make for following them up and looking after them?

Mr. FORKE: In Canada?

Mr. McGIBBON: Yes, for those who cannot speak the English language.

Mr. FORKE: The hostels are really clearing houses. I have under my hand a statement of the houseworkers by origin arriving at ocean ports during the fiscal year, all of whom are looked after, sent to the hostel and distributed by our own officials. Those who come out under the different associations are looked after by them and a report is made by the organization as to where they have gone. There is no method of keeping a girl in domestic service if she does not want to remain, at least none that I know of.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister does not get my point. I have had complaints from people who have hired these girls who cannot speak the English language. When they no longer require their services there is no place for the girls to go to and they are under the necessity of finding another job for them before they leave their first employment. There is no agency in Toronto to which to send them, no organization that cares a fig for them; they are left in this country, not being able to speak the English language, practically helpless.

Mr. FORKE: There is in every large city a hostel towards the maintenance of which the department subscribes. Our officials are supposed to keep an eye on the girls when they go into domestic service. Of course everyone will recognize that it is impossible in every case to keep track of a girl if she is determined to slip out of sight. I know the difficulties our women's branch has in looking after these girls.

Mr. McGIBBON: My point, if I can make it clear to the minister, is this: these girls do not slip out of sight. They come to Toronto and somebody employs them. When that employer is through with them, there is nobody to look after them. They cannot speak the English language; they have no place to go to and their employer has to keep them until he goes out and finds another place for them.

Mr. FORKE: I had the great pleasure of visiting the Toronto hostel and addressing the girls there on one occasion. That hostel is a home for any girl in Toronto who has come from a foreign country, and if such girls go there, they will be treated as well as their mothers would treat them.

Mr. McGIBBON: Who is in charge of it?

Mr. FORKE: I was at the hostel, but really I do not know where it is as I was taken down there in a car. It is in the city of Toronto.

Mr. McGIBBON: This is another example of the great efficiency of the department and of the minister.

Mr. FORKE: If friends drive one in a car to a point in a city the size of Toronto I do not think it is surprising that one should not know its exact location. It is a very good hostel. Hon. members from the city of Toronto ought to know something about it. It is a large institution, well run, and a great credit to that city and the people who are in charge of it. When those girls go there these are the different organizations that look after them:

Women's Auxiliary, Anglican Church.
Girls' Friendly Society.
United Farm Women of Ontario.
Toronto Catholic Women's League.
Presbyterian Church.
Women's Patriotic League.
Toronto Young Women's Christian Association.
Municipal Chapter of the Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire.

Ladies connected with this organization were kind enough to take me down to see the hostel.

Georgina House.
Traveller's Aid.
Women's Institute.
Women's Christian Temperance Union.
Toronto Local Council of Women.
United Church Missionary Society.

All these organizations are interested in the girls and are assisting the Immigration department in seeing that they are properly looked after.

Mr. McGIBBON: Do they take care of them in their homes?

Mr. FORKE: The hostel is the home.

Mr. McGIBBON: Where is it?

Mr. FORKE: I am informed it is on Jarvis street. If I were in Toronto, I could soon find out where it is.

Mr. McGIBBON: That is all the minister knows about it.

Mr. FORKE: Yes, my hon. friend will have to be content with that.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): When I raised this question, I was interested in another phase of the matter. I was wondering whether the minister and his department made any attempt to follow up and find out the result of this policy. We have a two-sided policy—agricultural labour and domestic assistance. I wanted to know if the minister had followed up these cases to find out if Canada was getting any results from this immigration. I can speak only for our own section, but it is my belief that you cannot find fifteen per cent of these domestics in Canada after two years, and under this policy you are only paying out good Canadian money to provide splendid domestic assistants for the United States. As soon as they have finished one year's service here and paid off their indebtedness they are on the train bound for New York City, where they get big pay. Has the minister any information on that? I know that in our district you will not find fifteen per cent of the Scotch domestic servants here after two years. They stay just long enough to qualify for entrance to the United States. If that is the case generally, we are simply providing another means for the United States getting the domestic help that they badly need, and are spending money without much result so far as this country is concerned. I do not blame the girls for going. The ones who come into our district are splendid girls.

Mr. FORKE: The department uses its best endeavours to see that these girls stay in Canada, but I am afraid that there is too much truth in what the hon. gentleman has said, and that quite a large number slip away across the border. At the same time we could never begin to fill the demand for these girls in Canada. All we can do is to get the best girls we possibly can and send them to the points that are asking for them, and then follow them up and try to keep them in the employment to which they have been sent. I admit that quite a large percentage do leave the country. I believe that some come with

[Mr. McGibbon.]

United States addresses in their pockets and are just awaiting a chance to slip over the line. We try to meet that situation as best we can. The demand from Toronto, Winnipeg and other large cities for these girls is great. I think my hon. friend will find that the situation he complains of is worse in the smaller towns than in the big cities.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister is familiar with the difficulties in the Calgary hostel in connection with the women that came there. Would it be possible for the minister to indicate who selects these girls and what effort is made to secure the right type when they come to Canada? I think the minister through his official will understand what I mean without my going into details. Some of them have not been exactly the type that it is thought should be brought over. What supervision is exercised?

Mr. FORKE: The girls that are recruited in Great Britain are recruited mostly by our own women officials.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sorry to hear that, because I could not have thought it possible that some of these girls could have been recruited by any of our own people. I will speak to the minister personally about it, because certainly the situation is very undesirable, very.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. gentleman refers to immigration from the United Kingdom?

Mr. BENNETT: They came to the west from the United Kingdom. As a matter of fact some of them came from north of the Tweed.

Mr. FORKE: It is a very difficult situation.

Mr. BENNETT: I know.

Mr. FORKE: I have looked at it this way. Fathers and mothers will think twice before they let their girls go to a new country unless they know that they are going to a good home.

Mr. SPENCER: According to a return which I received, over 16,000 female domestic servants entered Canada in 1928. Would the minister tell the committee how many of these spoke the English or the French language, and how many spoke some other language?

Mr. FORKE: All I can give is the countries from which they came. I am afraid that

my hon. friend will have to guess the tongue they spoke. The figures are as follows:

Albanian	5
Arabian	1
Armenian	4
Austrian	50
Belgian	58
Bohemian	2
British—	
English	2,859
Irish	1,443
Scotch	2,664
Welsh	153
Bulgarian	9
Croatian	17
Czech	54
Dutch	85
Esthonian	26
Finnish	1,279
French	47
German	1,142
Greek	65
Hebrew	691
Italian	210
Japanese	6
Jugo-Slav	42
Lettish	18
Lithuanian	201
Magyar	212
Maltese	3
Moravian	3
Negro	67
Persian	2
Polish	745
Portuguese	2
Roumanian	20
Russian	95
Ruthenian	1,404
Scandinavian—	
Danish	266
Icelandic	5
Norwegian	327
Swedish	289
Serbian	14
Slovak	144
Spanish	1
Swiss	56
Syrian	11
Turkish	1
Total	14,798

Mr. SPENCER: Do I understand that Japanese are encouraged to come in as domestic servants?

Mr. FORKE: There is a gentleman's agreement between the British government, the Canadian government, and Japan under which a very small quota comes in every year.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the quota?

Mr. FORKE: I do not know that I am at liberty to disclose that. I think the Prime Minister mentioned the agreement in the house, and perhaps gave the number. It is only a small number.

Mr. SPENCER: If it is a gentleman's agreement, an international agreement, surely the members of this house are privileged to know how many are allowed to come in.

Mr. FORKE: I did not say that it was an international agreement, but a gentleman's agreement.

Mr. SPENCER: Surely the 245 members of this house are entitled to have that information.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): May I point out to the minister that the list which he has read does not purport to give domestic servants only? Many of those who came out came to get married or to meet their relatives, so this is not a list of domestic servants. It says underneath the table:

The foreign women listed in table above were destined either to husbands, relatives, or to be placed in domestic work.

Mr. FORKE: They were all brought out under the care of the Immigration department. It was a mistake, of course, to read them out as domestic servants. As stated at the bottom of the table, they were destined to husbands, relatives or to be placed in domestic work.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think there is a great deal in what the member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) said, that the government should make some permanent arrangement in regard to those who cannot speak the English language very well, and who perhaps after a certain time have terminated their agreement. With regard to this hostel that the Minister has spoken of, the arrangement there simply is that these girls are kept for twenty-four hours.

Mr. FORKE: I have mentioned the places where hostels are run under the auspices of different organizations.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The arrangements are only for the detention of those girls there for twenty-four hours, whereas a girl should be kept in some place until she has another place of employment to go to. I think the government could very well take up that line of work.

Mr. FORKE: When I visited that hostel there were, I would say, almost 200 girls there who were working in the city of Toronto, and who had come to the hostel when they arrived in Canada. They go there in the evening to pass a social hour. It is a home for domestic girls who have come from abroad.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What they do is to form an overseas club, which is a splendid idea. They have their own entertainment, but unfortunately, from what I know about them, they stay there about two years and

then go away, and it seems to me that we are just providing a splendid class of girls for the United States. I do not agree with what the minister said about these girls. I know something about the Scotch girls, and I say absolutely that his statement is untrue. The Scottish domestic who is brought out here is a splendid type of girl, and she can usually get any place she likes and can demand her own pay in the United States.

Mr. FORKE: I think the hon. member misunderstood what I said. I cast no aspersion against the character of any girl. If I did, I did not intend to.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I thought that was the gist of what the minister said, that you could not get a good type of girl to leave her home and come to do domestic work. I find it to be very opposite as far as Scotch girls are concerned.

Mr. ROBINSON: I would like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that on January 1, the international bridge between Detroit and Sandwich is likely to be opened, and provision should be made in the supplementary estimates to take care of the additional immigration officers who will be required for that post.

While I am on my feet, I may say that before I went overseas I had some correspondence with the minister in connection with the annoyances at the ferry docks at Windsor and Walkerville where we have practically adopted the United States system of inspection, which I do not approve of. I do not know what has been done in the meantime, but I have made inquiries since I arrived in Ottawa on Sunday, I received a telegram to-day from a thoroughly reliable source, which reads as follows:

> Undoubtedly a feeling exists here that there is too much immigration red tape at the ferry docks. Objections come from Canadians returning from Detroit.

What I am anxious to have is a statement from the minister placed on Hansard which will satisfy my constituents in regard to the situation there. If the minister was going back and forth between Windsor and Detroit every day he would be stopped every time and asked where he lived. He might live in Timbuctoo, yet he could tell the officer that he lived in Walkerville or Windsor or Sandwich and go on. It is mere child's play, and I am sure the minister would think the same thing if he watched the proceedings at the ferry dock. It is more annoying in the winter than in the summer. In the winter you usually get a cold northwest or northeast wind; I have timed myself and found that it took sometimes from five to fifteen minutes to get through in the rush hours. It all depends on how long the officer will question some of the people going through. For instance, I know some people who have lived in Windsor for years and years who have an English accent, and these officers will not take their word; they catechise them just as they would a school child. I am sure it is the desire of the department that harmonious conditions should prevail there, conditions that would satisfy the people living in the border cities. A Canadian, born in Canada, who has lived in Windsor nearly all his life, certainly objects to getting an identification card to return to his own country from his everyday work in Detroit. I know I would not do so, and I do not think we should call upon them to do it. I am anxious to assist in any way I can. When people have to remain on the dock in the winter time, with a cold wind blowing, they are liable to catch a heavy cold. I have received hundreds and hundreds of complaints, and I have tried to assure those who complain that the department will ultimately work it out to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Mr. FORKE: The extra help has been provided for the new bridge in the estimates this year. In regard to the examination crossing at Windsor, an officer has been sent down there several times to inspect and report and his report has always been favourable. I shall be glad, however, to look into the matter again, and to have things smoothed out as far as possible. My deputy informs me that everything is working very well at the present time. Is the telegram the hon. member referred to of recent date?

Mr. ROBINSON: It is dated to-day. I know it is from a thoroughly reliable source.

Mr. FORKE: I will see that a thorough investigation is made.

Mr. ROBINSON: I think one of the difficulties is due to the fact that the officers are so frequently changed. When a stranger is put on there he will stop everyone. Then others feel that if they let some go through whom they recognize as persons who live in Windsor or the border cities, complaint will be sent in against them that they are not doing their duty, and they tell me that in order to avoid that they have to question everybody whether they know them or not.

Mr. FORKE: I will have an examination and report made.

Mr. BENNETT: May I ask the minister a question with respect to the appointment of an official at Sutton, Quebec, under his

department? We have heard a great deal of Sutton recently in connection with the Post Office Department. I have received a communication with respect to an appointment in the immigration service at that place. Perhaps it is not possible for the minister to go into it now, because he is dealing with his estimates, but it may be that he will give us the information at a later date.

Mr. FORKE: The information will be given.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister, in giving the details of the item, mentioned $65,000 for deportation cases. How many cases of deportation occurred last year?

Mr. FORKE: For medical reasons, 519; public charges, 430; criminality, 426; other causes, 257; persons accompanying those deported—if for example, a husband and wife come out and the wife is deported, the husband goes back with her—254, or a total of 1,886 By nationality, these were 1,047 British; 297 American; other countries, 542. It is one of the most difficult and one of the saddest aspects of the work of the Minister of Immigration to be under the necessity of deporting people, for it touches his humanity as nothing else can.

Mr. SPENCER: It would seem from the figures the minister has given that by far the largest percentage of those who are deported come from the United States.

Mr. FORKE: No, the British figure is 1,047 and the United States 297.

Mr. SPENCER: But the proportion of people coming from Great Britain is greater than that from the United States.

Mr. FORKE: Yes, it is larger.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the fact that there are so many deportation cases to be explained by an inefficient inspection before the immigrants leave for this country?

Mr. FORKE: If an immigrant, after his arrival in Canada, commits a crime within a year, we send him back, and no examination on the other side could possibly have obviated that.

Mr. BENNETT: Over 400 are accounted for by criminality.

Mr. FORKE: Criminality and public charges comprise half the cases and you cannot very well anticipate those causes. If someone comes here and becomes a burden on the public there is noting to do but send him back where he would be better taken care of among his own people.

Mr. GARDINER: Did the minister say that the number of those becoming public charges was 519?

Mr. FORKE: No, 430.

Mr. GARDINER: Would they become public charges in the municipalities in which they reside?

Mr. FORKE: Yes; they would be unable to make a living and therefore nothing could be done with them. Someone has to look after them and so they are deported. Probably they are kept in the immigration buildings for a time until a sufficient number are ready for deportation. Of course those that are deported from the different ports generally go back by the next steamer.

Mr. GARDINER: I presume that those who are deported as public charges will probably have lived in Canada for some time.

Mr. FORKE: They may or may not.

Mr. SPENCER: You cannot deport after five years.

Mr. FORKE: We draw the line at five years; after an immigrant has been five years in the Dominion we do not think he should be deported.

Mr. SPENCER: Those deported for medical reasons numbered 519. Does this mean that the examiners on the other side fell down in their work?

Mr. FORKE: What we consider a really thorough medical examination on the other side began only last year.

Mr. SPENCER: But 519 came through.

Mr. GARDINER: How is the present system working in comparison with the old?

Mr. FORKE: I think it works better; it is much more rigid. The fact that a number of persons may be deported does not argue that the inspection is not efficient, because, as I have stated, the inspection is much more rigid than it was in former years.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the minister give some information regarding the training farms in the old country? What experience do immigrants get there?

Mr. FORKE: If you will let this item go through that question can be answered under the next vote with reference to empire settlement.

Mr. SPENCER: The minister informed us a little while ago that there was one man kept in Peace River. What is a man there for? What are his duties?

Mr. BENNETT: To keep the peace.

Mr. FORKE: That is in connection with repatriation work. We are giving $5,000 to the Salvation Army, $1,000 to the Anglican church, $1,000 to the Presbyterian, and $1,000 to the United church. Those are all the grants given. In connection with repatriation work in Quebec, in relation to French Canadians returning from the New England states and going to Peace River or northern Ontario as immigrants, we have two Catholic priests acting under the department, one in northern Ontario and one in Peace River. These repatriation fathers receive no salary but we have been allowing them $100 a month and expenses. I thought that was due to the Catholic community as their share of the grants that were being paid.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister give us details of the amounts paid to the various societies under the item for immigration purposes?

Mr. FORKE: I have mentioned them all.

Mr. GARDINER: You gave some of them. I should like to have the grants given to all organizations engaged in immigration work.

Mr. FORKE: I do not know of any other organizations getting money. I have given certain grants including those to workers in Peace River and northern Ontario. Then there is $5,000 to the Salvation Army, $1,000 to the United Church of Canada, $1,000 to the Anglican Church and $1,000 to the British Settlement Society of Toronto, which is the continuing Presbyterian Church. I do not know that I am greatly in favour of making grants to religious denominations in this way, but these people are doing splendid work in selecting and placing immigrants and I think the money is well spent.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not think the minister gave us the particulars of the grants to the provinces.

Mr. FORKE: I gave that information this afternoon; or does my hon. friend refer to the British boys?

Mr. CAMPBELL: The direct grants to the provinces.

Mr. FORKE: There are no direct grants to the provinces, unless my hon. friend means in connection with repatriation, and I went into that matter very carefully this afternoon.

[Mr. Spencer.]

Mr. SPENCER: Does the minister call upon these societies which obtain government grants for any report as to how the money is spent?

Mr. FORKE: Yes, they report exactly how many immigrants they bring in and where they place them, and our officials also check up their work. I must say that the church societies especially bring in a very good class of people.

Item agreed to.

Empire settlement scheme, including grants to immigration societies, provinces, women's hostels, etc., as may be authorized by the governor general in council, $1,000,000.

Mr. CAHILL: This appears to be quite an old item in the estimates, but I do not think it adds very much to Canadian immigration or benefits Canada in any way. I think the expenditure of $1,000,000 proposed here could be made to much better advantage on many other things in Canada, and I believe that the general opinion on this side of the house at least, and I believe throughout the country generally, is that assisted immigration is a mistake on the part of Canada. We have a good country here which naturally attracts people, and if we were to eliminate assistance to immigrants I think we would attract a more desirable class of people, increase our immigration and satisfy our own people to a greater extent than is the case with this assisted immigration.

I have discussed this matter on previous occasions, and while I do not expect many hon. members on this side of the house to support me, feeling perhaps that loyalty to their party is stronger than any other feeling at present, still I believe that if a free vote could be taken without any obligation to support the government or the minister in the matter, this item would be defeated by a very large majority. I have no criticism to make with regard to the present minister; I think perhaps he is doing as well as any minister could under the circumstances, but the time has arrived when Canada would be much better served by allowing healthy, energetic and enterprising young people to come here of their own accord instead of taxing the people of this country in order to assist what may be more or less undesirable class of people to come to Canada. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would go so far as to say that we might abolish the Department of Immigration altogether without any great hardship to Canada. I think if we must have our present quota of ministers, a minister of

mines would serve a much better purpose than a minister of immigration. Any restrictive measures necessary in connection with immigration could be undertaken by the Department of Justice and the medical inspection of immigrants could be looked after by the Department of Health. I believe if we entirely eliminated the Department of Immigration more people would seek entrance to Canada than is the case to-day. I would even say that where we have caused a certain amount of hardship or grievance by the appointment of medical officers in Europe we might well withdraw those appointments and leave everyone free to come to Canada on an equal basis subject to our willingness to admit them. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I desire to move in amendment:

That vote No. 56 be reduced by three-fourths of $999,999.

Mr. BOULANGER: I heartily support the amendment just moved, for reasons I have previously indicated and which I do not intend to repeat to-night. This afternoon we had consistency and logic preached to us, and if I desire to be consistent and logical I must support the amendment.

I should add that in supporting this amendment I do not impute any blame or criticism to the Minister of Immigration; we realize that he is an honest and capable man doing his level best with a bad job, but we do blame the policy, for which the minister is not responsible. He inherited that policy and he is trying to navigate as best he can with it, but in my humble judgment this policy is a misuse of the taxpayers' money. More than that it is useless, because we have been told that all the people whom we bring to Canada at such great cost do not stay here. For these reasons I desire to support the amendment.

Mr. POWER: While I am not perhaps prepared to go the length to which my hon. friend from Pontiac wishes to go, in this item is included grants to provinces. I am prepared to leave out those grants, but in order to show that I heartily approve of the principle enunciated by the hon. member for Pontiac, namely that this government should no longer vote money for the assistance of immigrants, I am prepared to vote for his amendment. I firmly believe that the vast majority of the people of this country no longer wish any of the taxpayers' money to be expended in inducing people to come to Canada. If they wish to come here we should allow them to do so, provided we surround their entry with certain medical and moral safeguards but to have an agency in Europe or in any part of the world to ask people to come here after describing to them in glowing terms the future they will have in this country I think is going altogether too far. I do not believe that ten per cent of the members of the house are prepared to get up and say that they desire more assisted immigrants in their own constituencies. I will say that we do not want any more in my constituency. The members rise in their seats and say that we must people the fertile plains of the west, but very few of them would be prepared to say that they have room in their own home towns or their own home cities for any more people from the other side.

Mr. GOTT: Bring back the Canadian boys.

Mr. FORKE: I would like to offer a word of explanation in regard to this vote. The total amount spent last year amounted to $634,699.70. The Dominion government pays the full amount of the passage and then later on the imperial government repays its share. When we strike the estimate we have to allow for a sufficient amount to cover the total cost of the passages, but that amount is reduced by what is repaid by the British government.

Mr. GARDINER: What are the items which go to make up that total?

Mr. FORKE: That figure of $634,699.70 was all that was taken out of the $1,000,000 vote of last year. A balance of $365,300.30 was never withdrawn from the Dominion treasury. The same thing will probably happen next year, and to a larger extent. That amount was made up in the following manner:

Salaries..	$ 22,399
Administration and general expenses..	42,738
Canadian share of passage grant.. ..	532,228

As far as Canada was concerned, the total cost of the assisted passages amounted to $532,228, which is a long way from the $1,000,000 which many members seem to think we are paying for these passage grants. A grant of $20,640 was made to hostels and societies, and our share of the passage loans, which are recoverable, amounted to $16,693.17. That reduces the total expenditure for last year which will not be returned, to $618,592. I think a very careful analysis of the whole Immigration department activities by an expert accountant would be a very good thing, and if it is my luck to present the estimates another year I intend to have that done so that I will be able to show the house that the amount spent on immigration is very much smaller than the estimates would appear to indicate.

I would like to point out to the house what the imperial government is contributing to-

wards that amount. The figures I am giving include the whole period during which the Empire Settlement Act has been in force, the last six years. As Minister of Immigration I had no connection with the bringing in of that act. It has been in force for six years and will run out at the end of the present year. That would be the proper time to take such steps as are being taken here to-night. We have an agreement with the British government which we cannot repudiate and I do not think the hon. member who has moved the amendment realizes that fact.

Mr. GARDINER: When does that agreement expire?

Mr. FORKE: The last day of the present year.

Mr. GARDINER: The fiscal or the calendar year?

Mr. FORKE: It will be the calendar year. That would be the proper time to take such steps as are being taken at the present moment. This government has entered into a bargain with the imperial government which it is in honour bound obliged to carry out. The British government has paid, under this Empire Settlement Act, $4,105,977.43 in loans and passage grants. That expenditure was made in connection with the three thousand family scheme. That passage money will never be repaid, except the small amount which has been loaned, but the land grants will be recoverable. In all the British government has paid out in cash $9,105,977, and of that amount $5,000,000 will be recoverable from those brought out under the three thousand family scheme. I would like the committee to pay attention to this, because it is very important.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. FORKE: The Dominion government has paid out in passage grants during the six-year period the amount of $1,814,891.40. That is a much smaller amount than the $1,000,000 per year which some members seem to think this country is paying out.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Would not the minister classify the grant to the provinces as assisted immigration, just the same as this item?

Mr. FORKE: They are not the same.

Mr. CAMPBELL: You do not consider that grant as assisted immigration at all?

Mr. FORKE: You mean the $10 we pay for every boy which the province brings out?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I think the minister has missed my point.

[Mr. Forke.]

Mr. FORKE: You mean the $50,000 we are paying?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes.

Mr. FORKE: I think that is a different thing altogether; that is entirely a Canadian arrangement and the British government does not come into it at all. We can step out or continue that arrangement just as we see fit. It is an agreement which we have made, open to every province in the Dominion, that the Dominion government will pay 50 per cent of the cost of the repatriation work carried on by the respective provinces.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not object to the amount at all, but I am saying that if there are objections to this $1,000,000 vote, then the same objections would apply to the $50,000, and my hon. friends raised no objection to that.

Mr. GARDINER: Is that $5,000,000 spent by the imperial government expended by the land settlement board?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Is that expended for the purpose of acquiring land?

Mr. FORKE: No, it is for stock and implements. This is the $1,500 which is loaned under the three thousand family scheme, and it is recoverable.

Mr. GARDINER: The different amounts the minister gave totalled $18,000,000.

Mr. FORKE: No, $9,000,000.

Mr. GARDINER: That is for loans, passage money and so forth. The three items he gave, come to $18,000,000.

Mr. FORKE: No, there must be a mistake somewhere.

Mr. GARDINER: I am speaking now of the money spent by the imperial government.

Mr. FORKE: The imperial government has spent on loans and passage grants $4,105,977.43, and on loans, land grants, $5,000,000, making a total of $9,105,977.43.

Mr. GARDINER: I understood the minister gave an item of $9,000,000 for cash advances.

Mr. FORKE: No, that is the total amount.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the minister give any information as to the total value of land used by his department for the purpose of settling British settlers under the British land settlement scheme?

Mr. FORKE: I think we can get that better when the soldier settlement and land settlement estimates come up. These lands have all been revalued and sold to British settlers on twenty-five-year amortized annual payments.

Mr. GARDINER: It does not come under the empire settlement scheme at all?

Mr. FORKE: It is part of the empire settlement scheme. We provide the funds.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister has not the information until we come to the soldier settlement estimates?

Mr. FORKE: It would be more convenient to get it at that time. I will try to arrange to have it.

Mr. GOTT: Although I have no intention of supporting the amendment, yet I think possibly not the Minister of Immigration, because he may not be here another year, but the department should take heed and discontinue a great deal of the unnecessary expense it is incurring in the United States. In Boston, Columbus, Chicago, Detroit, Fargo, Great Falls, Harrisburg, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Manchester, Omaha, Saginaw, St. Paul, Spokane, Syracuse, San Francisco, Woonsocket—in all these places immigration offices are maintained. I doubt whether there is any business for a number of these immigration offices.

Mr. FORKE: I went over these item by item and mentioned all the business done at these offices. If hon. members are not in the house, it is pretty hard to have to go over them the second time.

Mr. GOTT: I notice the minister was not in touch with the situation at the border or at the Detroit office. I would suggest that the Detroit office be moved to Windsor, because that business could be taken care of at Windsor just as well as at Detroit.

Mr. FORKE: That has all been discussed with hon. members on my hon. friend's side of the house.

Mr. GOTT: If the minister is not more closely in touch with the other offices in the United States than he is with the Detroit office, he should not discuss any of them, I notice some huge expenditures in maintaining offices in the United States. In one there are four clerks and in most of them there are one or two clerks and an immigration agent drawing $3,120 a year. Stenographers are maintained; in several offices there is only one, indicating that there is very little work to be done, and I believe several of these offices could be closed without any loss to the Dominion. In view of the opinions that have been expressed to-night, the department should take heed and reduce these huge expenditures for maintaining offices in the United States.

Mr. FORKE: There is only one thing I want to say: I know the hon. member will be very sorry if I am not here next year as head of the Immigration department.

Mr. BENNETT: Then the hon. gentleman is going.

Mr. GARDINER: I should like the minister to give the committee some further information with regard to the $532,000 paid out for passage grants. How many people came in under this item?

Mr. FORKE: There is a little difference in the two numbers, owing to the conditions under which they came in. The Canadian statement is 89,321 and the imperial government's is 87,284, a difference of about 2,000. The difference arises in the way some passage grants are paid. Actually 89,321 people came in.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: There is just one question I should like to ask in connection with this vote and the amendment. I believe my views are pretty well known; at least, I endeavour to express them clearly. Am I correct in assuming that the larger part of this vote is already under commitment; that is, to fulfil commitments, either legal or moral, with the British government and other organizations, and that this money now is practically morally due; that is, that commitments have been entered into covering almost the full extent of the money, which commitments will not be discharged until the end of the present year?

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member is quite correct. The people are coming in now and getting their passage money at reduced rates under this agreement. I do not think we can do anything but leave the estimate as it is for the present year.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is what I think. A notice of motion as to a future year's policy might be quite in order, but I feel strongly on the question of the commitments we have entered into and I would hesitate very much before refusing to vote for money which we are almost bound in honour to pay, unless we are prepared to cancel the commitments we have made.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Can the minister give us the items in regard to assisted passages?

Mr. FORKE: We have an estimate of $1,000,000.

Mr. ADSHEAD: But that covers several schemes. How much is for assisted passages?

Mr. FORKE: That will depend largely on the movement.

Mr. ADSHEAD: How much was it last year?

Mr. FORKE: $634,000.

Mr. NEILL: I notice the empire settlement scheme has about run out. When will it finally cease?

Mr. FORKE: The end of the present year.

Mr. NEILL: This calendar year?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: How is the three thousand family scheme working out?

Mr. FORKE: That will be better answered under the land settlement estimates.

Mr. IRVINE: Would the minister be satisfied if the amendment were carried?

Mr. FORKE: I certainly would not.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the minister tell the committee just how much we are indebted to the British government? Personally I should like to support the amendment before the committee, but I wish to know the actual extent of our commitments, because we cannot break our pledge if we are committed.

Mr. FORKE: We have been carrying on since the month of January under the present year's estimates and we will carry on until the 31st December of this year. The amount will depend entirely upon the number of immigrants who come out under the assisted passage scheme.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the minister been approached as to any extension of this agreement?

Mr. FORKE: I do not think so.

Mr. GARDINER: Is there any possibility of the minister entering into another such agreement?

Mr. FORKE: I am not going to promise ahead. I have listened to what has been said in the committee to-night, but I am not going to make any promise.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister consult the house before making a further agreement?

[Mr. Speakman.]

Mr. FORKE: If the house was in session I would certainly consult it, but I might be called upon to take the responsibility when the house was not in session. It would be a matter for the government, not the minister, to decide. The minister, of course, has power to enter into an agreement, but from what I have learned and from what I have heard in the house to-night I would not be prepared to enter into any agreement with the British government unless it was an arrangement made with the Canadian government as such.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister has evidently heard the opinions that have been expressed here to-night. Before voting on this item I would like some definite information from him. Will he promise to consult the House of Commons before entering into an agreement similar to the one he now has?

Mr. FORKE: If the house is in session it can be done at the time. The hon. member knows my private opinion about this, and I do not think I should be called upon to make a statement as to what I am likely to do twelve months hence. I think the hon. gentleman should be content with that answer. He is asking me to commit myself when I do not know what the circumstances will be in the future.

Mr. SPENCER: When was this arrangement entered into?

Mr. FORKE: In 1923.

Mr. SPENCER: The reason I ask is this: If the minister intends to make a new arrangement, is he going to make it for one year or for six years, in view of the feeling of the house on this matter?

Mr. FORKE: I do not think it is fair for hon. gentlemen to seek to commit me as to what I shall do twelve months hence. I am responsible for what is taking place at the present time, and I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I attempted to say now what I shall do twelve months hence. I do not know what the circumstances will be then.

Mr. GARDINER: Would it be asking too much to ask the minister to consult this house before entering into another agreement?

Mr. FORKE: I believe in parliamentary government wherever possible.

Mr. NEILL: I find myself in a good deal of accord with the remarks of the two hon. gentlemen directly opposite. Apparently this is about the first time that some of the more remote members of the house have had a chance to express themselves on this immigra-

tion policy, and it is easy to see from the remarks that have been made that hon. gentlemen do not stand for a largely assisted immigration policy. I do not want to embarrass the government if they have made commitments that we must in good faith keep, but I entirely agree with the leader of the Progressive party that we are entitled to some statement, if we vote this money, as to whether we will be consulted before a similar policy is inaugurated in the future. The minister says that we must in good faith pass this estimate, but he can make the same remark next year or the year after. What I would suggest—I do not want to be put in the position of bartering with the government at all—would be that, if we pass this vote to relieve the government of the unpleasant position of having made commitments and not being able to fulfill them, which we do not want to see, he will very seriously consider the feeling that has been exhibited here to-night and will consult this house before he goes into any extensive system of assisted immigration in the future. Speaking for my district, I have consistently opposed it and I know that that is the feeling of the people I represent. I came out in the steerage myself, unassisted, and nobody hand-fed or pap-fed me when I got here, I am quite willing that other people should have similar opportunities.

Amendment (Mr. Cahill) negatived.

Item agreed to.

Chinese immigration—salaries and contingencies, $70,000.

Mr. BARBER: I suggest that this item stand because there are several members who wish to discuss it.

Item stands.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We should like to take up a railway item.

Mr. BENNETT: You can only take supply for a department with respect to which the motion to leave the chair was made.

Mr. LAPOINTE: On Thursday and Friday—

Mr. BENNETT: Thursday and Friday, automatically.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But to-day we can take any department.

Mr. BENNETT: No, not any department. You cannot go into supply for any department without a motion previously made.

Mr. DUNNING: The motion is general, and the estimates of any department can be taken up.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think so.

RAILWAYS

The CHAIRMAN: Vote No. 93, page 28 of the estimates:

Canadian Government Railways: to provide for additional car ferry and facilities for car ferry service between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, $3,500,000.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, May 29, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Second report of the joint committee of both houses on the printing of parliament. —Mr. Girouard.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): In order that the railway committee may be able to meet to-morrow, it will be necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to ask the unanimous consent of the house to move:

That the select standing on railways,, canals and telegraph lines be permitted to sit while the house is sitting.

The motion is seconded by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr.Neill).

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: May I ask the hon. gentleman how many bills are yet to be considered?

Mr. CAHILL: There are two bills; one, I understand, is to asist in legislation of the New Brunswick legislature and the other is known as the Jacobs bill, having reference to return tickets.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, AMENDMENT

Hon. LUCIEN CANNON (Solicitor General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 313, to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Explain.

Mr. CANNON: I intended giving a full explanation of the bill on the second reading. On the first reading—

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried. Mr. Cannon moves that said bill be read the first time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall said bill be read the second time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The objection is well taken. Next sitting.

PRIVATE BILL

SENATE BILL—FIRST READING

Bill No. 281, respecting The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada.—Mr. Smith (Stormont).

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TRANSFER OF PENITENTIARY INMATES

Miss MACPHAIL:

1. How many inmates were transferred from Portsmouth to Stony Mountain penitentiary in 1928?
2. How long were the inmates kept at Stony Mountain?
3. Why was the transfer made?
4. How many inmates were transferred from Portsmouth to Prince Albert penitentiary in 1928?
5. How long were the inmates kept at Prince Albert?
6. Why were they transferred to Prince Albert?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. 1 from Kingston penitentiary to Stony Mountain penitentiary.
2. This inmate is still in Manitoba penitentiary.
3. For disciplinary reasons.
4. None.
5. Answered by No. 4.
6. Answered by No. 4.

DOCTOR A. G. FRASER

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. Has Dr. A. G. Fraser been appointed as dentist at Westminster hospital, London?
2. If so, is it a part time or full time appointment?
3. What salary and allowance is he being paid?
4. Who was his predecessor?
5. Was his predecessor dismissed? If so, why?
6. Was his predecessor's appointment part time or full time?
7. What salary and allowance was he paid?
8. Has Dr. Fraser been employed in the income taxation office in London?
9. If so, during what time and at what salary?
10. Has Dr. Fraser been employed in the weights and measures department at London?
11. If so, during what time and at what salary?
12. In what other government offices, if any, has Dr. Fraser been employed?
13. Who recommended his employment as dental officer at Westminster hospital?
14. Is Dr. Fraser a relative of the present Minister of Public Works?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Yes.
2. Full time.
3. $2,400.
4. Dr. K. Berry.
5. Retired, as duties require full time man.
6. Part time.
7. $2,400.
8. No record of employment at any time with any branch of the income tax division.
9. Answered by No. 8.
10. Yes.
11. Temporary appointment as inspector of weights and measures from August 2, 1927, to January 23, 1928, at a salary of $1,500 per annum. From September 1, to November 30, 1927, Dr. Fraser was paid by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment, and he was given vocational training in the weights and measures inspection office in London.

On January 24, 1928, after the above training, and examination by the Civil Service Commission, he received a permanent appointment as inspector of weights and measures at $1,500 per annum. On April 1, 1929, his salary was increased to $1,560, and he continued to occupy this position at that rate of salary until May 14, 1929, when he resigned.

12. No other department.
13. Dr. Fraser first made application in June, 1920. He was informed that as soon as an opening presented itself the Department would avail itself of his services.
14. No.

TRUSTEES IN BANKRUPTCY, ONTARIO

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. Who are the authorized trustees in bankruptcy for the province of Ontario?
2. Is there any supervision over them for the protection of bankrupts and creditors?
3. If so, what is the process?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The creditors at their first meeting may choose any person, except the official receiver, as authorized trustee.
2. Yes.

3. The trustee is subject to the supervision of the court and is required to deposit with the court a bond of an approved guarantee company in connection with each estate, satisfactory to the court, conditioned for the proper administration of the estate.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

BRUNNER MOND WHARF

Mr. GOTT:

For a copy of all correspondence, requests, telegrams, recommendations or other documents relating to dredging operations at the Brunner Mond wharf, Essex county, Ontario.

REAR BIG POND POST OFFICE

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton):

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to the closing of Rear Big Pond post office.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 312, to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill was framed for the purpose of obviating a difficulty which might arise upon the retirement of Mr. Justice Mignault which is to take place on September 30 next, under the provisions of an act which was passed by this house a few sessions ago, making retirement compulsory at the age of 75 years. I wish simply to express my personal opinion that despite the general grounds presented to the house when the act for compulsory retirement was passed, probably no man on the supreme court bench of Canada is better qualified, physically and intellectually, to perform the functions of his office than is Mr. Justice Mignault. Personally, I think it is a public misfortune that his compulsory retirement is necessary at this time, and I desire to give expression to a view which I have heard expressed in the province of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives, to this effect: In case a judge has been appointed for life it is a serious breach of contract when that judge is compelled to retire at an age and at a time when he is thoroughly equipped, physically and intellectually, for the performance of his judicial duties, and especially in view of the fact that his compulsory retirement necessitates his taking a pension which is very considerably less than the salary which would otherwise be paid to him under his contract with the state. I am simply giving expression to a view which I think is generally prevalent among the legal fraternity in my province, that in Mr. Justice Mignault's case there should be some exceptional consideration given by the government to the fact that he is retired by an act of parliament which is in apparent breach of his contract with the state, and he is thereby compelled to accept a pension which is much less than he would otherwise have received, and at a time when he is physically and intellectually competent to perform his judicial duties.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of course, this bill is general in its character and does not apply to any special case. With regard to the act passed two years ago, parliament in its wisdom thought it well to fix an age limit so far as federal courts were concerned. If the hon. member was aware of the representations which are coming to the Department of Justice at the present time concerning the other courts in Canada, perhaps he would admit that the provision is a sound one. However, I fully concur in the tribute which he has paid to the particular gentleman he has referred to.

This bill covers not only the case of a judge who has retired after having reached the age of 75, but of a judge who has resigned. Section 27 of the act reads:

> Any judge who has heard the case and is absent at the delivery of judgment, may hand his opinion in writing to any judge present at the delivery of judgment, to be read or announced in open court, and then to be left with the registrar or reporter of the court.

The purpose of this bill is to allow a judge who has resigned his office, or who has been retired after having reached the age of 75, to be considered absent, within the meaning of this section, for a period of six months, so that he can give his opinion to any judge who may be present when the judgment is delivered.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I propose to call attention to one point made by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan), and direct the attention of the house to the fact that when the legislation was passed which compelled the retirement of a judge of the supreme court at the age of 75, the Minister of Justice was good enough to say that he would consider the matter before the event happened which would necessitate the retirement of the judge in question, especially as it affected his compensation. That judge undoubtedly has a contract with the state which entitles him to receive a salary for life or until such time as he resigns. New legislation has been enacted which limits

his employment by the state merely because he has attained a given age without regard given to any consideration which he may urge. I think the government would be well advised to consider whether or not, in all cases of this kind where a contract has thus been amended, the judge should receive full salary. There are half a dozen cases which will be affected because I think there have been only two appointments made since the legislation in question was enacted. Undoubtedly one of the terms of these contracts governing new appointments is that they are subject to retirement at the age of 75 with the consequent pension which they will draw by reason of the services rendered up to the time of retirement. It may seem rather strange that attention should be directed to the matter in this way, but when a servant of the state, whether judicial or otherwise, has a contract with the state and we impose a new term in that contract, I think we must have regard to the terms and conditions under which the original contract was made. Although it may seem out of the ordinary that a judge should draw full salary when he is retired compulsorily, nevertheless, good faith and good morals, in my judgment, impose upon us that obligation and it is an obligation which we should not lightly disregard. I pointed that fact out to the minister when the other bill was under consideration, and when he speaks of parliament in its wisdom adopting that bill it must always be remembered that the wisdom of parliament consists of the majority of parliament. I do not believe that the Canadian people would approve of our departing from the general principle that the government must as in times past have respect for the sanctity of a contract made between a servant and the crown when he entered the employment of the state.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka-Ontario): I had a resolution upon the order paper two years ago compelling the retirement of all judges, but the Minister of Justice rather forestalled me, and promised at that time that he would take the matter up with the provinces. I would like to ask the minister if he ever did that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If I am allowed to answer my hon. friend, I may say that the matter was called to the attention of the interprovincial federal conference last year. Though several of the provincial representatives were in favour of some such change as that suggested by my friend some of the provinces were not ready to acquiesce in the demand, and of course, we cannot do anything as far as the high courts of the provinces are concerned without changing the British North America Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Chinese immigration—salaries and contingencies, $70,000.

Mr. BENNETT: I was going to ask my hon. friend for a statement on one matter. It will be observed that in the reports issued from time to time by the department certain newcomers are within what is known as the "preferred class," and others marked as "other countries." I can find nothing in the statute that warrants this distinction being made, and I gathered from what the minister said the other day that it was an arbitrary division. I am quite certain that there are settlers of a type within the class coming from other countries who have quite as much claim to be within the preferred class as those that are there now, and if the minister will give us some explanation to be placed upon Hansard it will help to answer many questions that are received, and at the same time, I think, settle a problem of some difficulty in the minds of many people.

Hon. ROBERT FORKE (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): There has been made a rather arbitrary division of countries on the continent of Europe from which immigrants may come. I will mention the first class of countries in Europe. The regulations governing the entry to Canada of European immigrants may be summarized as follows:

Northern European countries: France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Germany.

Immigrants from the above countries are eligible for entry to Canada provided that they

(a) are in possession of valid passports;
(b) can pass medical inspection; and
(c) can maintain themselves until employment is secured.

That deals with countries of northern Europe. Then the other European countries covered by the railway agreement are as fol-

lows:—Austria, Hungary, Poland, Roumania, Lithuania, Esthonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Jugo-Slavia, Czechoslovakia. The only immigrants who are admitted from the countries covered by the railway agreement are:

(a) Farmers;
(b) Farm labourers who have a reasonable assurance of employment on the land;
(c) Houseworkers;
(d) The wife or child under 18 years of age of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents.
(e) Persons who satisfy the minister that their labour or service is required in Canada.

I do not know whether I should attempt to read the railway agreement or not. It is quite a lengthy document. Perhaps I can summarize it in a few words.

Mr. BENNETT: That is satisfactory to me.

An hon. MEMBER: Are you putting it on Hansard?

Mr. FORKE: I can put it on Hansard.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Was that agreement authorized by regulation of the department, or by order in council?

Mr. FORKE: By regulation of the department; it is an agreement between the Department of Immigration and the railway companies.

Mr. BENNETT: Approved by order in council, I think.

Mr. FORKE: Probably it was. I think it was entered into in 1922. It was during the time that Mr. Robb was the Minister of Immigration. It was felt some move should be made to stimulate immigration, and this agreement was entered into between the Department of Immigration and the railway companies with that end in view. The purpose of the agreement was to encourage the movement of agriculturists, agricultural workers and domestic servants. They were to be healthy people of the labouring class, fit to care for themselves when they came to this country.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Who determined the countries that were to be preferred or non-preferred?

Mr. FORKE: The Department of Immigration.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And was that approved by order in council?

Mr. FORKE: I think it was. Of course, that was in 1922.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the minister be sure on that point, and let us have a copy of the order in council?

Mr. FORKE: The whole agreement is here. I will put it on Hansard if necessary. I do not desire to waste the time of the house.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am not wasting the time of the house.

Mr. FORKE: That was carried on quite successfully until—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is simply impossible to hear at this end of the house.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is so much conversation going on in the house that it is almost impossible to hear the minister at this distance.

Mr. FORKE: This was carried on quite satisfactorily until the spring of 1927, when perhaps the transportation companies got a little too enthusiastic and recruited a very large number of immigrants. It was a late spring. The snow lay long on the ground in western Canada, and there were quite a large number of immigrants arriving in Canada for whom there were no work for several months. I was absent in Europe at the time, but the cabinet issued an order stopping immigration for the time being. There was no complaint from the railway companies. Some hardship was experienced, however, by the people in Europe who had been recruited and were ready to sail when that order was issued. It was, however, better for them to stay in their own country than to come over to Canada and wait here for weeks until employment could be found for them.

After that I had a meeting with the colonization departments of the railway companies and discussed the whole situation. I had inserted in the railway agreement a clause to which they were quite agreeable to subscribe, providing that at any time should the Minister of Immigration think sufficient numbers were arriving in Canada, he could, after giving notice, ask the railway companies to stop bringing in immigrants. As most of the members are aware, we had a meeting, I think last fall or in any case, during the winter, to discuss the whole immigration problem. After discussing the matter with the colonization departments of the railways, I came to the conclusion that if they were to bring out the same number of farm labourers they brought out the previous year, we would have a surplus. They asked me at that time the percentage I would like to have

come, and stated they would be quite satisfied. After investigation and after consulting with the provincial governments, I came to the conclusion that about 30 per cent of the number of single farm labourers who came from Europe last year would be sufficient to meet the needs of the country this year. Later on, there came from the transportation companies some protests, but they were not serious. The two presidents signed a letter which was published in the newspapers, condemning my action.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister thinks that was not very serious?

Mr. FORKE: I think subsequent events have provided that I was in the right, and I did not feel very much hurt about what the presidents did, nor do I think they felt badly about what I did. No harm was done to anybody in regard to that.

There was no thought in the mind of the department that one country was preferred before another, but the railway companies were not recruiting in northern Europe. Anyone coming from the first list of countries I have mentioned in northern Europe, came upon their own; no recruiting was being done there, and in this respect the so-called non-preferred countries were perhaps in a superior position because recruiting was really being carried on in them for immigrants. I think I have made that plain. I will repeat: I have no idea of inferior or superior people. The people from Austria or Czechoslovakia are just as good as any others, and it was not with any idea of inferiority or superiority that these regulations were framed.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Has the minister ever considered landing by ship on the Pacific coast immigrants who intend to live in British Columbia, instead of, as is done at present, landing them at Atlantic ports and taking them by rail across the continent? I am told that there are running from northern Europe lines of ships which would be prepared to go in for this class of business. These ships would be of the tramp class, freighters, but provision could be made for carrying passengers as the ships usually come out fairly light. Then the ships would be available for transporting our products from the Pacific coast back to the old country. I am informed that proposals of that kind have been made to boards of trade, and so on. I do not know whether the matter has ever been put before the minister or not, but I would suggest to him that it is worthy of consideration. I am speaking about immigrants who intend to go to British Columbia and the western part of Canada who might more easily approach their destination via the Pacific than via the Atlantic.

Mr. FORKE: The transportation of immigrants from the continent of Europe is entirely in the hands of the two transportation companies who recruit those immigrants from those countries I have mentioned, commonly called the non-preferred countries. The Department of Immigration takes no part whatever in regard to ocean passages or railway rates. I have never thought of the matter in the way in which the hon. member presents it. I do not know whether it would come under the jurisdiction of the department to say how immigrants should come. I will, however, keep the matter in mind.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I was referring to what might be called the preferred class, although I do not know exactly the definition of that class. I was referring to the people of northern Europe. It seems to me that the department should be interested in a matter of that kind. If it is possible to arrange a cheaper and more convenient passage for people who come to this country, the minister should be interested; he should not leave it entirely to the transportation companies. There is too much of the transportation companies running the immigration to this country. I should like to see the department taking an intelligent interest in the matter and certainly the proposition that I have put forward should come within the scope of the department. The minister can sit back and say: I do not know anything about it; that is not a matter for me; it is a matter for the transportation companies. But that is not good enough, and I would suggest to him that he should really look into the matter.

Mr. FORKE: I shall be glad to look into it, but when an immigrant is leaving the old country or northern Europe, he buys his own ticket and arranges for his own transportation. I am quite willing to answer any questions. I do not want to be discourteous and I promised the leader of the opposition yesterday I would give him the information I have given, but I would remind the house that we are dealing with the estimates for Chinese immigration. I do not want to be discourteous in connection with any question that is asked.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister a moment ago referred to the fact that he had reduced the number of farm employees or people that

were going into farming to 30 per cent. In respect to the agreement with the transportation companies, is there anything reduced to writing? Is there anything in it beyond what the minister has stated?

Mr. FORKE: We have it in letters exchanged between the presidents of the two railway companies and myself whereby an agreement was reached.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Has that been reduced to an agreement, or is it merely an understanding?

Mr. FORKE: I think the president of either of the railways has confidence in the minister.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not care about the presidents; I am speaking now as a member of parliament, and I want to know something about this agreement.

Mr. FORKE: The presidents of the railways have my letter stating my terms, and I have their letters stating theirs. That is in addition to the original agreement, which is signed by the heads of the colonization departments of the two railways.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister tells the committee that he practically washes his hands of a certain affair. The minister says: Why, the transportation companies have everything to do with this.

Mr. FORKE: I did not say so.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Well, Hansard will show what the minister said.

Mr. FORKE: Well, we shall see.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister said in effect that he had nothing to do with the matter; that it was being looked after by the transportation companies, and that the people bought their tickets and came to this country on their own.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On this question of trusting so much to the railways—

Mr. FORKE: I want to appeal to the committee. I have had about two days of this discussion and have got the estimates passed. We are now dealing with Chinese immigration. If the committee wants to discuss the other estimates all over again, that is all right.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister is to blame for this. He brought the matter up.

Mr. FORKE: I did so in response to a question asked by the leader of the opposition yesterday. As a matter of courtesy I was quite willing and ready to give him the information.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Surely the understanding was that we would be able to discuss the matter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I want to refer to one matter, if I may, now that the discussion has gone this far. I want to quote a paragraph from the Free Press of January 11, 1929:

> The defect in the arrangement arose from the fact that a double interest entered into the activities of the railways. There was the permanent interest of Canada, which was general and remote; and there was the immediate and special interest of getting third-class passengers for the ships that were owned or controlled by the railways. There was thus an obvious incentive to employ up-to-date methods of salesmanship with the eye concentrated pretty much upon the early payment of passage money. This was supposed to be guarded against by regulations, which put upon the railways the obligation of placing these immigrants and looking after them for a period of time. There is a good deal of evidence available that, although things have been better the last year, the railways put an interpretation upon these obligations which did not interefere to any serious extent with the business of selling tickets. To drop an immigrant down in a district where there was a reasonable presumption that his services would be in demand, or to place him in employment, temporary in character, were regarded as filling, roughly, the requirements of the agreement.

I would say that the railways have not only a very immediate interest, twofold in character, that of generally extending the welfare of Canada and, incidentally, of increasing their own dividends and secondly, of being able to sell tickets, but they have a third interest, and that is that very often the railways have used the immigration agencies to supply them with cheap labour for their own construction work. It does seem to me that corporations which are thus so vitally interested ought not to be allowed any special consideration.

The minister speaks of recruiting immigrants. That is the very thing to which many of us object—recruiting immigrants, bringing them in here for certain purposes.

Mr. FORKE: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I should not have to go over all my estimates again. This vote has been passed, but if the committee consents I am willing to hear the hon. gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN: Strictly speaking, the hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I suggested that as the discussion had gone so far there was a point that I wished to add, but if the minister refuses to permit me—

Mr. FORKE: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member was not in his place when this matter was being discussed, and why should I have to go over the whole thing again because he happens to come in this morning?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I was in my place when the matter was being discussed. The question was raised, and I wanted to emphasize one particular point in connection with it, but if the minister declines to permit this, I shall have to take another opportunity.

Mr. FORKE: It is for the committee to decide.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister promised me some information. I do not suppose that we are precluded from discussion simply because the item has been passed.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I wanted to point out that we talk about recruiting immigrants, and it does seem to me that we are often oblivious to the welfare of the people who are already here. I would like to see some greater coordination between the Department of Labour and the Department of Immigration. In fact, so far as I am concerned, it seems to me that if we need immigrants the Department of Immigration should be made part of the Department of Labour so that we would bring in men only as they are actually needed, and only in so far as their coming will not interfere with the welfare of the people already here.

The minister says that he does not discriminate against any particular class, but that he encouraged immigration from northern Europe. I would suggest that whether they come from southeastern Europe or northern Europe, or from England itself, very often their coming here decidedly interferes with the welfare of the people who are already resident in Canada.

I want to trespass on the patience of the house to read a paragraph or so from a letter that I received a little while ago from a labour man which is typical of scores of letters that I have received in the past.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman wants to speak for another forty minutes on an item that has already been passed. He takes up a good deal of the time of the house as it is, and even asks his colleagues to appear for him in the house when he cannot appear himself. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you give your ruling on the point of order now.

Mr. MacLAREN: I wish to support the objection just taken by my hon. friend opposite. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said that he wanted to ask a question, and then—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, I said nothing about asking a question.

Mr. MacLAREN: He now proposes to read letters. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that he is entirely out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I ruled a few moments ago that the remarks of the hon. gentleman did not pertain to the item now before the committee. The item my hon. friend is discussing was passed yesterday, and his remarks are not relevant to the item now under discussion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I understood that the minister gave permission. I ask the minister if he will permit me to go on.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out that the committee has to be considered, not the minister alone. If the committee decides to hear the hon. gentleman, very well.

Mr. McGIBBON: Can the minister now give me the information that he promised yesterday?

Mr. FORKE: I have the address of the Toronto hostel here.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister promised to give me the objections that had come from provincial governments and different societies against the admission of Barnardo children.

Mr. FORKE: That information is being prepared, and I will see that my hon. friend gets it as soon as it is ready.

Mr. McGIBBON: I say again, Mr. Chairman, that it is discourteous to this house for the minister to come here and not know the ABC of his department. We have to wait days and days for information that he ought to be able to give offhand.

Mr. NEILL: I should like to ask why this vote that we are supposed to be discussing, and relating to Chinese immigration, has been increased. The increase is $5,000 only, but the amount was pretty high to begin with, and it was increased last year also. I would point out that about five years ago we passed an act practically excluding all Chinese immi-

gration, and the only Chinese immigration allowed now is of transients, people who are coming here temporarily, such as nurses, missionaries and so forth. Very few of them come in and they can stay under their permit for only a few months. I do not suppose that on an average more than sixty or seventy enter in a year. Moreover, if my memory serves me, that immigration is limited to only two ports in Canada. Consequently the handling of this Chinese immigration is very simple, and one would suppose that the cost would not be much. Yet we find here a vote for $70,000 for Chinese immigration, or something like $1,000 for each temporary immigrant admitted. I would like to know the reason for the increase in this vote, and whether we should not rather be moving in the opposite direction and be decreasing the expenditure.

Mr. FORKE: Salary increases account for a part of the increase. I will read the different items, and the hon. gentleman can draw his own conclusions. This amount is required to provide for the salaries and expenses of the officers and employees engaged in connection with Chinese immigration and the administration of the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act. The salaries amount to $41,485. The other items are:

(2) Travelling expenses of officers doing Chinese investigation work and inspection of boats carrying Chinese crew; expenses of prosecution and deportation of Chinese other than those dealt with under the Opium and Narcotics Drug Act, printing and stationery; uniforms; telegrams; telephones, cablegrams, etc., $12,800.

(3) Hong Kong office contingencies, $4,200.

Living expenses of D. F. Warren, $2,000; office rent, $1,500; travelling expenses, $200; printing and stationery, $150; cables, postage, light, $250; miscellaneous office expenses, $100—total, $4,200.

(4) Expenses under the Opium and Narcotics Drug Act, including legal and deportation expenses, etc., $11,515.

Total Chinese immigration salaries and expenses, $70,000.

For fiscal year 1927-1928 the expenses were: Chinese immigration expenses proper, $50,781.54; Opium and Narcotics Drug Act expenses, $10,456.43—total $61,237.97.

The net expenses for the 8 months ended November 30, 1928, are:—

Chinese immigration salaries and contingencies, $38,923.76; Opium and Narcotics Drug Act, $7,710.07—total $46,633.83.

Estimated Chinese immigration expenditure for 1929-1930 based on the eight months of the fiscal year 1928-1929 ended November 30, 1928 —$69,950.

Mr. NEILL: May I interrupt the minister. That is as good an answer as I could receive; a lot of money is spent in enforcing the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act. This, of course, is a most worthy cause, but why mix it up with Chinese immigration?

Mr. FORKE: Because the immigration authorities automatically take charge of anyone convicted under that act. The moment he is convicted he comes under the control of the department and we may have to fight the case in court.

I have here a lengthy statement with regard to the operations of the Chinese Immigration Act and perhaps I had better read it. I think the hon. member for Fraser Valley—

Mr. FRASER: Cariboo.

Mr. FORKE: Cariboo, rather—wanted this information:

Section 5, subsection (c), of the Chinese Immigration Act provides for the landing in Canada of only two classes of immigrants of Chinese origin or descent, namely, merchants and students. Such immigrants must be in possession of valid passports issued by the government of China and endorsed by a Canadian immigration officer at the place where passport was granted or at the port of embarkation. Thus the law makes it necessary for this department to have a representative in China to investigate applications for these two classes and to grant or refuse the visa called for by the section in question.

Officials Employed at Hong Kong.

Name—Position—Salary—

Mr. D. F. Warren— Commissioner of Immigation for Canada.—$4,200 per annum, plus $2,000 living allowance.

Miss R. Judah—Stenographer—$3,120 Max. (About $1,560 Gold at present rate of exchange.)

Li Kam Hi—Messenger—$660 Max. per annum. (About $330. Gold.)

Duties of Hong Kong Official.

1. To investigate all applications for visas made in accordance with subsection (c) of section 5 of the Chinese Immigration Act.

In the case of merchants this necessitates investigation of the firm in China to which applicant belongs to establish if applicant has sufficient capital investment and is connected with class of business such as would warrant classifying him as merchant within meaning of the act. (Merchant means a person devoting his undivided attention to mercantile pursuits, who has $2,500 gold or more invested in a business dealing exclusively in goods grown, produced or manufactured in China, or in exporting to China goods grown, produced or manufactured in Canada, and who has conducted such business for a period of at least three years. Restaurant keepers, laundry owners, rooming-house proprietors are not considered merchants.)

In the cases of students, our officer investigates their educational status and financial standing in order to establish if qualified to enter a Canadian university and if sufficient

funds are forthcoming to permit studying in such university without working in Canada during period of study.

2. To check up vessels arriving from Canadian ports and identify Chinese deports for the purpose of establishing that they have really left Canada.

3. To examine Chinese persons returning to Canada under outward registration (sections 23 and 24) for the purpose of establishing that after registration persons actually left Canada, and, further, are returning within the two year period as limited by statute.

4. Passing on doubtful cases of other nationalities referred to the office by consular and other officials and by transportation companies.

Note.—Duties referred to in Nos. 2 and 3 are precautionary measures performed by our office owing to the fact that he is at Hong Kong, and are considered further safeguards in the general operation of the law.

Effect of having officer at Hong Kong.

1. Prevents all inadmissible cases coming forward to Canadian ports of entry with resultant costly investigations, examinations and attempts to secure landing by court proceedings.

2. Additional protection against fraud in returning registered Chinese.

3. Lessening of number of applications at Pacific Coast ports of other nationals not admissible under Immigration regulations.

Registration (Section 18 Chinese Immigration Act, 1923).

The law required every person of Chinese origin or descent in Canada to register within twelve months after June 30th, 1923, and further provided that persons who were absent from Canada during this period and who had the right to return under the law might be registered on their return.

Number of registrations to date total approximately—55,706. (1921 census 39,587 Chinese). Of this number 48,305 were males, 1,302 females and 6,099 children under 18 years of age, distributed as follows:—

British Columbia	31,116
Alberta	4,657
Saskatchewan	3,961
Manitoba	2,146
Ontario	9,377
Quebec	3,753
New Brunswick	270
Nova Scotia	404
Prince Edward Island	19
Not specified	3
	55,706

Result of Registration.

1. Establishing actual number of Chinese in Canada.

2. Establishing number illegally in Canada. So far 36 actual cases discovered where deportation effected; several other cases under investigation. Will probably be more when records completed.

3. The location of 624 Chinese who secured entry as merchants previous to amending of the old Chinese act in 1921 and who on investigation were found not to be of the merchant class. Head tax of $500.00 each was collected in these cases under authority of Section 27 of the Chinese Immigration Act; revenue in this connection $312,000.00.

[Mr. Forke.]

Revenue Collected under Chinese Immigration Act, during Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1929.

Fees collected for registrations under C.I.9A	$ 616 00
Fees collected for registrations under C.I.9	10,344 00
Fees for substitutional certificates	1,275 00
Visa fees collected at Hong Kong	60 00
Administrative fines (Sec. 19)	3,000 00
Administrative fines (Sec. 21)	5,000 00
Administrative fines (Sec. 31)	2,000 00
Taxes collected under Sec. 27	6,500 00
Bonds estreated	2,000 00
Total revenue	$30,795 00

Chinese Immigration to Canada—Fiscal Year 1928-29.

Immigrants admitted Under Section 5 (c) (1)	1
Non immigrants admitted. (Students coming to attend universities) Section 5 (c) (2)	3

Admission under Section 9 (Minister's Permit).

	Admitted	Checked out
Actors	29	11
Amahs	4	3
Consul, Eleve	1	..
Consul's servant	1	..
Dentist	1	..
Distiller	1	..
Editor	1	1
Farmer	1	1
Librarian	1	..
Merchant	1	..
Merchant's family	1	1
Minors	6	..
Missionaries	2	..
Professor	1	1
Professor's family	4	4
Students	4	4
Tourists	1	..
	60	26

The actors, amahs, servants to tourists and teachers were all admitted under either cash or guarantee companies' bonds of from $500.00 to $1,000.00 each.

Chinese Crews of British Empire Steel Corporation vessels.

At the present time there are 65 Chinese employed as members of the crews of vessels of the British Empire Steel Corporation under their $128,000.00 bond.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How long has this office been open at Hong Kong?

Mr. FORKE: Since 1923.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Since we have restricted immigration what is the sense of going to the expense of opening an office at Hong Kong? The minister intimated that the reason was to make it easier for us to prevent undesirables from entering this country, but if that is true why pick on Hong Kong? There are other cities such as Canton, Amoy and Shanghai which are just as large and from which just as many people come. This is just another case of extravagance.

Mr. FORKE: I think that is the only place from which they can sail.

Mr. CHAPLIN: You might as well cut it out altogether.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): May I ask how much money was spent for immigration in Nova Scotia during the last year?

Mr. FORKE: I will be glad to supply my hon. friend with that information. Those items were passed yesterday and I have left all my papers at the office. However, I will be glad to obtain that information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): I would remind the minister that Nova Scotia is a farming country, and we would be delighted to have a number of families located on the farms in the province, which farms can be purchased for less than the cost of the buildings. Has anyone been sent by the department to look into that situation and ascertain what could be done to place people on those farms?

Mr. FORKE: I am glad to inform the hon. member that the department has made a complete survey of the whole province, and the chances of settlement there are very good. We are now in negotiation with the Nova Scotia government with regard to a scheme similar to that in force in New Brunswick; negotiations are now in process and I think everything is moving favourably.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): I am glad to get that information. May I have a copy of the report?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: I would like to ask the minister a question in regard to Chinese immigration. The other day I made a few remarks in regard to the immigration question generally, and when I referred to this very situation the minister justified the expenditure for the Hong Kong office by virtue of the fact that he collected a certain amount in fees for visas. I understood the minister to say a moment ago that he collected only about $30 in fees of this kind. Am I correct?

Mr. FORKE: No, we collected $60, but if the hon. member will allow me to say so, I do not think that was the reason I gave. The act compels us to have an office there for that purpose.

Mr. FRASER: I understood the minister to say that only $30 was collected by way of visa fees in Hong Kong.

Mr. FORKE: No, we collected $60.

Mr. FRASER: That is the total of all the fees collected there?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: You collect other fees at the Hong Kong office, do you not?

Mr. FORKE: No, I do not think anything more is collected there.

Mr. FRASER: Then let me ask a general question. How much money does the Department of Immigration collect during the year? How much revenue do you turn in yearly?

Mr. FORKE: I just gave those figures not five minutes ago; $30,795.

Mr. FRASER: You have responsible officials who collect that revenue, and I would like to ask the minister if the government is protected with regard to the funds collected by these officials, by means of guarantee bonds. Are your officials bonded?

Mr. FORKE: My deputy informs me that they are all bonded.

Mr. FRASER: Under what system?

Mr. FORKE: The bonds of the guarantee companies; those are the only bonds we take.

Mr. FRASER: Do you know how much money you pay in a year for that purpose?

Mr. FORKE: I cannot say exactly, but my deputy informs me that it is a very small sum.

Mr. FRASER: Some time ago I put a question on the order paper in this connection, and I would like to read that question and answer as the basis for another question:

> How much of the consolidated revenue has been paid by each of the departments of the government as premiums on security bonds of its employees, in contravention of the Public Officers Act, R.S., chapter 164, section 5?

The answer from the Department of Immigration and Colonization is as follows:

> This department has paid $1,963.75 on account of guarantee bonds for its employees since the organization of the department on April 1, 1918.

What puzzles me is this: Under what authority do you pay for these bonds?

Mr. FORKE: I do not know whether there is anything in the act to prevent us from doing so if we wish. I cannot give the exact authority under which these payments are made but I do not think it is against any provision of the act.

Mr. FRASER: Very well. To continue, I will read from the Auditor General's report for the year ending March 31, 1928. At the bottom of page XIII I find the following:

Bonding of Government Officials

The Public Officers Act (R.S., chapter 164):

(1) Designates the classes of officials required to furnish security bonds (section 5);

(2) Authorize the governor general in council to direct that, in cases where the policy of a guarantee company is accepted, the amount of the premium be deducted from the salary of the official (section 29);

Is that the practice in your department? Do you deduct the premium from the salary of the official?

Mr. FORKE: No, I do not think so.

Mr. FRASER: The report continues:

(3) Authorizes the governor general in council to make regulations for the establishment and maintenance of a fund derived from contributions by the officers concerned (section 30).

Is there any such fund in your department?

Mr. FORKE: No, but I think I might answer all these questions by saying that I think we have authority under the Immigration Act to pay all expenses incurred in the administration of the act, so I do not think there is anything to prevent us from paying the premiums on these bonds if we wish to do so.

Mr. FRASER: I am a little puzzled as to the whole procedure. I want the minister to understand that my criticism is not specially directed to his department; I have the same criticism to offer in connection with perhaps a dozen of the departments, but I want to find out from the minister just what procedure has been adopted. As far as I am concerned I am very doubtful as to whether there is any statutory authority for these payments. At any rate, the report proceeds:

From the last two sections referred to, it seems a reasonable inference that the cost of the bonds should be borne by the officials and not by the government. With but a few exceptions, however, the premiums are paid from pubic moneys and, so far as I have been able to determine, only in the case of one branch of the service is any part of the premiums repaid by the officials. In the cases of two departments there is parliamentary authority for paying the premiums from public moneys, in some departments the payments have been authorized by the governor in council, but in a number of departments they appear to be made merely on departmental authority. Under the authority of the Post Office Act a guarantee fund, such as is contemplated by section 30 of the Public Officers Act, has been maintained in that department for a number of years and has accumulated to such an extent that no contributions by officials have been required since April 1, 1919.

[Mr. Forke.]

That system has been inaugurated in the Post Office Department and now that fund takes care of all the premiums. The last paragraph dealing with this matter is as follows:

On account of the lack of uniformity in the practice and in the application of the above provisions of the act, I would suggest that consideration be given to the advisability of an amendment which would dispel any doubts as to the interpretation of these sections by stating definitely whether these payments should be made from public moneys or should be borne by the bonded officials.

I would like to ask the minister what consideration he has given to that recommendation?

Mr. ROBB: Before my colleague answers I might just say, respecting the quotation read by the hon. gentleman as to the Post Office Department meeting these payments from a fund, that the Post Office Department does nothing of the kind; that fund is used at times by the Post Office Department to pay into the treasury the amount of any losses. My opinion is that it would be much better for the service if the fund were used to pay the premiums on guarantee bonds.

Mr. FRASER: I am very glad to hear that expression of opinion by the Minister of Finance. My object in calling the attention of the department to this matter was to see if some improvement could not be made, because as far as I can see there is no coordination between the different departments with regard to this matter. I understand, then, from the Minister of Finance that in his opinion guarantee bonds should be issued for all officials of the service. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBB: In my judgment, when officials of the service are guaranteed by a guarantee company we should pay the premium, and if officials occupy responsible positions they should be guaranteed by such companies. Then if they go wrong they will have to deal with the guarantee company and not with political friends who will lobby the minister and try to get them out of their difficulty.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why should they not pay their own premiums?

Mr. ROBB: I am not raising that issue at all.

Mr. FRASER: That is one of the issues. The Minister of Finance has given us certain information; perhaps he would tell us what is done in connection with his own officials.

Mr. ROBB: I am not sure; I know they are bonded by a guarantee company but I am not sure how the premiums are paid.

Mr. FRASER: I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that he secure that information before his estimates come up, because I will probably put the same questions to him.

Mr. ROBB: I anticipated that and I am preparing for it.

Mr. FRASER: Then let me read the second question which I placed on the order paper:

Does the government propose at the present session of parliament to amend chapter 164, section 5, of the revised statutes, as indicated by the Auditor General in his 1927-8 report, volume 1, on page XIV?

The reply from each department is the same, "No information." Now I would like to ask the minister whether he has given any consideration whatever to the recommendation of the Auditor General, and what he proposes to do.

Mr. FORKE: This has been a custom in the department for years, and I will admit that I have paid no particular attention to this recommendation. I still think that under section 80 of the Immigration Act we have authority to pay this money if we desire to do so. I may be wrong, but that is my opinion.

Mr. FRASER: Will the minister give me an answer to my question with regard to his statutory authority for making these payments? I will not press it now, but the minister might get me that information.

Mr. FORKE: Yes, I will be glad to get it.

Mr. FRASER: We might consider all the departments when the estimates of the Minister of Finance are up.

Mr. CHURCH: The province of British Columbia is not the only province which suffers from this Chinese immigration. To me the immigration policy of this government is a Chinese puzzle; as a matter of fact they have no immigration policy. We are only spending a little more than we did 30 years ago on this problem. In every city and town in Ontario the police commissions are having trouble with these people, who are taking the bread and butter out of the mouths of the women and girls of Ontario by doing domestic work. In Toronto the police commission have had trouble with the Chinese population all the time, particularly in connection with their restaurants. The minister talks about bonding them, but that does not mean a thing; a bond will not check them up. What about the middlemen, the people who bring them here? Where do they come in? Conditions in Vancouver are such as to create a veritable Asiatic peril and it is a wonder the people do not rebel against such economic conditions resulting from the activities of so many orientals. In this vote the government provides $60,000 for salaries and contingencies in connection with Chinese immigration, but look at the next item; only $4,000 is provided for the relief of poor, distressed Canadians driven out of their own country by the immigration policy of the government. If the minister is equally good as Minister of Immigration and as Minister of Emigration, he will be very successful because he, by reason of the government policy, has driven out of this country 700,000 of our own people to seek work in the United States.

At a meeting held at Kingston of the general synod of the Church of England in Canada, representing all dioceses in this country, a resolution was passed dealing with this particular matter and with the immigration policy generally, and urging British immigration now being discriminated against. This government spends $400,000,000 yearly to maintain this country but they can find only $3,500,000 to spend on one of the greatest problems we have to face. Last night some hon. gentlemen wanted to reduce one of these votes by a million dollars; some western members say we have enough immigration; they are free traders with regard to industry in the east but protectionists when agriculture and their own home affairs are concerned.

I wish to protest against this item of $60,000 for salaries and contingencies in connection with Chinese immigration. I venture to say that hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money is spent through the police departments of the country in checking up these people, and I know that in Toronto they take the bread and butter out of the mouths of our own poor women and girls. In the richer districts of Toronto, Hamilton and Winnipeg I have seen people engage Chinese to do their domestic work rather than pay a Canadian girl or woman a living wage. I say there should be a closed season for Chinese immigration for a period of five or ten years, or until such time as we may think it advisable to admit them again and give the British-born a chance.

Further, I desire to protest against the language used by one of the western members of this house in referring to a bishop of the Church of England. Let me say that Bishop Lloyd fought with the Queen's

Own at Cut Knife in 1885, and did a great deal to save that great western country for the British Empire. He is not here to defend himself and we do not know whether or not the words quoted really came from him. When the Anglican synod of Canada met at Kingston two years ago they protested against the present policy of discrimination against British born immigrants. It brings to my mind the description by the poet William Cowper, when referring to the great fire of 1666 in the city of London he deplored the undue proportion of Europeans in the population of England. He declared that London was over-run with Europeans, and had become the common sewer of Paris and of Rome and had sucked in the dregs of all corrupted states.

We do not want that in Canada. A solution should be sought by the government for this great problem, but we will never be able to solve it while we have a free trader as commissioner of immigration. The first cornerstone of an immigration policy is to keep the people we have now and to provide work—provide an economic trade policy that will give jobs to British born immigrants. The government does not do that.

Seven hundred thousand of our men have gone to the United States and the government only provides $4,000 for the relief of distressed Canadians outside of Canada, while they ask us to vote $70,000 for Chinese immigration, an increase of $5,000 over last year. The minister's policy is nothing else but a Chinese puzzle; it has been one which retards immigration rather than encourages it. It is no wonder that the British born in this country are beginning to wonder whether Canada is going to continue to be a British and a white man's country. Mr. Bruce in Australia is regulating this European and Asiatic immigration; he is going to make that country a white man's country. We are spending to-day on immigration $3,500,000, which is a million more than was spent in 1896, but we have not solved this problem of immigration and colonization. We might just as well close up the shop if the present policy is to be continued.

St. Catharines, Barrie, Belleville, Hamilton and other Canadian cities and towns are filled with Chinese labour and with Chinese restaurants. In some way these orientals have been able to get into Canada and to obtain licenses and they are forcing the white man's restaurant out of business. The women are being driven out of laundering, housekeeping, domestic work and the restaurant business, and their places are being taken by Chinese labour. The government should declare a closed season and say that they will stop Chinese immigration for the next five or ten years or until such time as British immigration is brought up to a point more in keeping with the policy and traditions of a British dominion. The people of this country are beginning to wonder whether our country will continue to be British or whether it will soon be under the control of these Asiatics and Europeans. Time will tell. The economic policy of the government is driving Canadians to the States to look for jobs while the government brings in European and Asiatic immigrants to take their place.

Mr. BARBER: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that this oriental question has come home to some of the people in eastern Canada. For years those of us from British Columbia have kept this matter before the house and before the people of this country. On June 8 of last year, when this same item was under consideration, the Prime Minister made an announcement concerning Japanese immigration, and I think I am quite in order when I refer to that matter.

This Japanese problem is one of the greatest we have in British Columbia, and it is growing year by year. During the Easter recess I visited my district and attended a meeting of the berry-growers, and I was impressed very much with the results of the policy of the present administration along the lines of restricting Japanese immigration. That meeting was made up of 200 growers and close to 50 per cent of that number were Japanese, and an interpreter was necessary to interpret the resolutions and other business which came before the meeting. The people of our province are up in arms against this invasion by orientals.

An hon. MEMBER: Why do they employ them?

Mr. BARBER: One man told me at that meeting that he would like to have a photograph of the gathering to be sent to the Prime Minister. Last year I brought to the attention of the house a few figures concerning Japanese immigration. Those figures were as follows:

1923	369
1924	448
1925	501
1926	441
1927	475

There has been a gradual increase year by year.

Mr. FORKE: Did the hon. member say that there were 497 Chinese immigrants who came into this country?

Mr. BARBER: Japanese.

Mr. FORKE: I think the hon. member is mistaken.

Mr. BARBER: It was 475 in 1927.

Mr. FORKE: There is an agreement between the Japanese, the British and the Canadian government limiting the immigration to 150 per year.

Mr. BARBER: I beg to differ with the minister. When the Prime Minister made his announcement last year he said that that agreement would not go into effect until September 1, 1928. I have received the following figures from the bureau of statistics, showing the number which came in during the calendar years:

1927. . 187 males; 324 females; total, 511
1928. . 218 males; 317 females; total, 535

These Japanese are permitted to enter the country under another classification, that of returning Canadians. In two years, 2,223 Japanese have entered this country in that way. During the fiscal year of 1926-27 there were 888 males and 312 females, a total of 1,200; and in 1927-28, there were 766 males and 257 females, a total of 1,023. We, in the province of British Columbia, are of the opinion that there is a great leakage through this particular channel. We would urge the minister to check up this matter and we believe that he will find that some of these Japanese return to Japan and others come back on their papers.

The Prime Minister said last year that an agreement had been entered into, through diplomatic channels, to take effect on September, 1, 1928, which would limit the immigration to 150 per year, and that the so-called picture bride would be barred. I have the immigrations by months for 1928, and I will give them for the last four months of the year, which would be the months after this agreement came into effect. These figures are as follows:

September	24
October	21
November	43
December	12

I have not been able to obtain the figures beyond December of 1928. During the four months, 100 have come in, and there are still eight months to run. We shall watch with interest the new arrangement which the Prime Minister has told us he has made. I just wish to draw to the attention of the minister and the committee the manner in which this problem is being handled. The committee will now begin to realize that it is one of the most serious problems which face us in many districts in British Columbia.

Mr. SPENCER: Only last night I inquired as to the number of Japanese allowed into Canada, but at that time the minister refused to give the information, saying that he did not think he had a right to give it. Just a moment ago he gave to the hon. member for Fraser Valley the very information for which I was asking. Why did he change his mind?

Mr. FORKE: I have had time to think the matter over. I was not aware that the Prime Minister had used the figure when he spoke, and I did not want to be the first to give out the agreement until I felt I was justified in doing so.

Mr. SPENCER: The number now is 150 a year?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: I should like to ask the minister a question with regard to the portion of this appropriation spent for the suppression of the narcotic drugs traffic. Does his department take charge of this altogether, or is is divided between the Department of Health and the Department of Immigration?

Mr. FORKE: The prosecutions under the Narcotic Drugs Act come under the Department of Health, and then when a man is convicted he comes under the Department of Immigration when we deal with him in regard to deportation.

Mr. GARDINER: It is only in relation to that one matter that the department spends any money under this item in connection with the traffic in narcotic drugs?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. SPENCE: This is one of the items to which I seriously object. I see no reason whatever for an increase in an item of this kind, seeing that Canada is not desirous of getting Chinese immigrants. Nevertheless it is proposed to increase this item by $5,000. My idea is that it would be more in keeping with the immigration policy that should be adopted by this government to reduce the item by $5,000. The minister a little while ago was talking about the class of people he would allow to come into Canada.

Mr. FORKE: Will my hon. friend allow me? This is a preventive service. An increase may be right or wrong, but the service is to prevent the Chinese from coming in. It may not function, but it is a preventive service.

Mr. SPENCE: Does the minister, deep in his heart, think he is justified in asking for an increase of $5,000 in this item? No one in this government ever thinks of reducing an item. Every year it is an increase in each of the departments. The less business the government does, the more money it wants. If a merchant were to do business in that way, he would not remain long in business and neither should the government. A few minutes ago the minister was speaking of the classes of individuals admitted. Does he consider a man running a Chinese laundry as a merchant?

Mr. FORKE: No. When I read my statement I said so explicitly.

Mr. SPENCE: I did not catch that. We have now only 55,000 Chinese in the whole of Canada, and yet we are proposing to spend $70,000 in administration. Is the whole thing worth it?

Mr. FORKE: This is to keep them out.

Mr. SPENCE: Well, for heaven's sake adopt some policy that will keep them out, and not waste the country's money. I could advocate some ways of doing this which might be more crude than that adopted, but these Chinese should be kept out, and the whole immigration policy should be changed. I do not wish to criticize the minister, because I have great faith in his integrity of purpose, but he is certainly not capable of controlling the situation and the government behind him is to be blamed more than he, because this is the policy of the government and not his. The minister can keep on saying: This has been done for years. But if it is wrong, it is up to the minister to change the situation. The whole world has been revolutionized since the war. Why not revolutionize the department and get assistance in this regard from the other ministers of the crown? I have heard the lamest excuses put forward in the house. I have been in business for many years; I have sat on boards and councils, and I have never seen a more unbusinesslike administration than this one. You can compare it with nothing but a town or county council. The absolute nonsense that is talked across the floor of this house is disgusting to many of us.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Spence.]

Relief of distressed Canadians outside of Canada, $4,000.

Mr. ROBINSON: I should like to say to the minister that I am in full accord with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) that the immigration office at Detroit should be moved to Windsor. It is only three short blocks from the Detroit ferry dock, and many people who wish to settle in Canada think they are compelled to come to Windsor to meet officials there in order to make arrangements for settling in Canada. I have had them calling at my house; and have received letters stating their intention to move to Canada in order to go into farming, and I have to refer them to the Detroit office. I feel it would be a good move on the part of the department to change the office to Windsor. The minister has promised to give the matter consideration and I trust the result will be that the office will be moved. When speaking last night in connection with immigration at the Walkerville and Windsor ferry docks the minister stated that he would have an examination and a report made. My opinion is that the reports which come from the officials themselves give only one side of the question. If the officials who are sent down to Windsor to make the investigation and report, would consult with the chamber of commerce, service clubs and the real estate board, they would get at the actual facts of the situation, and I am sure this would be of assistance to the department.

Mr. FORKE: I will make every investigation; I think I shall slip down there some day in order to watch the proceedings and see just how things are operated.

Mr. ROBINSON: I wish the minister would. We would give him a hearty welcome.

Mr. HEAPS: What are the regulations of the Department of Immigration in connection with the importation of men who come to this country under contract from other countries and who displace labour here? I ask this question because the item relates to relief of distressed Canadians outside of Canada. As a result of contract labour from other countries displacing our own, there are a number of distressed Canadians in Canada and I should like to see something done for them. For instance, there are those whom the Rapid Grip Company and other companies have displaced. Has this to do with the Department of Immigration or the Department of Labour? Who is responsible in a case of this kind?

Mr. FORKE: My deputy informs me that the whole of this appropriation is scarcely ever spent. There is only a very small portion of it spent. This is to provide for assistance to bona fide Canadians who may happen to be stranded away from Canada or who may be in need of temporary financial help. Most of the cases occur in the British Isles and the expenses are under the control of the Director of European Emigration, London. In cases involving payment of transportation to Canada, for which we obtain a specially reduced rate, an undertaking of repayment is obtained from the person assisted, which repayment the department endeavours to collect from him upon his return to Canada, or from his parents or relatives if he happens to be unable to refund the money himself. The net expenditure for the fiscal year 1927-28, was $1,379.36, and the collections during that year amounted to $753.46, so that it is really an infinitesimal sum.

Mr. HEAPS: I realize the purpose of this vote and I am trying to relate it to the contract labour that is brought into the Dominion, and which displaces men born in this country, and who in consequence of this imported labour find themselves in a distressed condition. What are the regulations in connection with contract labour that is brought into this country for no other purpose than to displace men who are already in a job? Is this matter connected with the Department of Immigration or with the Department of Health?

Mr. FORKE: That is opening up a wide question into which I cannot go at the present time. We are not supplying any money for that purpose.

Mr. HEAPS: I have in mind the case of Rapid Grip Limited, of Toronto. In that particular case men were brought in from the United States or from Germany and other continental countries to take the place of the men in Toronto who were working for that concern. I know that the Department of Labour was in negotiation with that company for quite a long time. Who is responsible for allowing these men to come in to take the place of men who are already employed in this country?

Mr. FORKE: The department is quite willing to assist immigrants who are temporarily in distress and are unable to take care of themselves, but if a man becomes a mendicant it is a case for deportation.

Mr. HEAPS: Is there any way of protecting the men who are employed in this country against this imported contract labour?

Mr. FORKE: There is an Alien Labour Act which is applicable to the United States, but its enforcement does not come under my department. All that can be done, as far as I know, is to apply that act.

Mr. BENNETT: I think this matter should be discussed when the labour estimates are under discussion. I have some inquiries to make with respect to it. I think my hon. friend from North Winnipeg will agree that this is a matter that comes under the Department of Labour.

Mr. HEAPS: I just wanted to find out whether it came under the Department of Immigration or under the Department of Labour.

Item agreed to.

Buildings at St. John, N.B., $8,900.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Five or six questions were asked in the house recently in regard to the question of conductresses, who are supposed to be nurses, and the answer given was that the appointments had not been made. Have they been made since?

Mr. FORKE: Appointments have been made in two or three districts but not in all.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The positions were advertised and the qualifications called for graduate nurses. Will the minister give the names of those who have been appointed, and state whether they are graduate nurses?

Mr. FORKE: I shall be glad to get the names. They have to be graduate nurses, and the appointments are made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McGIBBON: Same old story—no information.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): As the matter is related to this vote, I would ask that it stand until we get that information.

Mr. FORKE: It has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): These conductresses work in these buildings at St. John.

Mr. FORKE: This amount is required to make the last payment on a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is from buildings like this that these conductresses work. Will the minister say that that is not so?

Mr. FORKE: This is an obligation that we have to meet.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I have nothing to do with that. But the work of the conductresses has to do with the immigration building.

Mr. FORKE: I will supply that information.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): When?

Mr. FORKE: Immediately.

Mr. GARDINER: Would the minister give the details of this expenditure?

Mr. FORKE: The details are as follows:

Under an agreement entered between the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the department is bearing one-half the cost of construction and maintenance of the following buildings necessary for the proper handling of immigrants arriving at the port of St. John West:—

Baggage shed, our share, $88,048.28; detention quarters, our share, $55,748.68 ($5,748.68 extras totally paid by department); waiting room, our share, $20,419.11—total cost to department, $164,216.07; extras already totally paid by department, $5,748.68—$158,467.39.

This sum of $158,467.39 is payable in ten yearly instalments, plus interest at the rate of 5½ per cent on outstanding balances at end of each year.

Summary of amounts required for the fiscal year 1929-1930—

Waiting room, ⅒ share, $2,041.91 (10th instalment); interest on outstanding balance Jan. 1st to Dec. 31st, 1929, $112.30—$2,154.21.

Immigration quarters, ⅒ share, $5,000 (10th instalment); interest on outstanding balance Jan. 1st to Dec. 31, 1929, $275—$5,275—total, $7,429.21.

Provision for our share of repairs, $1,470.79 —total $8,900.

The above amount of $8,900 is to cover the last instalment that has to be paid in connection with these buildings.

Mr. GARDINER: When was this contract entered into?

Mr. FORKE: Ten years ago.

Mr. GARDINER: The first item is to provide a baggage shed at a cost of $88,000. Is that not really a transportation matter and not connected with the Department of Immigration at all?

Mr. FORKE: The buildings were put up under agreement between the Department of Immigration and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The agreement was entered into ten years ago, nine payments have been made, and this is the last. It is difficult for me to give offhand all the details of a contract that was entered into ten years ago.

[Mr. A. E. Ross.]

Mr. GARDINER: It appears to me that this parliament should have no responsibility for making payments in connection with baggage sheds and so forth, which are really a matter for the railways. Now that the agreement has been entered into, I suppose that we must meet our obligations, but I trust that the department will not enter into any such arrangement in the future, because this is simply assisting the railway company to provide part of the railway properties.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am sorry the Prime Minister is not in his seat, but in his absence I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the terrible exhibition we have had in conducting the estimates of this department through the house during the last two or three days. It is the worst exhibition of incompetence that we have had in this house.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend takes a pessimistic view.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How is it that some of these buildings are built out of appropriations of departments other than the Department of Public Works? Why does this not come under the Department of Public Works?

Mr. FORKE: This contract was entered into in 1919. The hon. member cannot expect me—

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I certainly would. Why should not the minister be able to give the information?

Mr. FORKE: I can if I am given time. I have already promised the hon. member that I will give full information.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): No, you started out by saying, why should the hon. member ask me about what happened in 1919? Why should not the minister know? It comes under his department.

Mr. GARDINER: I would suggest that the item stand until the information is brought down.

Mr. CANNON: The information has been promised.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is not carried.

Mr. McGIBBON: The Solicitor General is not going to put it over the house like that.

Mr. CANNON: I was saying that the minister was willing to give the explanation and was ready to do so.

Mr. McGIBBON: For the last three or four days we have had these assurances of willingness to give the information, but we can get practically no information. We would like to know whether we are going to get it this year or not. The minister has been in charge of this department some years; surely when he comes here with his estimates, with his deputy beside him, we ought to be able to get some information.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I was promised an explanation by the minister and I insist on it.

Mr. FORKE: I will get all the information I possibly can.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I want it.

Mr. FORKE: I will let you have the information.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There will be supplementary estimates, I am told, in relation to the Immigration department, and I suggest that when they are before the committee my hon. friend will get the explanation he asks for. He might let this item go through in the meantime.

Item agreed to.

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

Care of patients and medical examination of pensioners, $2,600,000.

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Pensions and National Health): Mr. Chairman, on two former occasions when we were in committee I asked that vote 232 be called. The discussion in each case has centred around the health section. I would therefore suggest that we call vote 244, and that we complete the discussion on the section of health, and proceed to items under that section.

Item stands.

The administration of the acts respecting food and drugs, opium and narcotic drugs and proprietary or patent medicines, including the laboratory of hygiene, $150,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the few remarks I made the other night I endeavoured to show the field of activity that was designed for this department, not only by the constitution but by the act that brought the department into being. Some of our friends opposite have suggested that services which are now being rendered by the health department had previously been and could now be carried on by other departments of government. There is no doubt that that is true, but those who were responsible for the amalgamation of those services must have realized that there was a necessity for closer application on the part of those who were qualified to deal with them.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I was indicating, Mr. Chairman, that under the old organization where the Department of Immigration controlled the medical inspection service that service was not efficiently performed, with the result that we introduced into Canada trachoma, which has spread as far west as among the Indians of British Columbia. We also found that our asylums were being filled with mentally deficient people; the hospitals were being filled; the charitable insitutions were crowded by incompentents. Since the Department of Health has taken over that work I think I can say with certainty that conditions have very greatly improved, and this is due to the thorough inspection carried on. It is suggested that the quarantine service could be carried on under the Department of Immigration. As a matter of fact, that service at one time came under the Department of Agriculture, and we know from history that during that period many epidemics did originate from the quarantine stations. I am pleased to say that since the Health department has been in control of this service not one case has got through.

Regulations in relation to foods and drugs were formerly under the Department of Trade and Commerce, but since they have been placed under the Health department a considerable amount of research work has been done and the elimination of impurities from foods and drugs has been effected in great measure. The benefit which has resulted to the public from the health standpoint is inestimable. When it is realized to-day that scientific methods are followed in the preparation of foods, and that there has been a great evolution in this matter of refrigeration and in relation to the preserves that go into foods, many vegetable colourings being discarded and aniline dyes substituted for them, many of which dyes are poisonous, one can readily

understand that a considerable amount of research and investigation is necessary in order properly to supervise the preparation of these products.

Mr. BENNETT: With respect to pure food products, does the minister handle that branch of the public service?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what the minister is speaking of just now?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the minister recalls the criticisms made by the producers of maple sugar and maple syrup in the province of Quebec as to what was done in the adulteration of some of their products. I understood that the government had taken action in this matter and also with respect to butter. Perhaps the minister, without interfering with the sequence of his remarks, will offer some observations in that regard.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have a Maple Products Act whereby the Department of Health is empowered to take samples from the shelves, just as is done in connection with ordinary food products, and have these samples brought to the laboratories to be tested for purity. A pure maple product is required; that is the standard. A great deal of work has been done in this direction and some prosecutions have been entered into. There has been some complaint from the sugar producing districts in Quebec to the effect that the service has not been as efficient as it ought to be. I would point out that the laboratory work in connection with maple products is one that requires probably the greatest degree of care, inasmuch as it is very easy to add cane and other sugars to these particular products, and the adulteration is very difficult of detection. The old lead standard had been in vogue, but in practice it was found difficult to apply. In some districts that standard would run as high as 9 per cent, while in others and at other seasons, it might be as low as 1.5. That standard, therefore, is not altogether reliable, especially in view of the fact that there is a great variation in the districts in which the commodity is produced. It is true we have not as large an inspection service as we should like to have. If we had more inspectors we could bring more products in to be tested. Among the producers themselves there is a desire to turn out a pure product. The trouble comes after the producer has sold his product to the manufacturer; it is then that the adulteration occurs. We have, however, been successful in checking adulteration. I know of one firm's products having been taken from the shelf—one of the largest firms in Canada—and it was a good lesson to them. There has been a suggestion that the administration of the act might be better conducted under the Department of Agriculture, and that is under consideration.

Mr. BENNETT: Why?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Well, some of those who made representations on the question thought that the Department of Agriculture was a little closer to the producer than the Health department and that consequently it could exercise greater control over the product at its source. I find, however, that in all probability the product is not very much disturbed at its source; it is after it leaves the point of production that adulteration takes place.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Perhaps it is easier for that department to get more inspectors.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not know about that.

Mr. BENNETT: They have 1,300 now.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I fancy cooperation would produce a better service. The control of culinary and drinking water on the great lakes has been taken up by the department.

Mr. BENNETT: Has it touched Ottawa yet?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have no jurisdiction in Ottawa, unfortunately, but on the great lakes and international waterways we have that jurisdiction and our service has been of considerable importance. For instance, typhoid fever was at one time a very common disease on ships on the great lakes; I am pleased to say that last year there were only four cases of typhoid which were reported in that service. In the administration of the Proprietary and Patent Medicines Act, which was formerly under the Department of Trade and Commerce, there were sold at one time 60,000 preparations of this character; the number has been reduced to 6,000. Many exaggerated and misleading claims have been disposed of and the public has been spared a good deal of money. It was never the intention of the Department of Health to merge the activities of the

province into a distinct unit, as has been suggested. But in cooperation with the provinces, through the Dominion Council of Health, we have been able to do work which I think has been quite effective.

The establishment of a research laboratory is desirable and I have no doubt that when the time is opportune such a laboratory will be established in Canada. But as I said the other night, the securing of a personnel for such a laboratory is more important than the expenditure of money in buildings and equipment. The government is not unwilling to provide money for the establishment of a laboratory of this character, but at present it would seem that the duties of the department in connection with the administration of the Food and Drugs Act occupy the present laboratory staff to the full, and the establishment of a research laboratory would mean the appointment of a staff of very considerable size with quarters of its own, together with a considerable outlay for equipment of a very expensive kind.

It was suggested to the committee that more money was being expended in connection with the health of animals than was spent in connection with the health of human beings. If my hon. friends would take into consideration the large sums of money spent by the provincial governments and the municipalities, together with the amount spent by the Dominion government in this regard, they would get a total expenditure of many millions of dollars. I have said, and I do not think it can be contradicted, that the Canadian people are making just as much progress in health matters as is being made by other countries throughout the world. We are fortunate, I think, in having, as deputy minister of the department a gentleman well known to health authorities not only in Canada but throughout the world as having exceptional knowledge of public health matters; I refer to Doctor Amyot.

The complaint has been made that the report of the department is too brief. That may be so, but a short study of the report does not give an accurate idea of the activities carried on or the amount of work done during the year. For instance, at page 10 of the report it will be noticed that 416 samples of narcotic drugs were analysed during the year. One might write a book on the work done by the police under the supervision of the department in seizing 416 samples of these drugs and in the prosecutions which followed. In that regard I think we might say that in Canada the organization which controls the use of narcotic drugs is as efficient as any similar organization to be found anywhere in the world. The work last year was exceptionally well done, and we secured many convictions in the courts. I believe that to-day in New Westminster penitentiary there are over 60 people who have been sentenced to terms of from five to seven years for trafficking in these drugs, and the same situation prevails in Winnipeg, Toronto and Montreal.

At page 33 of the report we find that patent medicines for cancer, diphtheria, diabetes, typhoid fever and other diseases are no longer permitted to be sold. That statement takes only a few lines, but it means that the public will be exploited no longer; it is a bald statement of fact. On page 39 we find that the total number of cases of typhoid on the great lakes during 1926 was only four. That is a brief statement also, but it means a great deal to those who know the character of that disease as it formerly existed on the great lakes before this service was undertaken. On page 47 of the report it will be noted that during the year 5,217 sailors were treated at Canadian ports. That statement means more than it indicates in words, but we can say that sailors coming to our shores receive treatment equal to if not better than that given by any other country in the world. That service is well organized in the larger ports of Canada, where we have officers under salary. In the smaller ports the customs officers act as our agents and where medical assistance is required it is furnished by local physicians either under fees or on a small salary basis.

Mr. BENNETT: That is particularly so with regard to the quarantine stations, is it not?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That includes the work at quarantine stations; the service is more or less inter-related.

I do not wish to continue at greater length than is necessary. The item under discussion is No. 244, and there is a slight increase this year. Perhaps I might be permitted to just indicate the expenditures made under this vote. This appropriation is to provide for laboratory and inspection service dealing with the adulteration and misbranding of human foods and of all drugs employed for the treatment or prevention of diseases in man or animal; the control of the export, import and sale of all habit-forming drugs; investigations and prosecutions in connection with traffic in narcotics and the protection of the public against the frauds of advertisers and money seekers trying to put out dangerous

drugs or medicines, the composition of which is unknown to the public. We have food and drug laboratories at Ottawa, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Halifax, Montreal and Toronto and also a laboratory of hygiene at Ottawa. This laboratory furnishes bacteriological, biological and biochemical data and reports on the qualities of foods, raw or manufactured; disinfectants; water supplies; pollution of shellfish areas and of shellfish and examination of diseased tissues, and it determines the potencies of the drugs, curative serums and vaccines mentioned in the schedule on page 14 of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended in 1927.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister did not do anything about the infection of the oyster beds in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We made an investigation some two or three years ago, when the epidemic came over here from the United States. Our officers were brought in at that time.

Mr. BENNETT: That was the typhoid epidemic?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, and at that time I think we made a health survey in Prince Edward Island as well.

Mr. BENNETT: I was referring to the parasite which destroyed the oyster beds.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We had nothing to do with that.

As I said, this laboratory tests the serums and vaccines and biological products. It is estimated that $10,000 of the $15,000 increase will be required to carry on the increased inspection service at Montreal and Toronto; for the provision of scientific apparatus urgently needed to cope with the demands of advancement in food and drug work and to make replacements of certain laboratory apparatus which, in the course of time, has become either worn out or obsolete. An additional $5,000 will be required for investigations and prosecutions in connection with the traffic in narcotics. The amount voted in 1928-29 was $135,000, of which $134,956.39 was spent.

Mr. McGIBBON: I think the minister's statement has furnished additional proof, if any were necessary, for the statement I made the other evening that there is no originality and no initiative in this Department of Health, and there has been none since it was formed. Of course, if the minister is going to take credit for the work done by the provincial governments and the municipalities and for the preventive work of the mounted police he can make a very plausible statement, but when you get down to the real facts the minister has not been able to tell us of anything new which has been contributed by his department in order to preserve or improve the health of the people of this country. I have listened to the minister very carefully in my desire to secure some information or facts which would justify the existence of this department, but I have heard nothing of the kind. The minister has stated that he is going to hand back to the Department of Agriculture some of the work he took away from it—

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I did not say that.

Mr. McGIBBON: —evidently with the idea that the Department of Agriculture can do it better than the Department of Health. I can see no other reason.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not propose to let my hon. friend put words into my mouth which I have not used. He can make his own statement but he cannot make a statement for me.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am in the judgment of the house if that is not a reasonable deduction to be taken from what the minister has said.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not at all.

Mr. McGIBBON: I stand to be corrected if the minister can produce any evidence to the contrary. But I say again that as far as doing anything to preserve or improve the national health of Canada, we have yet to learn of the first thing which this government has done. It is true that they have been inspecting some foods, some proprietary medicines and doing other routine work which was done in the past I think just as efficiently as it is being done to-day—in fact, I am credibly informed that it is being done by the same staff. If that be true, what right has the minister to assume that this work was neglected in the past?—because that is the only deduction we can draw from his remarks. That, I say, is about all the department has been doing.

There are many ways in which this government could improve the public health. Last Thursday night I referred to the great wastage of life and pointed out that in practically every instance the government had done nothing to improve conditions. The government might assist in the establishment of whole time county health offices. I think I am correctly informed when I say that the minister has absolutely refused to consider that proposition; he hides himself behind the

British North America Act and states that the department is restricted to doing certain things. I have in my hand a letter given to me by the hon. member for West Kootenay (Mr. Esling) in which the statement is made that the minister refused absolutely to take that matter into consideration. It is undoubtedly within the power of the department to assist in the establishment of full time county medical health offices.

The minister has referred to what his department has done as regards quarantine, but I would direct his attention to the epidemics of rabies which occurred in the province of Ontario. I am not blaming the minister for that, because I know that matter comes under the Department of Agriculture, but it must be remembered that the disease entered this country from the United States; that it has caused the provincial government a great deal of alarm and has necessitated the expenditure of a considerable amount of money.

The minister referred also to the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act and to the number of convictions which had been made under that act during the past year. I asked the government the following question:

How many persons were convicted last year for illegally selling any of the following drugs; opium, morphia, cocaine, or any of their derivatives?

If the minister's statement is correct, the answer which I received to that question must be wrong. According to the answer I received from the Deputy Minister of Health there were only 61 convictions in the whole Dominion of Canada, and I find that ten of that number were professional men of one kind or another. I also asked for the estimated number of drug addicts in Canada, and the answer was given as 8,000. If the statements made by the minister are correct, then I ask him: Where are those 8,000 adicts obtaining their drugs? The minister tells us that there has been a great diminution in the importation and sale of these drugs, but I find that there are still 8,000 people, according to the estimate made by his department, still using them, and only 61 convictions were made during the last twelve months.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We do not prosecute the addicts.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would like to direct the attention of the house to some of the methods used by this department in dealing with this drug evil. I received a letter from a medical man in my district, who I believe is just as innocent of dealing in these drugs as any hon. member in this house. If the name is necessary I will give it, but I do not think it is called for at the present time. He wrote as follows:

In regard to the conviction against me for breach of the Narcotic Act, I will give you the particulars as concisely as possible. Some time in August, 1926, Fraser called at my office and asked how much he owed me. He had broken into my office on three occasions, the last time being about three years before. He had done considerable damage, and stolen what morphia and syringes I had on hand, and some cash, and a sweater, possibly more. I asked him if his conscience was troubling him. He said that he was in very bad shape at that time. He paid me $20 and I said that would do although it did not nearly cover me. He was dressed very neatly and I hardly knew him, as he changed so much in appearance. I asked him how he was getting along and he said that after he was arrested in Gravenhurst he had been in an institution and had cut down to one-quarter the amount he had previously taken, and that he had been out a year and had reduced to about one-fifth and was gradually reducing the amount. I gave him some good advice and warned him to be very careful, etc. He got up to go and then asked if I could spare him a few tablets. I replied that I did not know how many I had but would look. I gave him about 20 tablets, gr. ¼ each. The point is that I did not know the act, and did not think I was in error any more than if I dispensed a bottle of stomach mixture. I had never read the act, or ever received a copy of it. I considered I was giving medicine which I knew he required, and thought that I had a license to dispense. He came back on three more occasions, and I gave him tablets each time.

Some time in January, 1927, Miller a mounted police, came in and served me with the summons. I immediately called up T. N. Phelan, my solicitor in Toronto, and he was the first to inform me that I had committed a breach of the Narcotic Act, and advised me to settle if given the minimum fine of $200, and have the other charges withdrawn. This was done, and I paid $257.50.

I later had to appear before the council and nearly had a two months' suspension for infamous and disgraceful conduct, but got off with a severe reprimand.

I could not understand why the government sent a spotter down here to get me, unless I was using more morphia than the average physician. I had never had an addict in for years before and only used it in the practice. No doubt you know that I have a good obstetric practice, and as a routine I left six morphine tablets after each case for after-pains, with instructions to burn the tablets that they did not use.

I think that is all that it is necessary for me to read.

I am credibly informed that this is the common practice of the department, to send around their sleuths to try to catch the medical men who are ignorant of this act, bring them into the police court and have them fined. No one wants to pay a fine if he does not feel that he should pay it. An-

other point is that once a physician is fined on a charge of that nature he is almost automatically barred from the practice of medicine; that is the serious part of it. I would ask the minister if this practice, which has been fairly general in the past, has been discontinued?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The hon. member was informed over a year ago that the department did not employ the type of investigator which is referred to in that letter. That incident happened back in 1926. The investigations to-day are conducted by the mounted police; the department does not send people in to pry upon the doctors.

Mr. McGIBBON: What do they do?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): When information comes to the department that some member of the medical profession is selling drugs, we make careful inquiries and if it is found that the statements are true, the man is investigated. If trafficking is discovered, he is brought into court, usually on a summary conviction if it is his first offence. If it is found that there has been regular trafficking and if he is what is known as a drug trafficker, he may be proceeded against under indictment. That is the practice of the department and it will not be relinquished. But no medical man need get himself into trouble if he will comply with the act.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister cannot put up a straw man merely for the purpose of knocking it down. I was not referring to the trafficker.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Neither was I. I was referring to the case the hon. member mentioned, and the question he asked as to the procedure. I have given him the procedure now in vogue in the department. The hon. member for Kingston brought up a case and he had the idea that the department had proceeded hurriedly and without proper knowledge with regard to the matter.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is the minister referring to the case I brought up?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. We received information from Kingston that a certain medical man was supplying narcotics. That information, coming to the department, was investigated and the investigation brought forth a report.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is the minister referring to the case I mentioned?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No. The report was not satisfactory to the department, but later on the officer of the mounted police went into that doctor's office and bargained for narcotic drugs. He found in the office supplies done up and addressed to parties in Ottawa for sale. Those packages were opened and drugs sold from them. That was the story. Our friends cannot complain if medical men get themselves into positions of that kind, but the department are not and have not been for the last two years, employing any addicts in their service.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There is no question as to the fact that the medical man was selling drugs, but it was found out that he was an irresponsible medical man who never should have been allowed to practise. When the time came, if attention had not been drawn to that fact, I am satisfied the department would have proceeded against him with the usual prosecution instead of having him confined where he is now or where he was sent afterwards. The man was irresponsible; he should never have been allowed to practise, but he was practising and he did not know what he was doing because he was under the influence of drugs all the time. Surely the mounted policeman should have become acquainted with the type of medical man with whom he was dealing and said: This is not a case for prosecution; it is one for putting him in an institution; he is an addict himself.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not see how my hon. friend can take that stand. Our business was to check this man's traffic in narcotic drugs. He had his own connections in Kingston and if it was known there that he was irresponsible and a fit subject for an institution, that surely is the duty of the local people. We did not intervene on that ground; we found that he was trafficking and trafficking for profit.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does the minister say that he would defend the prosecution of the man? Application was made a dozen times for his confinement in an institution.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We dealt with the facts only as we found them.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): But I would expect common sense to be used in connection with the prosecution. A mounted policeman should be a very good judge. This man has been in gaol and detained in different institutions. It is not fair to say: We are going to prosecute him. I quite admit perhaps the department had no knowledge of that, but it certainly changed the prosecution after the matter was drawn to its attention, and I will give the minister credit for that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We stayed the prosecution.

Mr. McGIBBON: I just want to make it clear that the case we are now dealing with is not the one to which I referred.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am prepared to give the minister all possible assistance in the house as well as out of it to prosecute criminals who are trafficking in these drugs, but he must exercise ordinary precautions not to stigmatize men whose reputations are clear. This is not the only case I have in my riding and in every case where they have been convicted, they have been convicted through ignorance of the law. I have had complaints from many parts of the province, and I am informed that the same course of action is still being pursued. I would be glad to have the minister's testimony that it is not.

Mr. HOWDEN: The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario contends that the individual whose case he stated, was hardly used by the department. I cannot see this. Ignorance of the law, we are told, is no excuse, and certainly for the last twenty-five years I have understood thoroughly that it is against the law to give morphine to an addict.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Coming back to the statement made by the minister and for information only, I should like the minister to tell us now what work was undertaken by his department to prevent or lessen typhoid on the great lakes?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have required the owners of ships on the great lakes to furnish a separate water supply for culinary and drinking purposes. Formerly they took the water from the lake; now it comes from certified sources of supply. The tanks are inspected from time to time and samples of water taken. These samples are examined with the assistance of the laboratories of the provincial government; if things are not found to be in proper shape on the ship the owners are notified, and until repairs are made the ship does not sail. The water supply is being very carefully checked especially on the great lakes and on some of the western lakes. I have under my hand a chart giving the number of cases of typhoid as follows:

Year	Number of cases
1923	50
1924	30
1925	7
1926	4

This shows a gradual decline since this system was inaugurated.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Of course the work of inspection there is largely provincial.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, entirely under our direction.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The water supply must be protected. I will come to that point a little later on. In regard to the food question, we are quite in sympathy with anything that will make for pure food, but last year I took up with the minister the question of sausages. The colouring substance which is and has been for years used to give the sausage a slight tint which makes it what it really is, has been acknowledged by the minister, his chemists and his department, to be non-injurious. Then what is the idea of worrying the manufacturers of the sausage for using that colouring? Could some common sense not be used and the department say: This is not an injurious substance? On the other hand, if you are going to forbid its use, why permit its sale in shops and so forth? The department can say that the butcher, the manufacturer of sausages, is aware of this; that ignorance of the law is no excuse. But the butcher's trade is handed down from father to son and these men would like to know, because they have asked me, whether some change could not be made so that they could manufacture the sausages. The department is welcome to take care of the meats. This is not a preservative of meat. The minister admits that it is not, that it is simply used for colouring, and that it is used in connection with a cheap food entering into the dietary of a great many people. If there is any argument in favour of continuing the prosecutions for the use of colouring matter, I would like to know what it is.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The department are of the opinion that if the people desire to eat sausage meat, they should have a pure product. It is well-known that in the better abattoirs and better shops, where meat is properly taken care of and there is proper refrigeration and care in handling, meat can be kept fresh and will make sausages that will stand up. This product that my hon. friend speaks of, sodium hyposulphate, if sprinkled on meat that is going bad, will hold it; there is no question about that; but in this country, where we have an excellent supply of meat and good refrigeration, I do not think we need a product that my hon. friend, for instance, would not want to eat in his sausage. That is the advice and the information which the department gives me

and so far as I am concerned, it sounds good to me. I do not think it is well to try to freshen up with a product of this kind meats that are undergoing early putrefaction.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Let us settle this matter. Surely the minister knows as well as I do that it is not a preservative; it is used only for table purposes, for colouring or tinting. Now if the department rules that that is a meat preservative I will withdraw any objection that I have, or if the deputy says it is a meat preservative I will withdraw my objections; but I say that it is not, and the chemical reports that have been issued by the department support my contention.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It will freshen meat and give it a better colour.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is tinting, I admit that; but it is non-injurious and is not a preservative. I am not going to stand up for the defence of any injurious or poisonous meat or for any product that will preserve such meat. But I think the minister and his department should take a stand on this question, and if they will rule that it is a preservative and has a chemical action, well and good; I will withdraw all my objections.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As far as the use of small quantities of this product such as is customary in the trade is concerned, I would not say that it is a preservative, but it does freshen and brighten meat.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister admits, then, that its only action is the tinting.

I have a few remarks to make, Mr. Chairman, on the general question. The minister defends the position in which his department is to-day on the ground that it has no authority. Its only authority is to deal with things that are perhaps secondary to public health. I differ from the minister, and I would point out where he gets his authority to step in and take action such as has not been taken by his department in the past. The minister quoted from the act:

> Cooperation with the provincial, territorial and other health authorities with a view to the coordination of the efforts proposed or made for preserving and improving the public health.

I contend that the word "preserving" gives him all the authority he requires to step in and preserve the public health of this Dominion. In connection with the Montreal typhoid epidemic, the minister had all the authority he needed to step in and say that the epidemic was a menace to the general health of the Dominion. I believe that he has sufficient authority under the act to protect one part of Canada from another part in which there is an epidemic.

I think perhaps the minister has done a little work in gathering up some little pieces and putting them together, but it it a patchwork quilt, and that is about all it is. There are other things that he should take in. I see no reason why the health of the Indians, for instance, which is a federal matter, should not come under his department. In fact, in connection with the whole health work of this Dominion, federal and provincial, there is duplication and overlapping, with a little bit being done by this department and a little bit by another department, and a little bit by the provincial authorities, and with no special authority over the whole. I think the minister should gather up all these things and put them together. The minister said that his department does a certain amount of national research work, but there again there is duplication because the provinces and the National Research Council are also working on that. The federal Department of Health may also take up the work and do a little bit more. While you are preparing your laboratories, you could turn many problems you have over to the research council, and I hope that they will be rather more practical problems than those engaging the attention of the council to-day, because judging by the report of the council they are not engaged on problems that are of any practical importance at all.

The minister and the department have a big field before them if they will only go into it and assert their rights. The minister may differ, but I believe that the preservation of the public health, not the preservation of the health of the man in Ontario or Quebec, but the whole national health, comes under the jurisdiction of the minister, and when any part of the country becomes a menace to other parts I contend that the minister has the authority to step in. A typhoid epidemic, for instance, has no limits. A man in Ottawa or Kingston or any other city may catch the typhoid germs and in two weeks he is down with typhoid, and he becomes a menace not only to his own city but to every part of this country through which he travels. The disease spreads all the faster because of the ease of communication, and you may next hear of the disease in Winnipeg shortly after the man in Ottawa or Kingston contracted it. The minister has read of the spread of sleeping sickness, which began in a small community of 350,000 people in central Africa. If the diseases had been confined to that little community, it would not prevail all over the world to-day. I contend that

the minister has the authority under the act to conserve the health of any part of this Dominion, and wherever he sees a menace he can step in. He stepped in in connection with the water supply of boats on the great lakes. There is no question in my mind that that was a provincial matter, because the water supply is obtained only in the ports, and any city supplying impure water would be responsible. When you realize that fifteen million people, equal to the population of five or six great cities travel on the great lakes, you can realize the great field that is open to the minister, and I am glad that he has gone into it. If he is going to take credit for that, he can also step in in connection with other provincial matters. He could certainly see that water is made fit for the travelling public. I think every province would unite with the minister if he would take a strong stand. There is a great opportunity awaiting the department, and the minister should gather up all this health work that is going on here and there and bring it under his department, and make the department one big, strong, health department. He has the authority to do so under the act.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In reply to my hon. friend who seemed to question my statement in regard to the number of convictions in the province of British Columbia, there were 67 convictions in that province in the year 1928-29, according to a return that has been given to me, and throughout the whole of Canada 189 federal convictions and 173 provincial.

In regard to what my hon. friend from Kingston City has just said in regard to epidemics in the larger cities, like the epidemic in Montreal a few years ago, the Department of Health acted only in an advisory capacity at that time. We did support the provincial health board after they were compelled to go in and take charge. Although they went in without authority, it was their duty to go in, and they got the necessary authority at the next session of the legislature. During the epidemic we had the opportunity of using the power that is in us. When the country districts were under quarantine and their milk was not being accepted on the American market, we were able as a national department so to arrange matters that the quarantine was lifted. They had the quarantine continued in the city of Montreal for some months, and it was only when the Department of Health at Washington were assured by the Canadian Department of Health that the things that should be done in Montreal had been done, that the quarantine in Montreal was lifted. Where our field existed we went in and helped to organize a health department. I do not think, however, that it would have been acceptable to the city of Montreal for us to have gone in in any other capacity.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): When you discover the source and then delay taking action, that is criminal. If you have not in your Health department men who can discover the source in a few days, then some other department should be allowed to deal with the matter.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is where I find fault, where a delay is occasioned by the department. For the sake of the health of the rest of the country they should say: "If you cannot find it we can, and we will send you a man who will do it."

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We are ready to do that.

Mr. MacLAREN: Will the minister make a statement to the committee regarding leprosy in the Dominion, informing us as to the number of cases, the increase or diminution of the disease, and any other matter in that connection that would be of interest to the committee.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That comes under our quarantine vote. We have two stations in Canada, one at Williams Head on the Pacific, and one at Tracadie, New Brunswick.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is mentioned under health.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, under the vote on quarantine. We have eight cases, I think at Tracadie, and some ten or twelve at Williams Head. I am informed the cases at Tracadie, with the exception of two, are probably non-active to-day.

Mr. MacLAREN: Where is the Williams Head station?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Victoria, B.C.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is there not one near Grosse Ile, Quebec?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No. There are just the two, all cases are confined in these institutions.

Mr. MacLAREN: How does the number compare to-day with say ten years ago?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The number is gradually decreasing. In 1899 there were twenty-five cases; in 1916 there were fifteen cases.

Mr. MacLAREN: Where?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is the number of cases in Canada.

Mr. MacLAREN: The total number?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, and to-day I find there are ten.

Mr. MacLAREN: I may be mistaken, but I was informed last year—not in the house—that there were cases of leprosy on the island of Grosse Ile, near Quebec.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MacLAREN: That is not correct?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MacLAREN: Will the minister inform us who the medical officer is at Tracadie, and what his salary is?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Doctor Langis. His salary is $3,360.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is there any research work or scientific investigation regarding the treatment and the nature of leprosy at Tracadie at the present time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We are not doing any research work at Tracadie, but we are using the latest treatment. Some research work, I think, is being done at Williams Head, where the cases are more active.

Mr. MacLAREN: Who is carrying on the research work there?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Doctor Brown, the chief officer there.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would like to clean up this matter regarding the accuracy of our records with respect to convictions under the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act. The record that I have here is for the same year, I think, as the minister gave, and indicates that his figures are about more than three times the amount given to me. I would like to know whether or not the records we get from this department are reliable.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The information that I have here, given in answer to a question by our late friend the former member for Frontenac-Addington, shows a total of 343 cases dealt with. That, I think, coincides pretty well with what I have given my hon. friend here.

Mr. McGIBBON: That does not answer my question at all. The minister simply repeats what he said before. I have a return here for the year ended September 30, 1928. The question is, "How many persons were convicted for illegally selling any of the following drugs: opium, morphia, cocaine, or any of their derivatives?" The answer is 61. The minister gets it up in the hundreds. This return is signed by the deputy minister.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): When was that return made?

Mr. McGIBBON: It was made this session.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): What date?

Mr. McGIBBON: February 26.

Mr. MALONEY: Does the ministers' three hundred odd cases mean convictions?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is rather strange that there should be two questions. I am reading the return as taken from Hansard on February 27th, and it shows a total of 343 cases in 1928.

Mr. McGIBBON: The point I am making is that we cannot rely upon the information we get from this department.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the statement to which my hon. friend is referring.

Mr. McGIBBON: I will send it over if the minister doubts my word.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am very glad to have inquiry made, but there is surely something wrong.

Mr. McGIBBON: That is the same difficulty we had this morning in connection with the Department of Immigration.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No; my hon. friend should not complain, because we are trying to give him information.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister be good enough to give us the convictions by provinces?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The federal convictions were Nova Scotia, 1; Quebec, 83; Ontario, 15; Manitoba, 5; Saskatchewan, 7; Alberta, 11; British Columbia, 67; making a total of 189. The municipal convictions were: New Brunswick, 3; Quebec, 30; Ontario, 53; Manitoba, 18; Saskatchewan, 1; Alberta, 2; British Columbia, 66; making a total of 173. The grand total therefore is 362.

Mr. McGIBBON: In comparison with the number of addicts, does the minister consider that the percentage of convictions is high enough?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The 8,000 addicts have nothing to do with these convictions.

Mr. McGIBBON: But they must be getting their supply somewhere.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Generally speaking we have had a good year. We have caught some large traffickers and with the cooperation of the municipal police we have also secured many of the smaller ones. These have been apprehended and taken to court.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is nice for the minister to take credit for what the municipalities are doing.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am willing to give credit where it is due, which my hon. friend is not prepared to do.

Mr. GARDINER: The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross) entered a strong protest against the sentence meted out to one of the medical profession who had been convicted of supplying narcotics to addicts. From what the hon. member said it would appear that this doctor was irresponsible. Does the minister find many cases of irresponsibility among the professional men?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, some of them are irresponsible.

Mr. GARDINER: Can you give accurate information?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, I should say that a medical man who has become a trafficker is not fit to be at large.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the position of the patients of these irresponsible medical men? Do not these patients deserve some protection? What is the department doing to weed out irresponsible doctors?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some of my hon. friends are complaining because we are arresting these men and putting them in jail. Wherever we find indications that there are such men we proceed against them. Of course, each province has its own register of medical men and action can be taken against irresponsible doctors and their names struck off the roll.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the minister any information as to what the various colleges of physicians and surgeons are doing with respect to irresponsible men?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): From time to time they have occasion to deal with conditions existing within their respective provinces and when warranted they take the license from a man and prevent him from practising.

Mr. GARDINER: Does the department take active steps to see that the public is protected against such doctors?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As far as we can, yes.

Mr. GARDINER: What action do you take? Give us some information.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The Department of Health does not proceed against the ordinary practitioner for malpractice; that is not the function of the department. If my hon. friend should suffer from malpractice on the part of a doctor he could proceed against him; that would be his duty. If a doctor has been convicted of malpractice it is then a matter for the College of Physicians and Surgeons in his particular province to deal with him. And they do deal with such men from time to time. Surely my hon. friend does not suggest that the Department of Health should inquire into the capacity or incapacity of members of the profession and take proceedings. This is well regulated to-day under the various laws of the provinces and it is not a field which it was intended that this department should enter into.

Mr. GARDINER: I asked the minister whether he had found many irresponsible medical men and the answer he gave would indicate to me that he had and that the colleges of physicians and surgeons in the various provinces are not looking after their business. I submit that the minister's department has some responsibility in this regard.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend is wrong when he says there are many irresponsible men.

Mr. GARDINER: I merely took your answer.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I never stated anything of the kind. I am glad to say that there are not many irresponsible medical men. I do say that when a medical man gets to the stage where he is trafficking in narcotics he should not be allowed to practise; and he is not, because he is prosecuted.

Mr. GARDINER: Under this item is provision made for the testing of proprietary medicines?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Is that merely for purity or for efficacy and purity as well?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Both.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What action did the minister and his department take after his attention had been drawn to the fact that this man who was being prosecuted was an irresponsible practitioner? Did the minister report him to the register of the medical council of the province, or what did he do? I am referring to the Kingston case.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not know just what was done. We proceeded against this individual, and while preparations were being made to have him arraigned in court a further inquiry was made, probably at the instance of the College of Physicians and Surgeons or of some of his friends. The result was that he was committed to an institution and we withdrew the prosecution. As regards referring these cases to the college, it is not necessary; the cases are known through the newspapers and the courts. The profession is aware of these cases.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is hardly a good enough procedure for the minister to follow. When this case arose I pointed out that a grave injustice was being done an irresponsible person. Had the minister, after his attention had been directed to the matter, looked into it carefully, he would have found that this mounted policeman did not even bother his head; all you had to do was to look at the man to know that there was irresponsibility there. The minister would then have applied to the registrar of the medical council of Ontario to take action. It was when I wrote concerning the case and called attention to what would happen that certain friends, realizing that the man would be prosecuted, took action. I pointed out at that time the injustice of prosecuting such a man. That man might have sold the drug to children or to anyone else, because he was irresponsible. He was not the type the minister would get after for purposes of prosecution. It is quite true that he took money, but, as I say, he was not responsible at the time; and it seems to me that there should have been, as the act provides, cooperation between the federal department and the provincial authorities in the interests of public health.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The chief officer tells me that after conviction the department does notify the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): But why prosecute an irresponsible man?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend is hardly fair.

[Mr. J. H. King.]

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is easy to say "Here is a man selling drugs for money," and so on, but I am sure that if the minister knew the case as well as I do he would not support the prosecution. The federal department easily could have cooperated with the province of Ontario in order to get that man out of the practice of medicine.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is our business to get him out of the practice of trafficking in drugs.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Am I to understand that to be the position of the department? I should have expected a medical man to be more compassionate in the case of a fellow practitioner than to have him sent to gaol and publicly punished and then, when he came out, have the whole thing repeated. I do not think that is cooperation for the public good.

Mr. KAISER: Perhaps I might be permitted to complete the remarks I made the other evening, which unfortunately I was not able to finish at the time. I want to emphasize the fact that the public health workers and public health authorities of Canada disagree absolutely with the attitude of the government and the Minister of Health in regard to the jurisdiction of the Dominion in this important question. In order that I may present the authentic attitude of the public health officers I desire to read part of a speech which was made at one of their meetings here in Ottawa:

> In 1849, probably because the return of cholera, legislation was enacted by the parliament of Canada to establish a "Central Board of Health" and further regulations were passed in 1866.
>
> Four of the provinces entered confederation in 1867 and others at later dates. The basis for confederation was the British North America Act which definitely set down the matters hereafter to be within the jurisdiction of the provinces. The subjects not mentioned came under the control of the Dominion parliament. As health is not mentioned at all in the act, it would seem that the control of health matters should have remained within the jurisdiction of the Dominion.

I think the reason for Dominion jurisdiction should be plain to the minister, if he has ever paid any attention to the requirements of national health. In connection with any other question on which joint action of the provinces is necessary that then becomes a Dominion matter. Can anyone tell me when there ever was an epidemic which came just to the borders of Ontario or any other province and then stopped? Surely, with

this in mind, it cannot be argued that the question of health is not a matter for Dominion jurisdiction.

A great deal has been said with regard to the efforts put forth by the various provinces and municipalities in Canada in connection with the matter of health, and I would like to place upon Hansard exactly what is being done by these provinces and municipalities, as follows:

	Provincial	Municipal
Alberta	$171,365 00	$150,000 00
British Columbia	82,154 00	132,145 07
Manitoba	96,000 00	79,000 00
Nova Scotia	74,924 72	121,226 67
New Brunswick	97,298 28	60,103 14
Ontario	753,250 00	1,300,000 00
Quebec	622,000 00	150,000 00
Saskatchewan	222,726 23	521,875 39

That gives an aggregate expenditure by the provinces and the municipalities of $4,563,068.50, which, added to the expenditure of the Department of Health, makes a grand total of $5,454,529.32 for public health work. The addition of the sums spent by voluntary societies probably would bring this expenditure to over six million dollars. In other words, we spent about 54 cents per head in connection with public health as compared with an expenditure of about $2.55 per head, which, as I pointed out the other night, is necessary in order to carry on anything like efficient public health service.

In this connection I would like to read also an editorial from the Canadian Public Health Journal with regard to the question of creating health units in various parts of the Dominion. As I mentioned the other night, we are the only country claiming to be civilized that has not resorted to this method of grappling with the question of national health. The editorial states:

> One cannot but feel that, in view of the proven fact that organization of the county health unit type will definitely save life, a determined effort should be made to make such organization possible for the whole of Canada. The relative poverty of any section of the country should be no reason why that section should be neglected. After all we are all Canadians whatever province we live in, and surely the duty of the Dominion government is to see that in every part of Canada the most valuable of our assets—human life—is cared for.
>
> Dominion subsidy of the provinces on condition that the provinces and municipalities do their part is the only solution of the problem. The Canadian Public Health Association has no hesitation in urging every member of parliament to give vigorous support to such a project in the full belief that the Dominion-wide scheme which should result would pay heavy dividends in the lives and health of citizens saved for Canada.

There are so many things which could be done by the Department of Health that it would undoubtedly weary the house and perhaps even the minister, if that were possible, to enumerate them. But I want to ask the minister whether his department has joined in the world-wide effort now being made to grapple with the disease of cancer. We know that in Canada this terrible scourge is spreading rapidly, as is the case in all other civilized countries, and we should endeavour to do something to mitigate its effects. There is not sufficient radium in Canada even to take care of the patients able to pay the tremendous fee charged, let alone to take care of the afflicted poor people of this country in order that they might have some hope of relief and of stopping the onrush of this disease.

The old practitioners in Canada can remember the terrific feeling they had when in other days they stood beside the bedsides of children suffering from diphtheria and who died by the hundreds and thousands. We remember when antitoxin was discovered and marvelled at the results obtained. The most gratifying moment I ever had as a practitioner or as a man interested in the public health of this country was when the provincial board of health, of which I was a member, was enabled to give the people of Ontario this wonderful remedy free of charge and thus enable the poor children of our province to have access to relief from the terrible scourge of diphtheria. Old medical practitioners will tell you that up to the time this antitoxin was discovered they never knew of a case of laryngeal diphtheria being cured. From the date of its discovery many are able to say that they have never seen a case which has been fatal.

The Dominion government should step in and lend its aid to some of these progressive movements and offer a service to the poor people of our country at cost or better. When I think of what could be done and when I see how little has been done by this department, when I look at the words "Minister of National Health" there is only one picture that comes to my mind, and that is: a golden breast plate on a basswood coffin.

Mr. WHITE (London): Could the minister give us some information as to the prevalence of cancer in this country; whether it is on the increase or decrease?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am satisfied that it is on the increase; I have not the figures here but there is no doubt that this disease is increasing.

Mr. WHITE (London): What is being done by the department to fight this terrible disease?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The department has not undertaken any investigation of that character. Investigations are being carried on in the universities of the world and by other organizations, but I am sorry to state that up to date very little progress has been made in the effort to find a cure.

Mr. WHITE (London): I have some figures, compiled by a specialist in the treatment of cancer in this city, and which deal with the prevalence of cancer and the mortality rate. I have not checked these figures but I assume they are correct. This specialist states that in 1906 the mortality rate per 1,000 in the city of Ottawa due to cancer was 69.5; twenty years later, in 1926, that rate had risen to 115. In 1906, the mortality rate from tuberculosis was 156, and in 1926 it had decreased to 71.2. These figures show that while the mortality from tuberculosis has decreased 54 per cent, the mortality from cancer has increased 66.33 per cent.

It seems to me that the Department of Public Health might very well consider conducting a program of education so that the people of this country would be advised as to what steps to take in these cases. The educational work with relation to tubercular treatment started about twenty years ago, and the above figures show the degree of success that has attended that movement. It seems to me that cancer could be handled in the same way. I agree with the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Kaiser) when he says that we should have a supply of radium, but there is another phase of the matter which should be considered. In certain cases radium can be used to excess with resultant harm rather than good, but in view of the fact that the ravages of this disease are increasing so rapidly it seems to me that the Department of Public Health should pay some attention to this matter.

Mr. McGIBBON: How much of this amount of $150,000 is for salaries?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Salaries, $83,575.

Mr. McGIBBON: What does the balance represent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Travelling expenses, $5,500; printing and stationery, $4,000; scientific apparatus and chemical supplies, $14,500; legal expenses, $30,500; sundry expenses, $11,925; making a total of $150,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister give us some details of that $30,000 for legal expenses?

[Mr. J. F. White.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Those expenses are incurred through proceedings taken under the Food and Drugs Act and under the Narcotics Act. I do not think I have the details before me of the information which the hon. member would like to have as to who received these fees. I think there was a return brought down a week or two ago giving the information for previous years.

Mr. McGIBBON: We are having a repetition of our experience this morning; when we desire information we cannot get it. In every case we receive the answer that a return is going to be brought down some time, probably next year or the year after. The outstanding feature of the last few days in connection with the estimates for every department, has been that we are unable to obtain any information. Does the department retain any solicitors?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is it not the duty of the Solicitor General to handle some of these cases?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The department pays the expenses involved in the prosecutions, although the Department of Justice taxes the costs. I have a report here for the legal expenses for 1927-28, if the hon. member is interested in that. The payments were as follows:

P. Monette, Montreal	$11,215 82
Phelan and Richardson, Toronto	1,295 70
Wood, Hogg and Bird, Vancouver	1,951 10
Accounts under $1,000	6,401 24

There are many prosecutions, and it runs into a good deal of money.

Mr. McGIBBON: What department employed those lawyers?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The Justice department.

Mr. McGIBBON: And has not the minister or his department anything to say about that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We apply to the Department of Justice for the services of a lawyer. We have been doing work with their cooperation and seeking to get a firm of lawyers who will specialize on the work in the larger centres. That is being done in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver. We think we get better results in that way.

Mr. McGIBBON: Are all those firms on the patronage list?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not know anything about a list?

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the name of the firm in Toronto?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Phelan and Richardson.

Mr. SPENCER: I should like to draw the minister's attention to many requests which members have had with regard to full-time health units and the suggestion which has been made that the Department of Health should help these units throughout Canada, providing the money that has so far been provided by the Rockefeller Foundation. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to very excellent speeches which have been delivered by several hon. members on this side of the house who happen to belong to the medical profession. Assistance to these health units was advocated by one of them the other night, but I do not think the minister gave any reply in regard to the matter. This seems to be an excellent opportunity for the Department of Health of the Dominion to step in and do some really constructive work. There is not the slightest doubt that although these health units have only started in a small way in Quebec and British Columbia—and I understand an effort is being made to start some in Alberta—nothing would do more for the public health than a properly organized effort in this respect supplemented by help from the Dominion. Without taking up further time of the committee, I should like the minister to make a statement as to his opinion in regard to this suggestion and whether or not some help may be expected in the near future.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): With the idea of the establishment of health units in Canada the department is thoroughly in accord. We think it is an excellent measure, but to date the government have not considered that they should provide a portion of the money required to develop these units. It has seemed to us that if this policy is to become general throughout Canada and to be applied in various counties or districts, which would form units, it should remain, as it is to-day, under provincial control. That is the system which has been followed largely in the United States, where the conditions are very similar to our own, the only variation being in the devastated areas in the Mississippi district where the federal government stepped in and contributed. Outside of that the matter is left to the municipal or state authorities.

Mr. SPENCER: Did the Rockefeller Foundation not give a great deal of help in the United States?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, in the United States, and also in Quebec. That is a field which they have undertaken and in which they are doing very good work.

Mr. SPENCER: As Canadians we cannot very well expect to receive help continually from an outside association.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the Rockefeller Foundation are doing in that regard what they are doing in very many other fields with the tremendous funds at their disposal. It is true that they have come into Canada at times and subsidized various experimental institutions and health organizations. I think the work carried on by the mental hygiene council here is being subsidized very largely by the Rockefeller people. These health units are made up of counties or districts where the population would run from 20,000 to 30,000 and the annual cost is estimated at from $10,000 to $15,000. Under the system, a full-time medical officer is stationed at a point within the district. He has a staff of nurses, assistants, clerks and so forth; he carries on a campaign of education, and is at hand to control epidemics. No doubt that plan is working well, not only in the United States but in some of the provinces and in other countries. So far the Dominion government has not considered the matter of giving grants from the federal treasury to these health units.

Mr. SPENCER: I take it for granted that the government has not closed the door on the possibility of a grant being made.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No; it is being considered.

Mr. COTNAM: I should like to get a definite statement from the Minister of National Health with regard to his attitude on the question of establishing local health units, and whether his department intends to co-operate with the municipalities and the provinces in this matter.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have just said no; it has not been so decided at present.

Mr. COTNAM: It seems to me that the Department of National Health functions for the purpose of not functioning. It is very difficult to understand why we have a department of national health. I should like to know exactly what the functions of the department are. In what way is the department contributing to the general health of the Dominion of Canada? There can be no question in the mind of anyone in this country to-day that the greatest question of all is the preservation of our national health, and the federal Department of National Health is simply

juggling with the question in order to avoid spending a little money to help the provinces in their work of maintaining the public health. The time has come when there should be a little more cooperation. This is not a political question; it is a great national question—the preservation of the health and happiness of the people of Canada.

The hon. member for Ontario a few moments ago spoke about the use of radium. Is it the intention of the minister or of his department to nationalize the supply of radium in the Dominion? This is one of the live questions in the country to-day as regards the public health. The supply of radium in most of the cities is owned by private individuals, and as everyone is aware, radium is a very expensive metal and the treatment is also costly. At the present time radium is owned only in small quantities by medical men in various cities. I think the statement was made a short time ago that some eight private physicians in Toronto and the Toronto General hospital own all the radium in that city. Radium to-day has become one of the outstanding necessities in the treatment of the great plague of cancer which is abroad throughout the land. Practically every medical man in Canada who has had any experience in treating malignants, knows that there is no question that malignancy at the present time is greatly on the increase, not only in this country but throughout the world. Any method which even promises something of hope to those poor people who suffer from cancerous diseases, anything that will offer them any hope of life or relief from pain, should be supported by the Minister of National Health. In Sweden at the present time they have nationalized the supply of radium, and the government and the Department of National Health should nationalize our supply so that in convenient places they could have establishments with adequate supplies of radium where these sufferers could be sent. People who cannot afford the treatment should not be deprived of the right to have it if it is going to lengthen their lives or relieve them from suffering. If that radium were supplied by the government and placed in accessible localities with men skilled in its use, this would be indeed a great boon for the poor people of the Dominion. There are many people in this country who are wealthy enough to procure treatment in places where radium is obtainable in sufficient quantities, but unfortunately many men own radium in such small quantities that it is not adequate to relieve the trouble it is intended to relieve, and so I would impress on the minister the necessity of coordinating the work of his department with that of the provincial departments and considering seriously the necessity of establishing medical health offices in counties throughout the Dominion to cooperate with the provincial departments of health. I would also urge upon him the extreme necessity for nationalizing the supply of radium in this country, and considering in what way he can best cooperate with the provinces in order to relieve the suffering of people in this country who are afflicted with cancer and at the present time are not able to get the radium treatment.

Mr. WHITE (London): Would the minister make a statement as to the treatment of cancer and the activities of the department in that regard?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have said that we were not dealing in any way with the treatment of cancer.

Mr. WHITE (London): Is not that within the functions of the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have not done so up to the present time.

Mr. COTNAM: I feel very keenly on this subject. I do not think it is the business of the national health department to shuffle all the responsibility and all the work on to the provinces and the municipal health authorities. I would like a definite statement from the minister as to what is to be the attitude of the government and of the department in this matter, whether they are going to back up the provinces and the municipalities in the conservation of the general health of the Dominion. It is a shame that in this country we are spending more on our live stock than we are spending to conserve the health of the people. I believe that the minister should look into this matter very, very carefully and give his decision to the house. Let us know just exactly what the department is doing or whether it has done anything at all towards mitigating the terrible scourge of cancer.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have been very frank. I have told my hon. friend that the department has made no study of cancer, that that work is going on in various universities and laboratories throughout the world. It is now the subject of a great deal of research. I do not wish to repeat what I have said in this house on a number of occasions, but up to the present time our laboratory work has been devoted to maintaining the

purity of our food products, maintaining the standards of drugs and medicines that are required, and protecting the public in relation to the proprietary medicines which heretofore were on the market.

There is nothing in the estimates for health units. I informed my hon. friend a few moments ago that we were thoroughly in sympathy with the health unit idea, but that it did not seem opportune or advisable for the department to supplement what the provinces are doing because it is generally understood that the more decentralized health matters are, the better. What we are doing through our committee on public health has been to bring together and synchronize the various activities that are provincial or interprovincial in character, but I do not believe that the people of this country or that this government or the department are desirous of going into the provinces and trying to supersede or override the provincial health authorities. I can understand my hon. friend and many people desiring that from the treasury of this country there should be money paid to the provinces, but we have been told by those who are in charge of the provincial governments that unless these grants can be made continuous we had better not come in, because it would only involve the provinces in expenditures which they are not ready to undertake. At the interprovincial conference it was decided that it was desirable that the Dominion government should keep within its own field and the provincial governments within theirs, and that if the subsidies granted under the confederation agreement are found to be insufficient for the present needs of the provinces, the matter of increasing those subsidies should be considered. It is well understood in this house that that matter is being given consideration by the government. If the subsidies to the provincial governments are increased, and if they wish to develop health units out of the increased revenues, that is their business, and I have no doubt that they will do it without desiring some outside authority to supervise them.

Mr. COTNAM: The minister says that his department is in sympathy with the health unit movement. It is only natural to suppose that the minister of health would be in sympathy with health matters throughout the Dominion, but the people are looking not so much for sympathy as for assistance. Sympathy may go a long way, but it does not accomplish much. I think the minister is not taking a proper stand with regard to the matter. It is the business of his department to cooperate with the provincial authorities and coordinate the work of his department with that of the provincial department of health in every possible way even to the extent of making grants or using money for research work with a view to mitigating suffering and increasing the general health of this Dominion.

Mr. HOWDEN: I do not propose to answer at all for the Minister of National Health. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Renfrew that the rural health depot is a very desirable movement, and I would certainly like to see the federal health department make grants if possible, towards that movement. However, as we have heard on frequent occasions, it is the desire of the provinces, as far as we can understand, that grants be made at one time to cover everything, and since this is a provincial matter, doubtless in that way sufficient allowance will be made for the provinces to indulge in the rural health depots.

Just a word with regard to radium, Mr. Chairman. The radium treatment for cancer is by no means final and definite. If this government supplied a sufficient amount of radium to meet the needs of all the cities and all the surgeons throughout Canada it would cost millions of dollars, if not billions. Many years ago they used to try and cure cancer by burning it out with plasters of zinc sulphate. This was very often in the hands of quacks. Then came the time when we endeavoured to cure cancer by cutting it out, and if we got at it early enough and cut wide enough we were sometimes able to cure it for a few years. And now we have radium and X-ray, but the treatment is by no means definite and conclusive. If we had arrived at the stage where we were certain of there being a cure for cancer, I would say yes, by all means, let the federal government, the provincial governments, and any other government buy radium for the citizens of Canada. But we are not past the experimentation stage yet, and I think it would be decidedly unwise and quite unjustifiable for the federal government to spend a large amount of money in a supply of radium.

Mr. COTNAM: Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the honourable gentleman in that statement with regard to radium, for this reason: He says that because we cannot cure all cases of cancer, and because it is not a sure cure the federal government should not spend any large amount of money on radium. In the history of medicine, had we all accepted that dictum from the beginning we never would have arrived anywhere. We would not

today be curing diphtheria with diphtheria antitoxin. Radium to-day is accepted as a treatment for cancer which in probably 30 or 40 per cent of the cases is as efficient as surgery; it is much less painful and it is just as sure, and if we can relieve 35 or 40 per cent of the malignant cases that people are suffering from to-day I think we should do everything possible, not spending as the hon. gentleman suggested possibly billions of dollars for radium, because that amount is not necessary, but probably one million dollars which would provide sufficient radium to alleviate a great deal of suffering and sickness, and in many cases prevent the death of people who are afflicted with cancer to-day. I do not think any private individual in this country can afford to own so much radium. Many of the men who are using it to-day are using it in such small quantities that it is not doing the work it is intended to do, and furthermore, many of them have not the experience or training necessary for the proper administration of it in connection with malignant diseases. I am asking that the government do something to assist in obtaining a national supply of radium, even if it only helps to control the scourge, and that they provide men who are skilled in the use of radium, in order to make the best use of that agent which is recognized to-day as one of the most efficient means of treating certain types of cancer.

Item agreed to.

Pollution of inland waters, $16,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the Minister explain what is being done on this?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This appropriation is being expended in maintaining the purity of the water of the inland lakes that is used for culinary and drinking purposes by the shipping of those lakes. There are employed a chief sanitary engineer at a salary of $3,780; an assistant engineer for western Canada at $2,820 a year, and a junior engineer at $1,800 a year. That is a salary list of $8,400. Travelling expenses and miscellaneous $7,600. This work not only relates to the purity of water on the great lakes, but also drinking and culinary water on international and interprovincial trains.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would like to ask the minister if there is anything being done through his department to prevent the pollution of water in rivers in western Canada? I recall being asked the question in my own constituency. Quite a number of people are required to use water from the South Saskatchewan river, and they stated that the water is polluted in many cases by refuse being thrown in, or in various ways it is polluted upstream, and they are obliged to use that water for drinking and cooking purposes because they cannot get well water.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Our activities are confined to international waters such as the great lakes. The pollution of the rivers of the province would come under provincial control. It is true that where information is brought to us that pollution does take place we call attention to it and direct the authorities to take action, but it is under local control.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: In the case I refer to the river runs through two or three provinces. Suppose, for instance, the pollution takes place in the province west of Saskatchewan, what authority would Saskatchewan have to take action?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think we have authority there and would act in conjunction with the province.

Item agreed to.

Marine hospitals, including burial expenses of destitute deceased mariners and grants to institutions assisting sailors, $240,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister tell us how many patients they have had in these hospitals in the past year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some five thousand odd. I think I gave the committee a few minutes ago the number treated in these hospitals. This is an expenditure for the treatment of sick and distressed mariners, who come to our shores as well as those employed on Canadian ships. We operate two marine hospitals, one at Sydney and one at Lunenburg, Nova Scotia. At other ports provision is made as far as possible for treatment of sick sailors, in the various local hospitals. Where there is no marine or designated hospital provision is made for their treatment at private residences. This fund is derived from the shipping that comes to our ports. Two cents a ton is charged for one voyage up to three, that is a ship coming into the port of Montreal would be taxed two cents on her tonnage which would go to this fund. This fund has been in existence since confederation, and the expenditure is very little less than the revenue obtained. Last year we collected $220,048 and expended $189,969.

Mr. McGIBBON: Are these patients all treated free?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is the same treatment accorded to Canadian sailors in other ports?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Similar arrangements are made.

Mr. McGIBBON: If this fund is nearly self-supporting why does the minister ask for such a large grant?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is paid into the consolidated revenue, and we ask each year for a vote of this character.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is not necessary.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We do not use the money that is collected. It is paid into consolidated revenue.

Mr. SPENCER: Can the minister give us the number of destitute mariners that have had to be buried on this side?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am informed comparatively few, probably two, or three, or four, depending on circumstances.

Item agreed to.

Quarantine—salaries and contingencies of organized districts; public health in other districts; Tracadie and Bentinck island lazarettoes, leprosy generally and Public Works Health Act, $210,000.

Mr. FRASER: I see this refers to salaries. What amount of revenue does the Department of Health collect?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The revenue collected in the department amounts to $287,759.48. That is made up as follows: from the Food and Drug Act, $11,193.55; from opium and narcotic drugs, $7,078.50; patent medicines, $7,140.75; sick mariners' dues, $223,283.46; casual revenue, $39,063.22. That will be found on page 77 of the report.

Mr. FRASER: Let me ask the minister if the officials who are responsible for the collection of that revenue are bonded.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some of them are, yes.

Mr. FRASER: I suppose the minister is familiar with the requirements of the act with regard to public officers. Under section 12 he is required to register these bonds with the Secretary of State. Have these officials been properly registered?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. FRASER: I have the report here and the minister's officials do not appear therein. What is the explanation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The sick mariners' fees are collected by the Department of National Revenue in conjunction with our department, and that is a large item. These are bonds in connection with those officers.

Mr. FRASER: Do I understand from the minister that the officer who collects these fees for his department is an official of the Department of National Revenue and not of his department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are agents for our department in the collection of these fees. They are shown under the Department of National Revenue.

Mr. GARDINER: What is meant by "salaries and contingencies in organized districts"? What districts have been organized?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The organized districts are those where there are quarantine stations, as at Victoria, Halifax, Sydney, St. John and Grosse Ile in Quebec.

Item agreed to.

Immigration medical inspection, $300,000.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister might give us an outline of this.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This appropriation is to cover the cost of medical examination of immigrants before embarkation and on arrival at Canadian ports, in accordance with section 5 of the Immigration Act, which stipulates that persons who belong to prohibited classes, physically, mentally or socially undesirable, shall not be permitted to settle in Canada. It also covers the cost of operating the detention hospitals at ocean ports where immigrants who require medical attention are kept. The increase is due to additional provisions made for more efficient medical examination overseas. It is estimated that the roster doctors now being appointed—there are about 450 British men now in that service—will examine about 25,000 prospective immigrants on a fee basis. The average cost will be about $2 each, but it is expected that the British treasury will refund 50 per cent of the fees paid. That is an arrangement entered into last year. Medical officers are also transferred temporarily from Quebec to other stations in the winter and are paid an allowance of $100 a month during that period. Under this vote salaries and living allowances overseas amount to $189,022.50; travelling expenses, $56,500; maintenance of detained persons, including furnishings for an addition to the Savard Park hospital, Quebec,

now under construction, $14,000; roster doctors' fees, $25,000; miscellaneous, printing and stationery, $15,477.50. We have overseas 24 doctors. These were located within the last year more in the centres of the population, the work in the rural parts of Great Britain being done largely by what are known as roster doctors. We have our own roster and make our own selection of British doctors, and, as I have said, there are some 450 of these acting for us this year. On the continent we have men stationed at points of embarkation, namely, Riga, Danzig, Hamburg, Rotterdam and Paris. We meet the people as they come in and they are examined. In Great Britain the service is more extensive.

Mr. LUCAS: How many doctors are there in Great Britain?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are 21.

Mr. GARDINER: Canadian doctors?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. LUCAS: Are these stationed or do they travel about?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are stationed at the larger centres and they travel within that area.

Mr. McGIBBON: In view of that fact, how does the minister explain the enormous sum of $56,000 for travelling expenses?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Although these men are confined to the centres they will from time to time visit rural districts, keeping in touch with the roster doctors on the staff.

Mr. McGIBBON: It seems to me that $56,000 for travelling expenses out of a total of $300,000 is out of all proportion. They must be taking a good many Cook's tours.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No. There is a large sum spent every year in the transfer of officers from Quebec to St. John and Halifax during the winter, and back again in the spring. Experience has also shown us, in regard to the work on the continent, that with the rush of applicants coming in it is necessary to send men from the offices of Great Britain to various points on the continent to facilitate matters.

Mr. McGIBBON: Surely the department must be badly organized when 25 per cent of the total expenditure is taken up in travelling expenses.

Mr LUCAS: Is it the intention of the department to retain the Canadian doctors in Great Britain now that they have appointed roster doctors there?

[Mr. J. H. King.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There must be a number of Canadian doctors in Great Britain to supervise the work, yes.

Mr. GARDINER: What are the salaries paid?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The grade 3 medical officer, who is the chief officer, receives $5,250; grade 2, $4,590. and grade 1, $3,810.

Mr. LUCAS: I was under the impression that, according to the recommendations made last year, after the appointment of roster doctors the department would gradually withdraw the Canadian doctors with the exception of a few at certain points. Apparently, however, they are all still there.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We are withdrawing some of them.

Mr. LUCAS: If I remember rightly, the number was originally 15; now it is 21.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No; we had as many as 25 in Great Britain at one time. There have been two or three retirements and resignations but we are not increasing the number; on the contrary, we hope to reduce it.

Mr. LUCAS: Does the minister think it is necessary for these doctors to be paid travelling expenses amounting to $56,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They must do a great deal of travelling.

Mr. LUCAS: That seems a very large expenditure.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is a good deal of travelling back and forth, and that includes the travelling expenses of our service here as well.

Mr. GARDINER: Are they paid any living allowance over and above their salaries?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes; $75 per month to grade 3 officers; $60 per month to grade 2 officers and $55 to grade 1 officers. That allowance is paid overseas only.

Mr. GARDINER: How are these grades determined?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): By the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GARDINER: Upon examination?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON: Would the minister tell us how much is paid the roster doctors and how much is paid the Canadian doctors?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The roster doctor works on a fee basis, averaging about $2 for

each examination. It is estimated that approximately 25,000 immigrants will be examined on a fee basis and, as I said before, 50 per cent of this amount will be paid by the British government.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In view of the fact that immigration is to be curtailed and in fact restricted entirely to agricultural labourers and domestic servants, will the minister say why it is now necessary to maintain this inspection and, in fact, increase the item by $100,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The immigration has not been curtailed as yet; it is larger than ever this year. If the immigration falls off and the service is not necessary, of course this amount will be reduced next year.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): But my point is that in spite of these inspectors in the old country we are in the unfortunate position of returning from 200 to 300 people each year, even after they have been inspected. Does the minister think that is a very good report; does he think it is fair to these people to be sent back after they have been passed by our selected inspectors overseas?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it can be shown that there has been a falling off in the deportations because of physical unfitness since this service went into operation.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Has the minister any figures showing that falling off?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. In 1927-28 there were 104 rejections on medical grounds and last year there were only 81. Many of the deportations are not made on medical grounds but come about because of the inability of the immigrant to make good. He may have some slight physical defect which would not bar him from Canada; if he fails to get along he magnifies his trouble and blames it for his failure, and to-day the municipalities are very insistent that these people who cannot take care of themselves shall be sent back. I think that largely accounts for many deportations.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Evidently the minister misunderstood my question; I am not referring to deportations but to rejections at our ocean ports. According to page 39 of the report of the Department of Immigration for 1926-27, 539 immigrants were rejected after being accepted in the old country. The following year there was a reduction, but that reduction only applied to Great Britain and Italy. The minister has pointed out that in one year we had 104 rejections, and in the other year 81; I take that to mean rejections made on the other side.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, those rejections were made at ports of arrival.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Then again there is a tremendous difference between the figures of the Department of Health and those of the Department of Immigration. If the rejections numbered only 81 I do not think there would be a great deal of trouble, but here are two official reports. Which are we to believe? We are given what we believe to be official figures with regard to rejections at ocean ports, but the figures of the Department of Health are quite different. According to the figures of the Department of Immigration in one year there were over 500 rejections and in the other year over 300, yet the minister has told us that there were only 81 rejections in the one year and 104 in the other.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am giving the figures for the year just closed.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I have no figures for the year just closed, but I think we have here sufficient evidence of the fact that there is a good deal of unfairness and injustice done these people. I quite understand that according to the law final acceptance is made on this side, but it does seem strange that after an expenditure of $200,000 we should reject 300 people after they reach this country.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They were not all rejected because of physical unfitness.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): We do not know the reasons for their rejection, but I do not think criminality, for instance, would arise in the short period of the voyage. Will the minister give me the reason for these rejections?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Rejections are made in some cases for lack of funds, for immorality, for criminality, for misrepresentation and for many other reasons.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister mentioned immorality. Does he mean that in some cases immorality has occurred after the immigrant has left the other side and before he reaches Canada?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Possibly, but these matters are handled by the immigration authorities. In some cases immigrants may be in Canada for a month or so before they are sent back.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That may be so with regard to deportations but it would not apply to rejections at ocean ports.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are many reasons for rejection.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Where would you get the evidence of criminality or immorality after the man left the other side?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That tendency might reveal itself on the trip over, through theft and so on.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is more serious than I thought. Instead of having a medical inspection perhaps it would be better thoroughly to inspect the individual before he leaves.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Inquiries are made.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Has the minister seen the list of deportations? In view of the pronouncement which has been made that immigration will be lessened, instead of increasing this vote it should be decreased.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There has been no lessening in immigration; in fact it is greater from Great Britain this year than it was last year.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): If there was coordination between the departments the Minister of Immigration would advise that he was going to lessen his work and the expenditure could be reduced in that regard.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There will be that coordination, undoubtedly.

Item agreed to.

Venereal diseases, $100,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Could we have some information as to the progress which is being made along these lines?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is a service in which the provincial governments cooperate with the federal government. There are some 56 clinics in operation throughout the various provinces which provide free treatment of venereal diseases. Laboratory facilities are also provided for diagnoses, and in addition there are subsidiary clinics in the hospitals and institutions where treatment is given. The patients in remote districts are treated through an arrangement with the local physicians. This grant is divided according to the population of the provinces, and the expenditures for 1927-28 were as follows:

Nova Scotia	$ 5,790 00
New Brunswick	4,287 22
Quebec	26,098 47
Ontario	32,425 93
Manitoba	6,743 67
Saskatchewan	8,372 80
Alberta	6,504 21
British Columbia	5,798 23
Printing and stationery	2,837 58

Under the arrangements with the provincial governments they are to spend a like amount of money.

Mr. McGIBBON: This seems to be "a vicious principle" which is followed in the latter part of the minister's estimates, but which cannot be followed in the first part of the estimates.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This arrangement originated shortly after or during the latter part of the war, when it was represented that there would be the necessity of establishing clinics. At one time the amount voted was $200,000. There is no doubt that the establishment of these laboratories and clinics throughout Canada has done a great deal of good and the work being done in the various provinces by certain public health bodies has been very helpful. This is particularly true of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which provinces have been very active in the matter of controlling these venereal diseases.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the minister any information as to whether or not this control is becoming more efficient?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I could not say that we have succeeded in controlling infection from venereal diseases, but where early care and treatment has been given the results have been very satisfying. Human nature has not changed very much.

Mr. SPENCER: Is there any compulsory registration? While I am on my feet may I ask whether the department keeps any statistics based on reports received from the different hospitals, which would show whether or not the disease is increasing?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Every case is recorded and registered; reports are received each month from the clinics.

Mr. SPENCER: How about those who do not attend the clinics?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If we do not get in touch with them we have no report, but every case which comes in contact with the clinics is reported on.

Mr. SPENCER: Do the medical associations report to the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The medical men do, not the associations.

Mr. HOWDEN: The provincial health laws require that all these cases be reported as soon as they are discovered.

Mr. GERSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the minister's statement that considerable good is being done through the work of his department, not only in the way of actual treatment but through the literature which is being broadcast throughout the country. The department publish a great number of booklets dealing with the care of infants, the care of mothers, and subjects of that nature, and these are circulated and may be obtained by anyone who is interested. I believe they are doing a great deal of good. Like other members of the house, I have received quite a few petitions from different organizations throughout the province of Alberta urging me to use my influence with the department to have assistance given in establishing health units, and I am glad to hear the minister say that the door is still open. I hope his department will be able to help the provincial organizations in the establishment of these units in the different provinces, more especially in the more remote districts. We had a very interesting discussion this afternoon on cancer, but I hope that that discussion will not give the people of this country the impression that that disease can be cured by radium treatment. If that should happen I am afraid it will only bring further disappointment to many sufferers. As we know, radium will cure some cancers, if they are in an accessible position and if treated early, but in other cases the results obtained are not as satisfactory as we would like them to be. The hon. member knows that a great deal of research work is being done by the Rockefeller Foundation and like institutions and should the department undertake similar work it would be duplicating what they are doing in this connection. But I do not think the people suffering from this disease should be allowed to get the impression that radium will eliminate their trouble.

Item agreed to.

Pensions and National Health—care of patients and medical examination of pensioners, $2,600,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): On the suspension of this item two evenings ago I asked the minister for certain information. I think it was in regard to the number of patients by provinces and the amount of money spent.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my hon. friend inquired regarding the reorganization of the departments of health and soldiers' civil re-establishment. These departments were amalgamated by an enactment of last year. The deputy minister of health became the deputy minister of the new department, which is now termed the Department of Pensions and National Health. The functions and activities of the former department of health have continued to be administered as a separate entity. For some time the fusion of these two departments will be somewhat difficult. There will be maintained for some years the section dealing with soldiers' affairs and the section dealing with health as we have been discussing it this afternoon. But it is possible to bring about fusion in certain instances. In Vancouver we have the Shaughnessy hospital where we have been looking after the veterans. Vancouver being one of our large seaports, it will be possible to treat a certain type of injured mariner or a mariner requiring surgical aid in Shaughnessy hospital through the staff employed under what is now known as the pension section. From year to year I have no doubt that as conditions develop there will be a union of the two services.

Prior to reorganization we had what might be considered dual control. That is, in the head office the director of medical services was responsible to the deputy minister, whereas in the field the medical officer was responsible to the director of medical services and the administration was responsible to the director of administration. We have made these services directly responsible to the deputy minister.

Possibly the most important item of the reorganization has been the consummation of an agreement with the Board of Pension Commissioners whereby the board have been provided with the necessary staff, medical, clerical and stenographic, both at head office and in the districts. This will enable the Board of Pension Commissioners to control the persons required to prepare the data necessary to accompany applications for pensions to the point where the board are able to adjudicate on

the question of entitlement to pensions and to assess, in cases of injury or disease, the degree of disability present. This staff at present is lent to the pension board and consists of about 100 employees. With this service coming within the purview of the Civil Service Commission, it will then become attached to the Board of Pension Commissioners.

The Department of Pensions and National Health has continued to give effect to the ruling of the Board of Pension Commissioners in the matter of payment of pensions authorized by the board and in the matter of maintaining the necessary statistics and records for such payments. The department also continues to care for what may be termed the auxiliary services, such as the custody of files, which must of necessity be used by the board and the department; the issuance of transportation to men called in for examination for pensions; the medical examination of all men for admittance to hospitals. The above arrangement has been made after consultation with the Board of Pension Commissioners and with their concurrence. In addition to the above, many changes have been made in the method of handling the internal work of the department. Practically all the recommendations of the Scott report have been carried out.

I think my hon. friend asked for a comparison in regard to the staff. The total number employed by the department on January 31, 1929, amounted to 1,973 persons, including 100 lent to the Board of Pension Commissioners, and in March, 1928, the number employed was 1,969. This would indicate a slight increase, but that is accounted for by the fact that whereas on March 31, 1927, we had 48,027 disability pensioners, on March 31, 1928, there were 50,635 and on March 31, 1929, there were 54,620. This means that there is an additional number of pensioners receiving benefits under the Pension Act and under the treatment and hospitalization that is given to that class. In addition, the reopening of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act has necessitated the addition of some ten or twelve officials to take care of new applications and to issue policies, and again some of our medical officers, who heretofore have been on a fee basis, have been placed on a part-time salary basis, thus saving the department considerable sums of money, besides being more satisfactory.

[Mr. J. H. King.]

Mr. BENNETT: Did the minister state how the sum of $250,000 was spent that was given for indigent cases?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will come to that. The total number of soldier patients admitted to treatment during the fiscal year 1928-29 was 8,890 as compared with 8,191 in the fiscal year 1927-28. I have indicated that there is a very considerable increase in the number of disabled men who are receiving pensions for disability and injury, these additional cases being obviously entitled to treatment of their pensionable disability when need arises. My hon. friend the other evening asked in regard to sheltered employment. The care of this class, a problem of the department to which a great deal of thought is given, is causing much worry to the department. Many of these veterans are getting old and are probably suffering from disease incidental to old age. The department is sometimes criticized for the unfortunate position in which these individuals find themselves. Usually they are unable to secure adequate employment, they are too old to be satisfactorily trained in new trades, and are unwilling to be placed in a category where they have to request assistance from the department in the way of unemployment relief. If they are married they do not want to be separated from their families, and they do not want to go into the hospitals or other institutions where they can receive treatment and care. Many of these cases are pensioners who do not require hospital treatment for injury or disease received on service, but rather what is called veterans' care or domiciliary care. Under the recommendations of last year we are taking care of many of these cases. Just here I might explain that when the public works estimates were under consideration the leader of the opposition asked in regard to the construction of a hospital in Winnipeg for the care of the soldiers in that district, and it seemed to be his impression that this hospital was being built and made a standard hospital. That is not the case. As a matter of fact for a period of years we have rented quarters where the convalescent cases or cases requiring veterans' care could be looked after. We have now built in Winnipeg a hospital of 250 beds to which that type of case will go. The active cases requiring surgical or medical treatment will continue to go to the general hospitals in that city.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is this an attempt to take care of the inactive cases?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, largely.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Are they of the old class?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Largely.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is this the first move to provide a sort of home for these inactive cases?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I imagine that eventually it will become that. There is a number of cases in every locality where nothing can be done for the patient in the way of medical or surgical treatment. He requires some place where he can be taken care of. Winnipeg is the only place between the great lakes and Calgary where we have a government institution of that kind.

In the case of the individual who is having difficulty in securing employment in industry, we in cooperation with the various employment bureaus throughout Canada have been selecting these cases. Where they cannot learn a trade, they may be able to perform some operation in the manufacture of some article, and we are trying to place them with various industrial establishments where they can do work of that nature. Some are being taken care of in that way. Unfortunately there are some who are unemployable, and who will have to have something in the way of institutional treatment or care.

My hon. friend also asked in regard to staff terminations. The figures are as follows:

Staff Terminations

	H.O.	N.S. & P.E.I.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Total
1927-28..	22	11	3	37	86	6	6	4	8	183
1928-1929..	33	11	7	33	105	16	3	8	10	226

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In regard to those patients, the number this year is 8,890. When Mr. Melville came to me I asked him if it would be as easy to give the figures by provinces and for two years, this year and last. I just wanted to see what increase had taken place.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): On March 31, 1929, the figures were as follows:

District	General Treatment	Mental	Tuberculosis	Total
A—Montreal district ..	90	275	27	392

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What are the figures for the year before?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Those are not shown by districts.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Mr. Melville said that he would have a table prepared covering the two years, this year and last.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will get that for the convenience of my hon. friend. The proportions do not change much from year to year. We handled more cases last year by six or seven hundred. To continue:

District	General Treatment	Mental	Tuberculosis	Total
B—Halifax district ..	117	39	42	198
C—Ottawa district ..	81	5	13	99
D—Toronto district..	297	9	82	388
F—London district ..	138	427	76	641
G—Winnipeg district.	206	65	44	315
H—Regina district ..	40	82	25	147
I—Calgary district ..	163	50	16	229
J—Vancouver district.	161	98	46	305
K—St. John, N.B. district..	53	4	27	84

I shall be glad to give my hon. friend a copy of that.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is just to see how this keeps up and where the increases are. Where is the increase of 700 generally made up, in what type of cases?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is made up of the increased number of pensioners as compared with a year or two ago, and the fact that we are treating more people for non-pensionable disabilities. There have been

quite a number of that type coming in since last winter. And then again there has been the soldier who is not able to get into institutions for care and treatment who has come to us to receive care and attention in our institutions. Under the veterans' care there were 115 of that type in our hospitals.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): And this is the first year that this type comes under the recommendation made that the department should not turn away the veteran.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Exactly.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I wanted to study this matter to find out just where the increase was, and until I get the information I am not prepared to make the remark I desire to make. Where are the mental cases cared for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Those in the Quebec area at Ste. Anne's hospital; at Halifax in the provincial mental institution, and the same in New Brunswick; in Ontario at London, in the departmental hospital, Westminster; in Manitoba we use the provincial institution; the same in Alberta, and the same in British Columbia.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is there still an inspector of hospitals in connection with these cases? It formerly was Dr. McCoomb; is he still in the employ of the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is there any inspection made or care taken of these cases? Is there any special relation between them and the department after they are confined to those provincial institutions?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Doctor Cathcart is the chief psychiatrist in the department. He is at the present time making a survey of those institutions in western Canada. Last year he made a very comprehensive survey in eastern Canada.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Would the minister state where the tubercular cases are treated?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In Nova Scotia at Kentville; that is a provincial institution. In the Toronto district, at the Mountain sanatorium at Hamilton, the Calydor sanatorium at Gravenhurst, the Byron sanatorium at London; in Manitoba at Ninette sanatorium. That is a private organization. In Saskatchewan at Fort Qu'Appelle; in Alberta at Robertson, and in British Columbia at Tranquille, near Kamloops; in New Brunswick at the River Glade sanatorium, and also the St. John county hospital.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There are some cases treated in general hospitals.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have some in our own hospitals.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What is the wish of the ex-servicemen with regard to treatment in general hospitals?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It varies. When I was in British Columbia last year I found men there who would have been better off at Kamloops, but they asked to come back to Vancouver. They preferred to be in the tubercular ward there. I do not think there is any prejudice one way or the other.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is really a condition that belongs to the case.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think so.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Just a word or two in regard to the reorganization. It looks as if the minister's reorganization has been to transfer 100 medical men from under the old soldier's re-establishment department to the pension board.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend said 100 medical men; that is not so. A staff of 100 has been transferred. That is an important part of the reorganization, but not all, because that established a relationship between the pension board and the department which I am afraid did not exist before.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Then what was known as the "D.M.S." is now known as what?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Director of Medical Services.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): He is still the D.M.S.?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. He is responsible to the deputy.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The only difference then is that these medical men, and the staff connected with them, are transferred directly from the soldiers' re-establishment department to the pension board.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I understood the minister to say that the members of the staff who had retired in the two years he gave numbered 183 in 1927-28 and 226 in 1928-29. Is that correct?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is correct.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Following that up, will the minister now give me the number added to the department during those two years.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I gave the number of retirements for 1928-29; I will now give the number of appointments per district:

	1927-28	1928-29
Staff appointments at headquarters	36	44
Prince Edward Island	5	12
New Brunswick	3	3
Quebec	24	38
Ontario	69	91
Manitoba	9	12
Saskatchewan	4	1
Alberta	4	16
British Columbia	7	18

This makes a total for 1927-28 of 161, and 1928-29, 235.

Mr. McGIBBON: What is the necessity for so many appointments?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In 1928-29 there were 129 resignations; 15 retired on account of ill health; there were 30 surplus; 16 were unsatisfactory; there were 4 cases of misconduct; there were 21 doing temporary duty; and there were 10 deceased.

Mr. McGIBBON: How many resignations were asked for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not know of any asked for, although there may have been some.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How many of these were civil service appointments?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not very many.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): None?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not very many.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Would it be one per cent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Less than that.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister now give us the names of the medical officers appointed last year? First, I should like to have those appointed at headquarters and secondly those added to the different units—that is, full time appointments. Beginning with headquarters, what medical officers were appointed in the last twelve months?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): At headquarters there was the Director of Medical Services, Doctor Millar, and Doctor Davies is doing temporary work in connection with insurance. If my memory serves me, those are all at headquarters, except that Doctor Burke of Toronto entered the service three weeks ago and is now at Ste. Anne.

Mr. McGIBBON: Whom did they replace?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Doctor Millar replaced Doctor Arnold, the former medical director. Doctor Davies is merely a temporary appointee, working under the extended insurance act.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister is not prepared to answer.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, I think so.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would as soon have the list of officers appointed in the last twelve months.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of course, in the field appointments have been made of men who are doing work on a fee basis from week to week. I have not that information at the moment. There are men resigning or dropping out and others being appointed. They are not permanent; they are on a fee basis and their services are obtained from time to time. I have not that information here, but it can be secured and I will see that my hon. friend gets it.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Now I am going to sum up my opinion of what has been brought out during the course of our investigation into these matters. Under this item there are two or three points to be considered. First there is the reorganization, and in making a criticism at this time I must say that one has to forget personal feelings. We all have a kindly feeling for the Minister of Pensions, but as members of parliament it is our duty to investigate the conduct of public affairs, to draw conclusions and if possible to make sensible or reasonable criticisms which at the same time should be constructive. When this department was reorganized one year ago we were led to believe that with the dismissal of the assistant deputy minister and several other officials some really constructive work would be ac-

complished and there would be a reduction in the cost of conducting this work, but what do we find? There has been no reduction at all but rather an increase in every way. I should like this committee to consider for a few moments what has happened. In order to do so you must take your bluebook together with the estimates for the last two years, and that will give you an idea of what has really been accomplished in the way of reorganization.

I find that this department has been reorganized to this extent: There has been dropped an assistant deputy minister whose salary was $4,860; in his place there has been added a chief executive officer whose salary is $4,920. There has been dropped in this reorganization one pathologist and bacteriologist whose salary was $2,820, and there has been added one assistant chemist at a salary of $2,940. There has been dropped one senior clerk at a salary of $3,480, and there has been added one chief clerk at a salary of $3,480. There have been dropped two accountants at salaries of $2,720 and there has been added so far one clerk at a salary of $2,100. In all, the reorganization of this Department of Pensions has resulted in the staff remaining fixed at 93, and there has been an increase in expenditure of $80,000. The total increase in this department has now cost this country $344,000, and that is the result of this reorganization.

Then this item provides for the care of patients. Let us again look up the estimates for two years, and we will find what has been done. In 1927 we were asked to vote $2,075,167 for the care of patients; in 1928 we voted $2,092,339 for this purpose, and this year we are asked to vote $2,600,000. We have no objection to everything being done for these men who have suffered and who to-day are in ill health as a result of the war, but look at the other side of the picture. In order to look after these returned men, whose care cost us $2,075,000 in 1927, we expended $2,713,000; that is, it cost us $2,713,000 for officials and so on in order to provide for these patients for whose care we voted $2,075,000. In 1928 we voted $2,092,000 for the returned men, but it cost us $2,688,384 to expend that sum, and this year we are asked to vote $2,600,000 for the returned men and $2,900,000 for administration. In these days when we believe it possible to reduce staffs and give better treatment and better care with a smaller expenditure, the cost of administration in this department is increasing by leaps and bounds.

How is that increase explained, Mr. Chairman? I can explain it in one or two ways, and first we might look at the report having reference to the hospitals. At Christie Street hospital, Toronto, there are 370 patients; to care for those patients we have a staff of 36 medical officers, practically one for every ten patients, and hospital staff of 198, one for every two patients; at Ste. Anne's hospital there are 398 patients, with 13 doctors and a staff of 193; at Westminster hospital there are 480 patients, with 14 doctors and a staff of 202. It does seem that, having undertaken this reorganization, the minister might have been expected to come to parliament this year and say, "We have reduced expenditures in the way of administration; we have been able to do better work and better results have been obtained for less money," but what do we find? The minister says that two years ago they released 183 members of their staff, and last year 226 were dropped. One would say it was good work to reduce the staff of the department to that extent, but what has happened? To-day the minister comes to parliament with figures which show that while the staff numbered 1,969 a year ago, it now numbers 1,971. Instead of a reduction we have an increase all along the line, and this is the supposed result of the reorganization. I have that criticism to make of the two matters which come under this one item, reorganization and the care of patients. I think that criticism is fair and is one which this house should consider, especially the minister and his department. Surely it is not necessary at this late date for the minister to say that he requires $2,900,000 in order to give the returned men some $2,600,000 in the way of hospital assistance, allowances and so on. I will have further criticisms and further questions in regard to the other items, but that is my criticism of this one. It is based on the minister's own figures and on the figures given in the bluebook of his department, and is my interpretation of what has been accomplished by the minister in the way of reorganization and the care of patients.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If the hon. member had waited probably he would not have fallen into the error under which he seems to be labouring. It is true that there has been an increase of $150,000 in the vote this year; it is also true that we show an increase in staff, but for the year 1928-29 the salary vote is $211,056 as against $277,208, showing a saving of some $60,000, although there has been an increase in the staff. That increase is brought about by the temporary employment of some 10 or 12 people in the insurance

department, and by the fact that we have transferred some of the medical men from a fee basis to a part time basis.

I would like to explain to the house just how the increase of $150,000 is made up. It is estimated that it will cost $200,000 to take care of the free treatment of indigent pensioners, that is, pensioners who, under the act as it originally existed previous to last year, were not entitled to treatment except for their pensionable disability. Then we have an amount necessitated by the legislation of last year, being the amount of pensions in excess of compensation rates previously received by men undergoing treatment by the department, the payment of which pensions is now suspended in accordance with the Pension Act, section 29, amended in 1928. This totals $100,000, making a total increase of $300,000 in this vote. Then we have a decrease of $145,000 brought about by transferring the wages of operatives employed in the orthopaedic and surgical appliances factories and depots which were previously paid through this appropriation, to the salary vote. This decrease leaves a total increase of $155,000, due to the amendments which were passed last year.

The hon. member indicated that our staff was too great at Christie street hospital, and that the cost of running the hospital was too high. I would like to give a comparative statement of the costs per patient in civic hospitals as compared with our hospitals. The civic hospital costs are as follows:

	Per day
50 to 100 bed hospital	$3 45
100 to 200 bed hospital	3 21
200 to 300 bed hospital	3 47
300 to 400 bed hospital	3 58
Over 400 bed hospital	3 69
Average cost	3 45

The cost per patient in our hospitals are as follows:

	Per day
Camp Hill hospital	$2 58
Lancaster hospital	2 87
St. Annes hospital	2 75
Christie Street hospital	3 43
Westminster hospital	2 16
Deer Lodge hospital	1 72
Col. Belcher hospital	2 62
Shaughnessy hospital	2 86
Average cost	2 68

The hon. member says that our staff is too large considering the number of patients. It is true that we are well staffed in our hospitals, but we must be. There must be a change of nurses every eight hours; changes of orderlies are necessary, and we have a general service which is peculiar and necessary to a hospital such as Christie street. In Christie street hospital I think we have as well equipped and as well managed a hospital as any institution in Canada or the United States. I do not think it is necessary to go further into the matter of the staff, other than to say it is in line with the organizations in other hospitals. It is not fair to say that there are so many attendants for each patient, because we have not only the medical staff, but the clerical staff, the nursing staff, the orderlies, the engineers, and the electricians, just like any other hospital.

As far as the expenditures are concerned, we are operating to-day at a lesser cost than any other hospital in Canada, and we include the medical services rendered, an item which is not ordinarily taken into account in the cost of running a civilian hospital.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is that the answer?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it is a pretty effective answer.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does the minister think that it is fair to make a comparison between a general hospital and a hospital which has no overhead charges or anything of the kind?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We include our doctors' services, which is not taken into account in a civilian hospital. We do not count our rentals or the full maintenance or upkeep, as that part is taken care of by the Public Works department.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In other words, it is no basis of comparison and is no answer to my criticism.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a complete answer.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think the minister sees my point.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The one offsets the other.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister is not taking into account the overhead costs, the repairs or upkeep of the buildings; they all come under the Public Works department and the estimates of that department will show an amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars for that purpose. My criticism that there has been no serious reorganization still stands; in other words, there is no reduction whatever. The minister has picked up in one body, as in a bag, a staff of 100 with its medical officers, and transferred them from the director of medical service of his department to the department of pensions.

That is the reorganization which has been made. In other words, he has taken a medical man who was under a senior medical man and placed him under a senior administrative officer with no medical man at the head. When we come to the items concerned, I shall have some criticisms and suggestions to offer with regard to other medical officers.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: There are two angles from which one may approach the subject involved in the item under discussion. Both, I think, are legitimate features; both must be kept in mind, and both are important. One is that from which it has been dealt with by the hon. member for Kingston, who has carefully studied the administrative cost of the method and the results of the reorganization, and has made a very close analysis of the matter from that point of view. I shall not go into that at all, because the other angle from which I wish to approach the subject, together with this one, practically covers the whole question.

The particular feature to which I wish to refer is the service given or the service which may be necessary. On that point I want to speak for a moment in regard to perhaps the most important question that was before the house and the committee last year in connection with the subject of our returned men. I refer to the problem, which we attempted to face and the importance of which we realized, of the men who, not pensionable or carrying very small pensions, find themselves now broken down under what is sometimes called "burning out," sometimes called premature old age, but all, in the opinion of most of us, the result of their experiences overseas.

I am bringing the question up with a dual purpose, the first being that the country—I need not say parliament, because parliament always has the matter in mind—may not forget those things which happened ten years ago. The public memory is short and the vision of things that are passed is very apt to die away. From two points of view it would, to my mind, be very unfortunate if we forget this. The first is, of course, the debt we owe to the men themselves; the second is that, as time goes on and the tangible results of the war fade out, a new generation arises that has not had the experience through either itself or its friends of what war means. If the memory of these things is allowed to die, one of the greatest possible bars against a future war has been broken down. That is one reason why I should like to keep this subject before the people of the country. The other is the matter of the debt we owe. We believe this premature old age or "burning out" is definitely one of the phases of the war which has passed. I think, too, it is one of the phases that we must face more and more seriously as time goes on, and one of the phases in which we shall have the sympathetic interest and assistance of the whole country. In reference to that, and as illustrating my point, namely, that the country as a whole is prepared to accept the problem and deal generously and fairly with it, may I read a very short resolution that was passed by one of our farmer organizations? This resolution was passed unanimously by the United Farmers of Alberta at their annual convention last January, a convention of, I presume, as representative a body of taxpayers as will be found in Canada. The resolution reads:

> Whereas, it is generally recognized by medical men that soldiers who have suffered the hardships of active service are more susceptible to numerous ailments and diseases by reason of such service;
>
> Therefore be it resolved, that we petition the Dominion government to enact legislation granting free medical attention and hospital treatment to all men who served in the Canadian forces overseas during the great war.

This question was brought before the committee last year and was definitely dealt with by them. Their inquiry took the form of a recommendation which again formed part of their report. The preface to the recommendation enumerated the different methods which we are employing to meet the situation, all the different organizations that are trying to deal with these problem cases and care for these men. Then the committee's report stated it as their firm conviction, not only that the problem existed, but that before very long any government in power must take cognizance of it and be prepared to bring down a definite policy to meet it.

As I listened to the minister this afternoon, I noted, with some pleasure, that a number of the minor recommendations were gradually being put into force; that the basis of hospitalization, as given without cost, was being widened and now includes to a large degree the small pension class, those who, pensioned for war disability, still have not a pension which enables them to live. The reason is that a man might have only 20 or 25 per cent or less pensionable disability due entirely to war service, but he might, in addition to that, have other disabilities which, although not attributable to war service, taken in conjunction with the first render him unable to support himself. To that extent the report is met, but the definite part of the

report was this: that the government was asked, through all its various agencies, by way of commission or otherwise, to investigate the question, to see what had been and could be done to meet the problem, and to ascertain, if it thought wise, the methods employed in other countries than our own in meeting the same question. The report concluded with the emphatic statement that, this information having been obtained by the government, it must then be prepared to come forward with some fairly definite policy to meet the situation.

That was the report of the committee, and those are the observations which I have to make—a summing up of facts of which I think everyone is cognizant, a summing up of the opinions of the committee as found in their report of last year. Based on that, I am going to ask the minister to go a little further in informing us as to the extent to which the government followed up that preliminary inquiry and as to the result so far as it may be a guide in the formation of a policy which may meet the situation.

Before taking my seat I should like to say one personal word, not in connection with myself, but in connection with the minister. I am not going to discuss at this moment the question of administrative ability, or the results, either from the administrative or from the economic point of view of the reorganization of the department. But I am going to say this, and I think all in this house, whether they are critical or not, can say the same: Forgetting these other things, we are glad to have a minister who at least takes a sympathetic view of this question, and who did I believe give to the committee all possible assistance, both personally and through his department. I would ask the minister to trace the steps that were taken to conform with the report of the committee last year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The committee last year made a recommendation as to treatment:

> That provision be made for free hospitalization without pay and allowances in respect of non-service disabilities for all pensioners who are unable to provide the same at their own expense.

That recommendation has been acted upon, to the advantage I think of those who have not the wherewithal to pay for the treatment which they would ordinarily secure at their own cost.

We have the problem of what to do with the man who is getting old and burning out. He cannot find employment and he has his difficulties. He has a small pension. Under the legislation that existed previous to last year he would not be entitled to treatment except for his pensionable condition. To-day that case is provided for. As far as the accommodation available within our own institutions and within contract hospitals is concerned, we have gone as far as the American people if not further, because they provide that they will take care of the soldier who is in distress, and who has not the means to provide for his own care and treatment only so far as the accommodation in their military hospitals will permit. They do not go into the contract hospitals except in the possessions outside of the United States.

I made a statement this afternoon in regard to some of those cases where the men are disabled and are growing old. The officers of the department in conjunction with different organizations in the larger centres are trying to find some form of employment for these cases in addition to what is given in the vetcraft shops that are maintained by the department in the larger centres throughout Canada. I stated that if it was found, after study of the individual case, that a man owing to age or disability, could not be trained to follow some occupation, he might yet be able to carry on some particular operation in an industry, and in that case he would be trained by the department to do that particular job, and we would seek employment for him in that industry. During the time of his vocational training the department would subsidize and maintain him. If he was able to learn that one operation and could fill a place in that industry doing the thing he had been trained to do, he would become self-supporting and earn a decent livelihood. That work has been going on for some time. As time advances, these cases become more difficult because the men are growing older and they have suffered from the fact that they have not been able to have the employment which they certainly would like to have had. The results in our vetcraft shops last year were rather encouraging. We took in 169 new men, and 132 were discharged, the total number on strength being 296. It is the object in these shops to train a man, and afterwards to find him employment outside the shop, keeping the personnel of the shops moving on from time to time. Last year I think we were more successful than previously in bringing in some who had been outside and in finding places for those who had been trained within. I might add that we have a departmental committee which is collecting data in regard to this type of case. That information is being

assembled in the department. This year it is proposed to have competent officers go into the various centres and study the problem there and see what is being done, and within the next year or two I am in hopes that it will be possible to evolve a policy that can be followed.

We are now some years away from the war. As was stated by the committee which did such excellent work last year, and by the House of Commons, our problems are not settled yet. For some time yet, before they are completely settled, they will require consideration from year to year. I mentioned this afternoon the new building that was being constructed in Winnipeg with a view to providing a place where a certain type of case, if it does not require active hospital treatment, could be sent to be cared for under conditions that are more pleasant and probably better and less expensive than in a general hospital.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Minister of Public Works gave the house to understand that the Winnipeg General Hospital had served notice that the soldier patients had to leave. I think the superintendent of the Winnipeg General Hospital states that that is not correct. Would the minister be good enough to explain the situation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I had an opportunity last year to meet the superintendent of the Winnipeg General and the authorities of the St. Boniface hospital. It was indicated to us that they could not increase our accommodation within their building; in fact, they needed to build additions to take care of the civilian population, and they could give us no further bed space. We had previously had control of Deer Lodge, an old wooden building, where we were taking care of some seventy or eighty cases, convalescents and cases of that type. We decided that within that very large area extending from Port Arthur to Regina and even further west we required some place that could be used for the care of convalescents and for veterans' care, and that is what this institution will be used for. That is a step which I think will be taken in other parts of Canada. It is true that we have some buildings that could be utilized, and they are being kept in shape in case it should be necessary at a later date to utilize them; but no such building existed in Winnipeg to take care of the type of case that I am speaking of. As regards those who are suffering from active illness or require active medical or surgical treatment, they will go to the general hospitals in the city of Winnipeg.

I was going on to explain that we have in Canada a medical service provided through various organizations—in the railway service of Canada, in the great mines, and in the lumber camps. Many pensioners are working in those occupations. There is no reason why this parliament should assume treatment of men who are already protected, and they will be excluded from the proposals that I have just outlined. We also have excluded the infectious case, the case of tuberculosis, the case of insanity, and the case of venereal disease. Insanity is a charge upon the province, and it is taken care of. For tubercular cases provincial sanatoriums have been provided. As I have already stated, in the matter of industry where medical services and surgical arrangements have been made, they are taken care of.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are any grants being made to provincial tubercular institutions for veterans who are being cared for by them?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If they are suffering from tuberculosis due to war service, we pay for that. If they are suffering from insanity due to war service, we pay for that. But in the field the case is not pensionable, tuberculosis for instance, becomes a provincial charge just as it is for any civilian; and in regard to infectious diseases, the same. I hope that I have covered that sufficiently.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am glad indeed to see that there is a movement in that direction. I will admit that it is a pretty slow movement, but still it is there—

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): Order. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Maloney) had the floor.

Mr. MALONEY: Mr. Chairman, I really do not wish to intrude on the hon. member for Red Deer, because I agree entirely with many of the sentiments which he has expressed, as I do with those of the Minister of Pensions and National Health. He has referred to the case of the tubercular patients, also those who happen to become insane. Of course both, if the result of war service, are entitled to care and treatment at the expense of the people of Canada. I would like to remind this house of the fact that more than 500,000 men left Canada during the war to do service in Europe in defence of what we believed to be right and justice. Before these men left Canada they were promised aid of every kind should they return. A great many did not return. The great bulk, of course, did, many of them maimed for

life. Those who came back diseased as the result of their service are receiving the care and attention of the government of this country, but it has been my fortune as a practising physician to come in contact with a number of men who for four years served their country faithfully and well overseas. These men to-day are suffering from tuberculosis. They received their discharge as medically fit; many of them, anxious to get out of the service, afraid to bring to the attention of the medical officer their real physical condition, were allowed to go as medically fit. Others who may have been looked upon as medically fit at the time of their discharge are to-day, through the exposures to which they were subjected during the war—although the result of those exposures may not have been patent to the medical officers when they received their discharge—suffering from tuberculosis, insanity, or other diseases. I will say this for the Minister of Pensions and National Health that in respect to any case that I have brought to his attention, he has been, as my hon. friend from Red Deer has said, most sympathetic, and in one or two instances he has insisted on these tubercular patients particularly receiving one or two months sanatorium care. That appears to be the extent to which he may go by virtue of his position as the head of this department. What I would like to suggest to the Minister of Health and Pensions is this, that before the next session of this parliament he endeavour to have an amendment to the Pensions Act prepared which would give him authority, or give parliament authority, to allow those who served overseas and who are to-day suffering from tuberculosis, cancer, or some other terrible diseases—even though they were discharged as medically fit—to be admitted to a government institution so that they may be cared for. As representatives of the people and as citizens of Canada it is our duty to help these men who were prepared to sacrifice their very lives in the defence of Canada and the empire.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I want to corroborate what has been said by the hon. member for Red Deer and the hon. member for South Renfrew. During the last year I have had occasion to deal with returned soldiers' problems, and if there is one thing that I have met with that could be likened to a stone wall it is this answer: 'This is a post-discharge disability and not attributable to war service." It has seemed to me that unless a soldier could directly prove, as in a court of law, that the particular disease from which he was suffering was due to war service, there could be no recognition of his case. I do not think the minister needs an amendment to the act. What I do think is necessary, however, is more sympathetic attention from the medical officers who examine these men. I have two particular cases in mind. There was a man—he is not in my constituency, so I am not looking for a vote—who, when he came out of the war was discharged as A-1. He was anxious, like many others, to get back to his farm and to his family. He never went to hospital or to the medical authorities. He said there was nothing wrong with him except that he had had a slight wound in his back, and he never asked for a pension. But in later years he found that this wound in his back was giving him trouble. He went to the hospital or to the medical authorities in Calgary, and they admitted that he had a slight wound in his back which was affecting him slightly. He was awarded a small pension. We have been trying for some time to get something more for that man We are simply told, "We cannot prove that his trouble is due to war service." They say, "We know his blood pressure is going up, we know his pulse is away beyond normal and that he is dying, but we cannot prove that his trouble is due to war service." After an infinite amount of trouble the man was taken to private doctors who found what the medical authorities ought to have found. He was one of those men who would hardly open his mouth to say anything for a pension; he would rather suffer and die. He was dragged out from under a wagon on his farm in an unconscious condition before he had even applied for a pension. When the private doctors took him in hand what did they find? They found that this man was suffering from a shrapnel wound in his back which was lessening the amount of expansion of his lungs, and that on several occasions he had been badly gassed. But these facts were not reported to the medical authorities, and the army medical men did not seem to have questioned the man to find out. It took two private doctors to do it. That is one case, and it is one of insanity. We are told that the trouble cannot be proved to be due to war service, but I contend that you cannot prove it to be due to anything else. To-day that man is in the asylum while his wife and children are trying to get along on the farm as best they can. The minister should instruct the medical authorities to be somewhat more sympathetic in their consideration of these cases and to examine such a man as

this with the same close attention as they would any of their own patients. Let them make the examination with the object in view of attributing the trouble to war service rather than to undertake the examination with the determination to prove that the man's condition is due to something else. These examiners sometimes make the statement, which fills one's heart with bitterness—"It is not on your sheet; your trouble must be due to some post-war cause."

Mr. ARTHURS: There is one suggestion I have to offer to the minister. Is it not possible for his doctors to suit their golfing hours to the convenience of men to be examined, particularly in urgent cases? I know of one man who was sent to Toronto for examination for supposed tuberculosis. This man was a pensioner. He was in Toronto for some thirteen days and he informs me that all the examination he received was a cursory one when the doctor—not the ordinary doctor, because I must give the department credit where it is due; this man was filling a vacancy —came in after golfing and examined him along with a number of other men. This man had travelled 200 miles or so and was superficially examined and then sent home. He was taken back, it is true, and examined, but a proper examination should have been made in the first instance. I submit to the minister that the golfing hours of the doctors at Christie street should not interfere with their professional duties.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have my hon. friend's statement and will check it up; we will look into the matter.

Mr. McGIBBON: I take this occasion to voice an objection which I have received personally from a number of patients at Christie street hospital. This is not hearsay; these men have themselves informed me of the facts. After going through major operations they were denied the comforts of a private ward and instead were wheeled out to the public ward and left there to recuperate, to the discomfort both of themselves and of other patients. This is actual fact and I think it is an absolute disgrace to this country that after men have fought for its liberty and have suffered to the extent of becoming inmates of one of its hospitals they should be made to undergo treatment of this sort, being placed in what is equivalent to association with pauper patients in public hospitals. Is the minister aware that this is the fact?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am very doubtful. I am satisfied that we have an excellent staff of men at Christie street, associated with whom are the best men in the city of Toronto. I am very sorry to hear my hon. friend make this charge. I shall certainly have inquiries made and if our soldier patients are not receiving the attention which they should have, the matter will be looked into. Let me say, however, that I have been attached to the department now since 1926, and while it is true that occasionally there are complaints from individuals or their friends, I know of no organization in Canada or in any other country, carrying on work of a similar character, which receives as few complaints as we get at headquarters from the various hospitals. Generally speaking, the men themselves who are treated in the hospitals appreciate the type of surgeons and medical men employed, and I do not think it helps matters for my hon. friend to make such a statement. With regard to the joke about golfing surgeons, that also will be looked into. I understand that these men have definite hours and the patients are being moved through the hospitals more rapidly than before.

Mr. ARTHURS: Too rapidly.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, not too rapidly. They are receiving treatment and are being moved to their advantage.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister is skilful; he is answering an objection I did not raise. I am not complaining about the doctors; I am protesting against the treatment which patients receive after operations in the hospitals. And this comes to me not from one but from many patients. On inquiry I have found that the practice to which I have referred is common. There are always exceptions, of course, but this practice is not exceptional. I hope the minister will see that it is remedied.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Now that the minister is in a sympathetic mood I will make certain representations to him. He says he does not think these things happen. Well, I will put up some cases I know of as having actually occurred. He knows as well as I do that there are good men and bad men in the service; he knows that there are careless and indifferent men. He has in Ottawa a man who did not see service but who nevertheless says that any married man who went overseas was a damned fool for having done so. Now how much sympathy can you get from such a man? Here is another case: A certain man for two years was described as a lead-swinger. He was sent to Christie street

hospital and at my special request he was operated on there and found to have a fractured spine, three vertebrae being tubercular —a most serious condition. Yet, as I say, that man for two years had been called a lead-swinger by medical examiners in the service. Just two or three weeks ago an employee in this department died suddenly. That man was on service with me. When he was examined in the city of Ottawa he was told that his trouble was his wife. What can you say when such things as these take place? What will be the feeling of the examiner in such cases as these who finds, for example, that the patient whom he has been describing as a lead-swinger, on going to the hospital is found to be in a most dangerous condition, having to have three vertebrae removed? What sort of heart has the man who examines a patient and dismisses him with some silly diagnosis?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No doubt silly diagnoses are made.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister has now a newly appointed medical officer in Toronto. I did not wish to refer to this, but this matter having been brought up I feel it my duty to mention it. This man is Doctor Smirle Lawson. A man told me distinctly that this doctor was sent to examine him and he saw in the place a picture of Sir Henry Drayton. The doctor asked, "Is that man a friend of yours?"—pointing to the picture. The patient replied, yes. Then there is nothing the matter with you, said the doctor. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that when anything like this can happen such a man has no right to be examining our returned soldiers. Sir Henry Thornton, for example, has instilled the proper spirit and morale into the employees of his department, and I think that might be done in this case as well. If the minister will simply say, "I will not stand for such examinations" he will see that proper care is given these returned men. I have here a written report on an Ottawa man which was sent me the other day, and I would like the minister and the members of the committee to listen to it:

> Physically he is of the asthenic build, tall and spare, with fair muscular development, however, with the exception that in the lower abdominal region of both sides there is a muscular laxity which might easily be corrected by proper exercise. . . . .

Imagine that; a man who was old enough to enlist eighteen years ago is now told that there is a laxity in the lower part of the abdomen which could be benefited by proper exercise, and the report says there is no doubt that this laxity contributed originally to the hernia which occurred during the war.

> There are some stigmata present: The ears stick out prominently in the lower half, the upper being directed inwards close to the skull. He wears strong glasses corrected for both astigmatism and myopia, which he had changed not over six months ago. The sclero-corneal margin is not an exact circle, but is irregularly ovoid in shape in both eyes. The whites of the eyes are bluish in colour, suggesting a deficiency in the sclerotic coat, an infantile relic. There is considerable scoliosis in the lower thoracic region with convexity towards the left. In accordance with the curve of the spine the lower part of the left chest posteriorly appears to be small.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a man is sent up complaining of certain symptoms following an operation for hernia which was produced in the war, and against that are put up conditions which might have gone against his enlistment but which do not enter into the question now. He has now returned, with these infantile relics which are mentioned; he has given four years of good service; he lost one brother in the war, another brother is a chronic invalid in Christie Street hospital and he is not getting a pension. I hold that that kind of an examination is absolutely unnecessary. I think it is not right that a man who complains of pain following an operation which was occasioned by the war should he told that he is asthenic, that he is not physically well developed and that he has astigmatism, which he had before enlistment and in spite of which he served four years overseas. In other words, it looks to me as though this man is being framed with all the stigmata and so on which possibly could be brought up against him in order to prevent him from getting his due. Either the man has a condition which was occasioned by the operation necessitated by the war or he has not such a condition. I did not intend to refer to these matters, but the minister said he doubted whether this sort of thing went on, and I thought this a good way to show him. I realize that the minister has good and bad men in the service; he has negligent men, with some of whom I have had to deal, and there is only one thing to do. Whether the man is a political friend or opponent he should be told that the first duty of this country is fair treatment to the returned men regardless of politics.

Mr. MALONEY: Whether the difficulty lies in the angle at which the ear appears to hang; whether it is due to laxity in the lower abdominal regions or whether it is due to tuberculosis, insanity or any other disease, I would like to ask the minister this question:

If we have another session of this parliament would he be prepared at that time to introduce an amendment to the present act giving to himself or some other body authority to bring these people under the law and give them the aid to which they are entitled?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter is being considered, and some advance has been made this year.

Mr. MALONEY: Will the minister consider that point?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend knows that is now under consideration, and considerable advance has been made this year.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the minister be good enough to tell us how many patients received treatment under the regulations recommended by the pension committee last year, and what was the cost of extending medical aid to indigent soldiers for disabilities not due to the war?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There have been 600 or more cases in and out during the year, increasing our hospital days by about 200,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: And what is the cost?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We estimate that under this vote it will cost some $200,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: Were any such applicants refused?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, I do not think any were refused if it was shown that they were in need and could not afford treatment.

Mr. McGIBBON: How was it ascertained whether they were in need?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Under the recommendation of the committee last year.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister says these treatments were given if it could be shown that the men were in need, and I would like to know what proof they must furnish as to their being in need?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Inquiries are made in each case. I know of one case which was brought to my attention this year in which it was suggested that the hospital bill of a certain returned soldier should be paid by the government. Upon investigation it was found that this man had a good position and that he was unmarried and living with his parents, who were well to do, so we did not consider that the bill should be paid by the department, since the condition, which was acute, was not pensionable. The recommendation of the committee last year was very plain; they suggested that provision should be made for free hospitalization for non-service disability for all pensioners unable to provide such treatment at their own expense. That has been carried out to quite an extent this year, and in all some 600 patients have received treatment.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister contradicted himself; in answer to my first question he said that no applications had been refused, but he has just told us of one which was refused.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I said that no application was refused which was within the restrictions imposed by the committee last year, and having regard to the conditions I mentioned a few moments ago.

Mr. McGIBBON: I think the minister mentioned the limitations later, but I am quite willing to accept his statement. Here is the point: Is the evidence of a medical man who might examine one of these patients sufficient to meet the requirements of the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. POWER: A medical man cannot say whether or not a person is destitute, any more than anyone else.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am simply asking for information. Who is the final authority?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The superintendent of the hospital where the application is made will ascertain the facts through the channels at his disposal, and he decides.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is his decision final?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not necessarily.

Mr. McGIBBON: Where would the appeal lie then—to the minister?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. McGIBBON: Where to?

Mr. KING Kootenay): It would probably come to headquarters. There are also appeals made to the minister, and that will always be the case.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what he is there for.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am not objecting to that; I would rather go to the minister than follow down the military routine.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That would be very difficult.

Mr. McGIBBON: I just wanted to know what procedure to recommend to these people when they come to me.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Have them apply to the medical superintendent of the local hospital.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion with respect to the matter now under consideration. Could not something be done which would swing the evidence required to determine whether a condition was post-war or war a little more to the side of the person affected? I have experienced the greatest difficulty in reconciling my judgment to the judgment of the authorities as to whether or not a present condition was post-war or war. I do not think any court of law would require evidence to be offered on behalf of the plaintiff in a negligence action such as is required by the department in these cases. During the last twelve months the department has applied a much severer test in these cases than is required to render a defendant liable for negligence.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think the hon. member really means the department; is he not referring to pensions?

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I am speaking about at the moment. Last year the chairman of the committee, in discussing this matter, made it abundantly clear that the very sincere efforts of the committee would be expended towards making the discretion so elastic that the injured soldier would receive the benefit of any doubt that might exist, and if there was any doubt as to post-war or war causation, the benefit of that doubt would be given in favour of war causation.

Mr. POWER: May I explain?

Mr. BENNETT: I have just one word more to offer. I have had a large number of cases of that kind brought to my attention, but I do not desire to make any further observations about them for the simple reason that this matter has been dealt with so fully by my colleagues that it is unnecessary for me to make any further comments.

The second matter I desire to comment on is the delay. I know of cases which have been kept under consideration not for one year, but for two years or more, and then suddenly the man is told that his condition is attributable to war causation. A considerable period of time has intervened between the moment the man became unable to earn anything and should have had attention, and the time he is told that he will receive attention. It is not too much to say to that man, "We will give you that back pension."

Mr. POWER: The statute restricts the period of retroaction to six months, and the committee felt that it should not go beyond that.

Mr. BENNETT: It is only a question of the application. The law is all right, it is the administration of it which is at fault. I do not think we could have a better illustration placed upon Hansard than that given by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross). I think the house will agree, and I do not think the medical members of the house will think it an unfair criticism, when I say that that case offers the strongest possible illustration in connection with this matter. I put this proposition to the minister: Why should these men, sometimes without friends and stranded, have to run the gamut of the pension board and the appeal board? They may be told to obtain some additional evidence, and they are put to the necessity of collecting that evidence. I think the committee must have intended something better than that.

The minister answered a question put by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) as to how a man who is suffering is to obtain hospitalization. I put this case to the minister, and this is not an imaginary case, it is a real one: A man finds himself in serious financial straits. He is physically unable to work; he is suffering from an illness and he goes to a military hospital and applies for free hospitalization. They say to him, "We cannot take you in." Between the time of application and the time of admission I have known of cases where the man was well-nigh dead by the time he reached the hospital. There is not one member of the house who does not know what that means. I do not think parliament meant that at all. An ex-service man in a condition such as I described who applies to a hospital should be taken in at once, and the inquiries can be made. He would then be receiving immediate treatment and would be better able to get along. There have been cases where admission was finally granted and the poor man was not alive at all. That is a condition which the minister can remedy. All he has to do is to say to his medical men, "If a man apparently in indigent circumstances comes to you and applies for hospital treatment, take him in and then make the inquiries." It is

a sad reflection upon this country to see these men, as I have seen them, I am sorry to say, dependent upon the generous treatment of their fellow men and the kindness of those to whom their condition appeals. They are forced to rely upon the kindness of their friends to place them in a hospital or a private institution or some place where they can get enough to eat and receive decent care and attention which will keep them out of pain.

Those are the two matters I wished to comment upon; the granting of relief in the form of pensions, and making it a little more speedy and easy to obtain hospitalization.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with the last portion of the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), and the minister tells me that he is also heartily in accord. It would seem to be a serious ground for complaint that applicants should be obliged to wait until their cases are investigated before they can obtain the treatment which they need so badly. I think the minister should give the strongest possible instructions to his medical superintendents and others to see to it that they act first and investigate afterwards.

I think the next point is a more serious one and will be more difficult to settle.

Mr. BENNETT: It is more difficult, yes.

Mr. POWER: The matter of the onus of proof, that is really what it amounts to. This was seriously considered last year by the committee. It has been said very often in this house and throughout the country that if a man was accepted for the army then the onus of proof should be upon the government in refusing him a pension.

Mr. CAHAN: Does not the hon. member agree with that?

Mr. POWER: No, I do not, and I will explain why. That point of view was presented very clearly to the committee by the soldiers' organizations. One class of patients was mentioned, I think it was the amputation cases, which seemed to be more deserving of consideration than any other class, but the committee refused to place the burden of proof upon the shoulders of the government. The committee felt that if it was the government's duty to make evidence against a pensioner, if I may put it in that way—and I think my hon. friends will follow me—and if an applicant for pension should at once be granted it unless the government could show that the man was not entitled to it, we would be face to face with an almost impossible situation in this country.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BENNETT: That was not the case I meant; that is the extreme case.

Mr. POWER: That is the extreme case. There is perhaps a great difference between that case and the ordinary ones which we have every day where a returned soldier makes application for pension and the board turns him down on the ground that there is nothing in his war record, in the medical evidence or in his medical history sheet to show that the disability was due to service. But let me put the matter in this way to the committee. The statute provides that pensions shall be awarded to persons who suffer from disability or disease incurred on active service or due to service in the forces of His Majesty.

Mr. McGIBBON: Or for aggravation.

Mr. POWER: I am leaving out for the moment the question of aggravation, because that is more complicated. Before almost any court evidence would have to be adduced that the disability or disease was incurred on service or due to service. The Board of Pension Commissioners, I am informed—and this was shown quite clearly to the committee last year—allowed, in order to connect the disability with the service, evidence to be made which might not be allowed in any court of law. For instance, we were told by the chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners, the chief medical officer and other members of the board that they would permit a comrade of the soldier to appear before the commissioners and say: "Well, at such and such a date I have a recollection that Bill Jones told me that he had severe pains in his chest," evidence dating back eight or ten years, circumstantial evidence—

Mr. BENNETT: As to appendicitis.

Mr. POWER: Evidence of appendicitis, of pneumonia. I know a number of cases were cited by the members of the Board of Pension Commissioners wherein they stated that they had accepted evidence which, to my mind, would not have been accepted in a court of law. On the other hand, the chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners says: "If you tell us that the onus must be on us to disprove the claim, then I must state quite frankly to the committee that it will be impossible, in the vast majority of cases, for me to find any such evidence, because we have not at our disposal, nor do we think the country should have at its disposal the machinery to go seeking evidence contrary to that made by a soldier before the board." That, perhaps, would commend itself to the committee generally.

Mr. BENNETT: That was not the case I was making. I said that they required too strict proof to relate the condition to the service. Do I make the matter clear to my hon. friend? If there is an action for negligence, my hon. friend knows that, before you can succeed, you must prove that the damages suffered are related to the cause alleged. My difficulty has been that they are too strict in their requirements as to the relation of the condition to the service rendered. It is not a question of onus of proof at all.

Mr. POWER: Perhaps they are too strict in asking for evidence showing the relation of the disability to the service. The committee refused to allow any presumption.

Mr. CAHAN: Is there not a strong legal presumption that necessarily arises from the fact that the government examined a man and found him sane and whole before it enlisted his services?

Mr. POWER: My hon. friend from Rimouski suggests to me that there is the certificate of discharge and the medical evidence given on discharge, but it never entered into the minds of any committee that the medical evidence and certificate of discharge should be taken as valid proof of any obligation which the state might have to the soldier or as to the condition of his health.

Mr. CAHAN: I am speaking of the medical examination on his enlistment.

Mr. POWER: I think my hon. friend makes a very good point; that is, there should be a presumption that the man was in good health at the time he enlisted. I am sorry to say that the conditions surrounding the enlistment and the acceptance of our soldiers when they went overseas were such that we can rely very little on the medical evidence given at that time.

Mr. BENNETT: The man should not suffer for that reason. He went away and served the state on the strength of that certificate as to his health.

Mr. POWER: I do not think the theory laid down by the hon. gentleman has as yet been sufficiently explained to any committee which has dealt with the matter to permit them to accept that generally as a rule of conduct, nor, do I think the pension authorities, generally speaking, will accept it. There have been cases known where a man with a wooden leg was accepted for services overseas.

Mr. CAHAN: That must be facetious.

Mr. BENNETT: That is a fact.

Mr. POWER: There was the case of a man with a glass eye. In order to cover such cases we put specifically in the act a clause referring to those disabilities. We said that a man might not claim pension on the ground of some disability which might have been obvious before he enlisted.

Mr. CAHAN: I am asking this simply because I think my hon. friend is thoroughly informed as chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWER: He has forgotten by this time.

Mr. CAHAN: He is not an expert surgeon or physician and therefore he may satisfy the curiosity which I have as to the basis of some of the decisions which have been rendered. Assume that you give some weight to the legal presumption that a man, who was examined and who enlisted upon that examination, was sane and sound at the time of his enlistment. Supposing, on the other hand, you give some weight to the fact that we must acknowledge from actual experience that men came through and received their discharge under conditions which made it impossible to ascertain their exact condition at the date of discharge. I have come into contact with hundreds of these men who have come to me and, although I am no expert, although I know nothing about medicine, nothing even about my own ills, I am convinced, from coming into contact with men whom I knew at the time they enlisted whom I knew at the time they were discharged and whom I have known since, that it was impossible at the time at which they obtained their discharge for the ordinary physician to form any idea as to whether they were not then liable to develop serious mental and nervous diseases. Four out of five men whom I know, who came through the war, came through with disabilities which did not fully appear until after they had obtained their discharge. I do not wish to make personal references, but I have come into contact day by day with men who went through the war, and it was only the exceptional man who came through without serious physical or mental deterioration as a result of the war. I am sure that many of them have since shown physical disabilities, unknown at the time of their discharge, which ought by some process of reasoning to be referred back to their experiences during the war.

Mr. POWER: My hon. friend has probably had experience in drafting legislation. Had we at the very beginning of our career in pension legislation said, "We are going to name a board of pension commissioners, and to this

board we will give absolute discretion in the awarding of pensions," I personally am of the opinion that we would have done a very good thing. Instead, however, we have built up pension legislation, and on every occasion when this legislation was revised, it was revised to bring in one particular set of cases, and in opening the door wider to include that particular set of cases, we probably allowed in hundreds of other cases that were not as deserving as they might have been. On many occasions it has been the judgment of this house that we should surround the discretion of the pension board with certain safeguards. I can remember arguing on both sides of that question myself, arguing one year that the board should have discretion, and then the next year, after it had badly exercised that discretion, arguing that we should take it away from them.

Mr. McGIBBON: That was after you crossed the floor.

Mr. POWER: No, from both sides of the house. I never defended the board.

Mr. CAHAN: I can bear witness that the hon. gentleman has always acted with fairness and impartiality.

Mr. POWER: Thank you, sir. It is extremely difficult to legislate for these cases which my hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George and I believe deserve a pension, that is of men who ten years after the war are beginning to feel the strain of the war, who at the time they left the army were just as healthy, or appeared to be, as when they joined, but who on account of the strain of those four years are beginning to feel they are not the men they might have been had they not gone through it.

Mr. CAHAN: More seriously broken than that.

Mr. POWER: I am taking the lighter cases, but I will go further and take the case of the man who when he returned was apparently in perfect health but has since broken down mentally and is now in a mental institution. We cannot prove that this man's mental disease is due to his war service. If we take the premises of my hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George we could say he was sane when he went over; we know the difficulties he had to meet, and we should therefore assume that those difficulties had some effect on his mental equilibrium. I am quite willing to agree with my hon. friend, but let him remember that bringing in these cases will go a long way to increasing our pension bill, and not only that, it will lead to the bringing in

of persons who do not deserve to receive support and assistance from the state. After all, every man who put on a uniform is not entitled to a pension. Some of them came back better off than when they went over. Let us be frank. We can have every sympathy and pay every respect—

Mr. CAHAN: You mean better off physically.

Mr. POWER: Yes, better off physically; I will say that. The open air life and the hardships probably did many of them good. I am not stating as a general proposition that the war was a good thing for a man instead of his daily dozen; not at all; but I do say that the exercise that he got, the physical training and the setting-up exercises in the open air did help a great many men to a healthier standard. But that has taken me away from my argument.

Either we must say to the board, "You have discretion to award a pension to every man who was a soldier; now use your discretion," or else we must surround the board with certain safeguards. If we are going to surround it with certain safeguards we must make the soldier prove the relationship between his service and his disability. If we say that he is not obliged to prove this, then we leave the door open. I agree with the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George that the members of the pension board might allow the natural inference which the man in the street would draw to have a greater sway over their opinion and their appreciation of the disability which is brought before them.

Mr. BENNETT: The irresistible inference.

Mr. POWER: Yes, but it is extremely difficult for anyone to draft legislation which will include in it an inference.

Mr. BENNETT: It cannot be done.

Mr. POWER: The whole matter then lies in the kindness of heart, if I may so put it, of the persons who are appointed to administer the act.

Mr. CAHAN: Or rather in their judgment.

Mr. BENNETT: Is not the difficulty that the irresistable inference which we say should follow is too often measured by purely technical and professional evidence rather than by those standards which the average man uses in a jury negligence case?

Mr. POWER: Absolutely. We are in entire agreement, but I do not know how to get over that difficulty.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is not the judgment of the pension board based on the report of the examining medical board, and ought not the doctor who examines the returned soldier to help him connect his disability with his war service?

Mr. POWER: I quite agree.

Mr. ADSHEAD: If the medical authorities at the first examination would help him to connect his disability with his war service he would get a better show than he now does, when he tries to establish that years after the war.

Mr. POWER: I quite agree, but it must not be forgotten that this parliament has also set up certain assistance to the soldiers through the appointment of official soldier advisers in the different districts, and the official soldier adviser, after some experience in handling these cases, while he perhaps does not know all the technical details of every disease, does know as much about the subject as the ordinary lawyer would who was presenting the case, and he knows what evidence he should produce in order to obtain a judgment in favour of his client. Besides, and I say this advisedly, I have had a large number of pension cases in which there were some involved technical medical points; I have submitted them within the last year or so to the service bureau of the Canadian Legion, and I find that the unprofessional staff, men who are not doctors or lawyers, connected with the Canadian Legion understand far better than any doctor or any lawyer with whom I have ever conversed just what evidence should be submitted to the board in order to win the case. I am saying that without in any way wishing to appeal to the legion. It is simply a matter of practical experience. These men, having worked at this for a number of years, know their job probably better than the ordinary physician or lawyer.

Mr. CAHAN: And know the psychology of the judges.

Mr. POWER: Yes, I had forgotten that. Perhaps I had better not say it.

Mr. McGIBBON: With a great deal of what the hon. member for Quebec South has said I agree. He will recall that on the pension committee last year it was suggested by some of us, and confirmed by the Board of Pension Commissioners, that a great deal of this trouble resulted through the soldiers' cases not being properly prepared. A suggestion was made which I think would have overcome a great deal of this difficulty had the committee adopted it, namely, that these men be allowed to employ their own solicitor or some competent person to prepare their case. To my mind, after sitting on a number of these committees, that has been the whole crux of the trouble. Take a man away back in the country; he is probably not sufficiently educated, does not know the law or does not know the procedure to follow, and he has no one to advise him. I remember distinctly asking some members of the committee if they did not think that is where the great trouble lay and their reply was in the affirmative. I am going to suggest to the minister that he take that into consideration; that these men making application for pensions have the privilege of employing their own solicitor at a stated fee, which need not be very much, so that their case will be properly prepared before it is presented to the board.

Mr. POWER: I remember very well that before the committee last year the member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) urged with considerable eloquence the proposition which he has just placed before this committee, but the other members of the committee did not see fit to agree with him. The argument against my hon. friend was that the members of the committee did not consider that we should create in this country a class of pension lawyers. We fear that by inserting in the act provision for the payment of fees to any solicitor who wished to take on the case of a returned soldier we might create such a class of lawyer, and I am informed that in the United States this class has not raised the standard of the bar, the standard of any person. That is why the members of the committee did not favourably consider that recommendation.

Mr. McGIBBON: Yes, but I think they made a mistake.

Mr. POWER: We may have.

Mr. BENNETT: There are just two questions that I would like to ask arising out of the discussion. Does the minister think it is a fair thing that a soldiers' adviser should be a Liberal politician who seeks votes and is a member of the legislature? I regard that as a crying scandal. I am not mentioning any names at all, but here is a man who is a soldiers' adviser; he is a member of the

local legislature; he is a Liberal candidate. Is that fair and right and just? I leave that to the minister. The second point is this: the minister said, "we accept evidence that would not be accepted in a court of law," which is quite true. Does the minister think the recommendation of a minister to the medical branch of the pension department, under personal cover, is sufficient reason for the favourable consideration of a case?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Soldiers' advisers are appointed on the recommendation of the various soldiers' organizations. I think my hon. friend has reference to one individual who took part in a recent provincial election but who retired from the position of soldiers' adviser.

Mr. BENNETT: He has been appointed again.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): After the election he was reinstated in his position at the request of the executive of the soldiers' organization in that province. I do not know that there would be anything very harmful in that. He is well thought of by the soldiers' organization and has been doing very good work.

Mr. BENNETT: Before the minister leaves that, what does he think of that same gentleman actively participating in a Dominion election on behalf of his party? That is the point I am desirous of making.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are not civil servants.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. That means that the federal government is paying for a soldiers' adviser to assist them in getting votes at the election. Is that fair?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some of the soldiers' advisers assist the other party too.

Mr. BENNETT: The point is this—and the minister does not seem to realize it—is it fair and just to the soldiers who may desire to vote the other way to find themselves in the position where they are relying upon the assistance of a soldiers' adviser who is telling them their duty is to vote for the government? This is a concrete case. I am not mentioning names, for reasons that are obvious.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it is very bad practice, but it applies to both parties.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no such case as the one I have mentioned.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not as being a candidate for election.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BENNETT: No, and resigning and coming back when the federal election is on. I am sure the minister will agree that human nature is being put to too great a test when we ask a man whose case is just in the balance to decide whether he will yield to the importunities of his adviser who says: vote for Doctor King; don't vote for his opponent or vote against the government. This gentleman conducted a political meeting in a particular locality that I will not mention at the moment. It is the principle that I am contending for. It is too much to ask human nature to resist the temptation to please the one who can assist him.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it is bad practice myself.

Mr. ESLING: Mr. Chairman, the recent speaker, I think it was the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) referred to the soldiers' adviser and said he could very well be of assistance to a man who was applying for a pension or for hospital treatment. Before dealing with that I would like to ask the minister if a pensioner or an exserviceman in straitened circumstances who is suffering and requires hospital treatment can have access to a local hospital.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. ESLING: On whose recommendation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In practically every locality we have a local representative of the department. If he finds a pensioner eligible for treatment he can place him in the hospital, advising the medical representative of that district, and that advice comes through to headquarters.

Mr. ESLING: When you speak about the local representative, is he the local medical examiner?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. ESLING: Well, the local medical officer.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. ESLING: It is not necessary for him to appeal to provincial headquarters or to the head of the provincial unit?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He must report to provincial headquarters.

Mr. ESLING: Yes, but can this local representative of your department put that man in the hospital for treatment without charge?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, if it is an urgent case and he can show it was necessary to put him in the hospital.

Mr. ESLING: Supposing this soldier is suffering and is in straitened circumstances. He has a family and is unable to employ a physician, and has not the proper facilities at home for care; is he permitted to have treatment at a local hospital other than one of the hospitals connected with the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend knows that we are dealing with some 500,000 or 600,000 men who went overseas, and there must be some rules and regulations made to apply. I think we made it very evident that on the recommendations of the committee of last year provision has been made for the treatment of pensioners with non-pensionable conditions. In case a man is taken suddenly ill, and the case is urgent, he can go to the local doctor, and if the case is as the hon. member says it is it will be taken care of, there is no doubt about it. But I will assure him of this: there will be a thorough inquiry and the man who recommends that case for hospital treatment will be held responsible for his diagnosis.

Mr. ESLING: I have no intention of being captious at all. I merely want to ask the minister if the recommendation of a local physician knowing the case—I am talking about small communities, not of our large centres where there are departmental hospitals —would be accepted for the free treatment of a returned man, whether he be a pensioner or not, if he is in straitened circumstances? I am bringing this to the attention of the minister for the reason that it is a request from one of the local legion, and now is a good time to have a clear and perfect understanding of the matter, because by the time a man goes through a lot of formality and correspondence and communication very often his condition becomes worse than it would be if he were given immediate care.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have men in the field who receive a fee for attendance. There is a regular fee arranged between him and the department. He is not a regular salaried officer. There are many of these men scattered throughout the Dominion, available in all small communities. Now to give the right ad libitum to an officer to receive into his office, or to go to the applicant's home, or to place in a hospital any applicant he sees fit would involve the country in a tremendous bill of costs. We must have rules and regulations. If a case is urgent and the man can prove this to the department the officer can certainly admit the case. But we could not have on the staff an officer who would adopt this practice indiscriminately. We have cases coming before us from time to time where it is represented that great urgency exists, and we have found out that there is so such urgency. We have also known it to be represented that a man had not the means to take care of himself and we have discovered the fact to be otherwise. All the facts are taken into consideration by the officer in charge, who knows the local conditions, but you cannot run wild in these matters; as I say, there must be rules and regulations. I am safe in saying that we have gone further than most other countries in this regard, in that we are to-day giving pensioners treatment for non-pensionable disability, and we are adding greatly to the number of patients who are being admitted to hospital. As regards the representations made by my hon. friend, I have stated that if the case is one of urgency and the local officer can so show to the head of the department he is entitled to take that patient in.

Mr. ESLING: Must the local medical officer necessarily go to the head of the department? I do not want to be captious, but is it not within the discretion of the local officer to send a man to a hospital which is not departmental? The minister knows that there are no departmental hospitals in the interior. May I ask him whether there is one in his district?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No. In regard to the pensioner coming in for treatment—the pensioner who has a non-pensionable condition —we require him to go to the departmental hospital. That has been the practice in the United States, and the man is admitted only when there is room for him, the pensioner of course having first consideration in the matter of accommodation.

Mr. ESLING: But the departmental hospital may be a considerable distance away. Where, for instance, is the departmental hospital nearest to the minister's own community?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have in the district representatives—

Mr. ESLING: But I am speaking of the departmental hospital.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): —who report to the head of the department. If the local medical officer can prove that a man requires immediate treatment his recommendation will be accepted.

Mr. ESLING: I do not seem to be able to get my case to the minister. I want to know whether the local medical officer has the dis-

cretion to place a man in a hospital, other than a departmental hospital, without communicating with the nearest departmental official.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): What type of case?

Mr. ESLING: Any type of case where a man is ill, or has a disability, or is in straitened circumstances. It would cost him a considerable sum to go to the nearest departmental hospital.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We should expect a man to go to the departmental hospital or to a hospital with which we had a contract.

Mr. ESLING: Well, where is the departmental hospital nearest to the minister's own community of Cranbrook?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In Vancouver.

Mr. ESLING: And it costs $25 to get there and $25 to return; that is the ordinary fare without travelling expenses. Moreover, considerable delay is involved. Would it not be more expeditious, and would it not be to the advantage of the man himself, to have him placed in a local hospital?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In all probability that would be the practice.

Mr. ESLING: If the medical officer saw that the man was in straitened circumstances and was ill, surely that ought to be done. Will the minister not concur in the suggestion that there should be some local discretion among the medical examiners employed by the department? Are these local medical examiners permanent, and are they paid a salary, or do they receive fees.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some act on fees and some receive a salary.

Mr. ESLING: I do not know of any man who could be of more assistance to returned soldiers than the soldiers' adviser. Now let me cite a case. Here is a man who went overseas and was wounded. He applies to the medical board or to the local medical examiner and is informed that it will be necessary for him to have an X-ray taken. The man has a wife and family. He has been working in the woods or in the mines, and his disability increasing, he is compelled to cease work. It is suggested by the medical examiner that he should have an X-ray taken. He writes to tell me that he had the X-ray taken at a cost of $25. He was able to borrow $15 of that amount but he still owes $10. Does the minister think that is a reasonable condition to exist? The pensions board has all these facts before it. It does not seem to me that a man who has been overseas should be subjected to any such expense as that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Now I know my hon. friend wants to be fair.

Mr. ESLING: Yes, I do.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): May I point out to him that the question of eligibility for treatment under the act is with the pensions board. Last year we extended the recommendation of the committee and we are to-day giving treatment to pensioners for non-pensionable disability. It is true, as my hon. friend says, that the people who live in the large centres have an advantage. That applies to everyday life; there are advantages accruing to life in the larger communities; there are larger hospitals and more and better experienced men. Obviously, therefore, the smaller community is at a disadvantage in this regard. The man who enters a civilian hospital to-day with a non-pensionable disability is, under the law of the country, a liability to the civil population if he cannot take care of himself, be the hospital provincial or municipal. The committee last year recognized that in certain cases it was desirable that, even though the condition was not pensionable, the pensioner should receive treatment. The department is trying to use its judgment in dealing fairly with this type of man, although we do not wish to load up the hospitals with cases which are not entitled to be there. At the same time, with respect to those who have not the means to take care of themselves, we wish to do all we possibly can for the returned men. In my own experience I know that sometimes in the interior, when a man is in great need and requires to be taken to a hospital for treatment, the municipal authorities will say, "We will help this man out. His ticket to Vancouver will cost $25; we will send him there and he will get better treatment than he could get in our local institution." We are following the course of the American people in that regard. We have increased very materially this year the number of patients in our hospitals, and I suppose it will show a further increase next year. I know that service is provided, and while there is the difficulty which my hon. friend has suggested I can tell him that in a case of that kind, where hospital treatment is urgently needed,

it will be within the power of our local officers to admit those cases and then show the department that a mistake has not been made and that the case is one which properly should be treated.

Mr. ESLING: I was not speaking of people who are able to pay; as the minister said, we do not want to load up these hospitals with people of that kind. I was referring to the man who is in straitened circumstances.

Now let me proceed to the question of the soldiers' advisers, of whom the hon. member for Quebec South spoke. I believe the services of these men would be invaluable in the local communities if their services were available, but unfortunately they do not seem to be available. I want to ask the minister if he does not consider that ex-service men would be much better off if the soldiers' adviser were made a full time employee.

Mr. POWER: Perhaps I might answer that question, since the matter was considered by the committee last year. As a matter of fact the official soldiers' adviser is a part time man, but he receives a monthly salary; in my mind I had the adviser confused with a man working on a free basis. That is to say, the soldiers' adviser may occupy himself in some other business; if he is a lawyer he may take other clients and so on, but it was clearly shown, for example, that the representative of the department in Winnipeg who, if I may say so, is a very brilliant man, had no time for any outside work.

However, to come to the question asked by my hon. friend, I am not prepared to say that the official soldiers' advisers throughout Canada are the best men that could be found, but I am prepared to say that in every case of which I have knowledge, at any rate up to last year, they were appointed on the recommendation of different soldier organizations. With reference to the question of making them permanent officers of the department, if that is done my hon. friend will find immediately that they lose their status with the returned men, who at once begin to think that these men are paid to turn them down. I think that has been the experience throughout the history of this department. The moment an officer became permanently attached to the department the soldier thought, "This man is in the department and it is his job to turn me down; the government has hired a lawyer to prevent me from putting my case through." I do not make that statement in any derogatory way with reference to the returned soldiers, but I am sure that will be the feeling throughout the country if these are made full time positions, and that was the conclusion to which the committee came last year.

Mr. ESLING: When I make that suggestion I am voicing the sentiments of local branches of the Canadian Legion in my constituency. Many of them have sent in resolutions to the provincial convention at Chilliwack, strongly urging that the soldiers' advisers be given full time positions. Their attitude is that it is not necessary for all soldiers' advisers to be doctors or lawyers.

Mr. POWER: As a matter of fact it is not necessary, and in most cases it is not so.

Mr. ESLING: The soldiers want a man with a practical knowledge of the problems and troubles of the returned man, and as the hon. member for Quebec South said a short time ago, such men can be of great help to the returned soldiers. Some of these advisers receive $3,000 per year together with travelling expenses, and I want to say that there are many very capable returned men who are familiar with the problems facing the returned soldier and who would be very glad to get such a job. Resolutions from the Nelson, Trail and other branches of the Canadian Legion are very strongly in favour of soldiers' advisers being appointed on full time, and these resolutions are being presented to the provincial convention at Chilliwack. There is only one full time soldiers' adviser; he is a barrister and receives a salary of $4,100 yearly; others who are on part time receive from $1,200 to $1,800, and in some cases up to $3,000.

Naturally we must speak on these matters from our local standpoints; I am not very much concerned with the conditions in Quebec or in Ontario, but I am concerned with the conditions in West Kootenay and if I am compelled to bring politics into the matter I will have to do so. All these local branches of the Canadian Legion, of which there are about twelve in my district, are unanimous in this opinion. Here we have a soldiers' adviser who receives $3,000 a year and another $1,000 for travelling and office expenses, and it must be remembered that he is not limited to that $1,000. In the amendment which was introduced last session provision was made that the soldiers' adviser should visit the various portions of his district whenever the minister so instructed him, so I say he is not limited in the amount of his travelling expenses. The local branches in my district feel that a soldiers' adviser would

better serve the men if he made regular, periodical trips to these local branches and met with the members. He might visit them on their regular meeting nights and listen to their troubles, and in that way he would do a great service. For instance, here is the case of a man who went overseas; he was physically fit, a wholesome, upright young fellow, and while he was overseas he received shrapnel wounds in both legs. He was in the hospital in England for some six months, and when he returned to Canada he went into a broker's office in Winnipeg. There he sat down to his work and did not use his legs very much; consequently he did not feel the effects of his wounds at that time. However, some two years later he returned to his little farm in West Kootenay and as soon as he started to follow the plough or the harrow his heels gave way and he was practically incapacitated. It was up to that young man to prove that this disability was due to war service, but as yet he has not secured a physician who will certify to the pensions board that such is the case. So there are two points to be considered: Are you going to take the decision of the physician or are you to accept the conclusion that this disability resulted from those shrapnel wounds?

Here is another case in which the soldiers' advisers might have been of great assistance. This man stated that he received a questionnaire from the department with regard to the revaluation of his land, but it was so complicated that he simply threw it aside and did not make application. In that case a soldiers' adviser would have been of material assistance.

Now I want to take the case to which the leader of the opposition referred. In five years time I think this soldiers' adviser has been in my district only once, except when he was there on political business. He was there in the early part of January, apparently as soldiers' adviser. He paid one visit in August, 1924; he was there twice in October, 1925; once in April, 1926; and again in October, 1927, and on each and every occasion he appeared on the public platform compaigning for my opponent. I do not think a man who is in receipt of a salary of $3,000 a year and is allowed his travelling expenses should be carrying on such practices. Does the minister really approve of these soldiers' advisers taking part in political campaigns when they are in receipt of a salary from the federal government?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I gave an answer to a similar question asked by the leader of the opposition a few moments ago. I think it is a bad practice for people in receipt of government salaries to engage in active politics. But it must be remembered that these men are not appointees of the government.

Mr. BENNETT: That makes it much worse.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are appointed upon the recommendation of the soldiers' executive in their district, and are not considered as being civil servants under the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. ESLING: But the final appointment comes from the minister?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Oh yes, the minister has to make the appointment, but it is made on the recommendation of the soldiers' organizations.

In regard to the resolutions which the hon. member has spoken of, undoubtedly these will be submitted to the central organization and when passed upon by that body they most likely will come to the department and later on be presented to parliament for consideration. I do not think that much can be gained by discussing resolutions of that character, when they must go to the central soldiers' organization to be passed upon.

Mr. ESLING: Would the minister not agree with the suggestion that it might be well to provide, at the next session of parliament, that these men be made full time employees? When the minister provided that they should receive their travelling expenses I do not suppose he intended them to make political trips. I am in receipt of a letter from the Canadian Legion at Trail, which goes to show that there is a considerable political complexion upon this matter. The letter, in part, states:

—the matter of the so-called soldiers' adviser certainly needs some attention. This gentleman recently made a trip through this district—

That was the first official trip to Trail since he was appointed in 1924. The letter continues:

—and, as far as I can ascertain, this was the first appearance of the adviser since his appointment.

Having wired his intention of visiting us he duly arrived and was met by our president (H. P. Kingwell, Esq.,). Following a few minutes of general conversation the adviser left Mr. Kingwell, promising to meet him again at 3 p.m., when it was the intention of Mr. Kingwell to introduce the adviser to several of our pensioners whose claims were not receiving the attention they merited.

At 4.30 p.m. the adviser telephoned to the effect that he was detained. During his stay in fact in Trail he only spent about half an hour on actual business and then left for Grand Forks.

When a man is paid a salary of $3,000 per year and also receives his travelling expenses to visit these different branches of the legion, I cannot imagine the minister approving of such a hurried visit as the one mentioned in the letter. The legion had cases which they wanted to present to him but they had no opportunity of doing so.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the hon. member for Quebec South, who has given the committee such valuable information in regard to this department, use his good offices and influence with the minister in an endeavour to speed up the soldiers' adviser at Vancouver and have him do a little actual work on behalf of the returned soldiers instead of using his time in political activities. If he would handle some of that work it would save the rest of us a good deal of trouble; we have to do certain work for the returned soldiers which he is paid to do.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be very glad to look into that matter.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Is it not a fact that the soldiers' adviser at Vancouver tendered his resignation some months ago?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister give us the particulars of that resignation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It was just preceding or during the election when he accepted an office under the local government and we were advised of his resignation. After the election the matter was brought to my attention by an executive officer of the legion and it was recommended that he be reappointed, and this was done.

Mr. CLARK: Is it not a fact that it was practically voting day before that resignation was tendered to the minister? Can the minister give us the date of the resignation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I was away at the time.

Mr. ESLING: Perhaps I can answer the hon. member, because I happen to have a little information regarding that matter. The adviser received a salary of $3,000 per year and also his travelling expenses. In 1928, apparently in July, as that was the date of the election, $23.45 was paid to Mr. Bruce Boyd. That amount represents the salary for three days, based upon an annual salary of $3,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Mr. Boyd did the work; he was the law partner of the adviser and he did the work and was paid for that.

Mr. CLARK: Can the minister give us the actual date of the resignation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the information before me at the moment, but I shall be glad to get it and give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARK: Does not the minister think that these soldiers' advisers should be considered in the same light as any other civil servant and be obliged to refrain from political partisanship?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it would be just as well, yes.

Mr. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question regarding the treatment of returned men, and why it is necessary to send these men long distances when the work can be done right at home. The minister claims that he is practising economy, but I wish to call his attention to the fact that in the city of Moncton we have a returned man, named John R. Leaman. This man was taking pneumothorax treatments. He was being sent to the sanatorium at River Glade and the department was paying his expenses. For a time he had a pass on the Canadian National Railway, but at the present time the department goes to the expense of sending this man to River Glade and then carrying him into the sanatorium, a distance of four miles from the station, or a total distance of about twenty miles. This work could be carried on just as well in the city of Moncton at the Hotel Dieu, as Doctor Landry is a specialist in this line. I might mention that Doctor Landry was giving this man special treatments on the advice of the doctor in charge of the sanatorium at River Glade, but payment of that bill has been refused. I would like to know why it is necessary that the department should go to the extra expense of sending this man to the Jordan sanatorium at River Glade, when the work could be done at an up to date hospital, second to none in Canada, by Dr. Landry, who is an expert in pneumothorax treatments.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I cannot reply to my hon. friend in regard to the particular case to which he has referred. There are many cases coming before the department; but, generally speaking, in the matter of treating cases of that character, we prefer to have them sent to a sanatorium. As I explained a little while ago, there is in New Brunswick the River Glade sanatorium and the St. John county hospital, which are the ones used.

Mr. PRICE: The department claims to be acting along the lines of economy.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, what is best in the interests of the soldier.

Mr. PRICE: That is no answer at all. This doctor is a very capable man and I would ask the minister to look into the matter.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I wish to direct the attention of the minister to a case I have brought before the department, and which has also been brought to his attention, as well as that of the Prime Minister, by the soldier himself. This is the case of a man who was gassed in France in 1918 and, while he was sent home as being physically fit, the question of gassing at the front was admitted by the department. He applied for pension in 1920 and carried on until 1922 without any result. I want to read to the minister the description he gives of the symptoms he experienced while in France and which he has felt ever since, although he has not been able to secure the consideration which he thinks he should have had. Prior to 1924 he tried without success to get his case properly before the Board of Pension Commissioners in order to secure a pension. In that year I took the case up for him and presented it to the federal appeal board, which at that time decided that he had a pensionable disability. This is the affidavit which he presented to the federal appeal board:

> In May or June 1918 was gassed and was sent out to the horselines. I was taking treatment when out there. I was only able to walk 100 yards and in October was gassed again and was sent to the hospital and from there to convalescent camp. All the time I was there I was taking treatment for the same thing which I have now—

These are the symptoms to which I would ask the minister to listen:

> —a pain in my left side and I am short of wind and am not able to do my day's work. I also take headaches and have sore eyes in the morning. When armistice was signed we were all sent back to our battalions without an examination. I was taking treatment when I left convalescent camp. I did not get a medical board before I left the army. I got examined by one doctor and I have been suffering from this trouble ever since I got gassed in May or June 1918. I was all right when I enlisted and have been taking treatment from Dr. Grey, Dr. McNiven and Dr. Nelson since I left the army.

I want to direct the attention of the minister to the fact that this man gives an almost exact description of chronic gas poisoning as is given by Major General Sir William MacPherson in his record of the medical services in the war, and I am going to read the symptoms detailed in his work.

[Mr. Price.]

Mr. POWER: Was this man's application turned down by the Board of Pension Commissioners?

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): Yes.

Mr. POWER: Does the hon. gentleman expect the minister to overrule the decision of the board?

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I am not asking for that. I will come to that point if the hon. member for Quebec South will have just a little patience. This is an extract of the evidence that was submitted to the Board of Pension Commissioners in this man's case:

> Gassing has been admitted by the military authorities. Also in October, 1920, Dr. Anglin diagnosed bronchitis due to gas poisoning. In August, 1920, Dr. Richards states that stereoscopic plates show fibrosis of the lung. On November 4, 1922, he was examined by Dr. Elliott who ascribed his condition to gas poisoning and estimated his disability at 35 per cent minus 10. Dr. Seaton also estimated his disability at 25 per cent. Dr. Leonard Murray on May 23, 1923, diagnosed a mitral insufficiency and Dr. Elliott again on May 23, 1925, diagnosed his condition as chronic gas poisoning and reaffirmed his statement that the man's disability was about 35 per cent.

Dootor Elliott in 1925 diagnosed the man's condition the same as he did before, namely, gas poisoning with a disability of 35 per cent. In 1924, after the Board of Pension Commissioners had refused to accept him as a disability case, the matter was taken up before one of the members of the federal appeal board, who decided in favour of the soldier, that he was suffering from a disability received on service. That decision of the federal appeal board was contested by the Board of Pension Commissioners, who appealed the case to a quorum of the federal appeal board. The quorum of the board decided again in favour of the soldier, stating that he had a disability due to service. The point is that the man having tried for a number of years before the Board of Pension Commissioners to get a pension, after the federal appeal board gave the decision and after the appeal was decided in his favour, they granted him a 20 per cent disability and paid him on that basis. After he had received that pension of 20 per cent for a short time, I hardly know how long, the Board of Pension Commissioners had him reexamined and reduced his pension to 10 per cent. At that time I took his case up with the Board of Pension Commissioners and had him reexamined. I also secured from his

employer a statement with regard to his condition and the number of days he had lost. This is what the employer said:

> The above has shown us a letter from you asking him to obtain from his employer the amount of time he has lost through disabilities.
> He has lost a total of 201 hours during the year 1925.
> We would like to go further and state that this man is married with two children, and is of an ambitious type. Since coming from overseas, he has been unable to do manual labour where any physical exertion was needed, and even on the work he is doing, at times is plainly working on his nerve. We have known this man as an employee for several years, both before and since the war, and his ambition to keep going in spite of his disabilities has earned our admiration.

These are the points in connection with this case. He undoubtedly is suffering from chronic gas poisoning. Let me read the symptoms as described in Major General Sir William MacPherson's book in regard to the medical services in the war, published in 1923. He says at page 402:

> Commonest feature—prolonged inability for severe muscular effort or even moderate exercise, associated with tachy cardia and rapid shallow breathing.
> The men's wind was gone and to some extent their nerves.

This is exactly what this man said. Among the other effects are giddiness on standing, headaches, and general vascular instability. This man complained of dizziness.

> It was closely allied to disordered action of the heart.
> Mild bronchitis in about 15 per cent of all cases.

The only part of this man's disability for which he is receiving a pension is chronic bronchitis due to gas poisoning. Among the other symptoms of gas poisoning I quote:

> Disordered heart action—irritable heart, precordial pain, exhaustion, dyspnoea, persistent tachy cardia after exercise, in one-third of total.
> Spasmodic nocturnal "asthena" either alone or in conjunction with irritable heart in less than a third.
> Exercise caused intense headache, giddiness and slow pulse (abnormally).

Thirty-five per cent of the above cases after three months' treatment persisted and were sent home for prolonged treatment. One group was composed of those who had not apparently been gravely gassed. I quote again:

> Condition supposed to be due to thickening of pulmonary epilhelium and bronchilitis obliterans.
> Causing deficient oxygenation of the blood similar to that found at high altitudes.

Every medical man who has examined this soldier stated that he has the symptoms of chronic gas poisoning, but they have not stated that he is suffering from chronic gas poisoning. Doctor Murray said that he had fibrosis of the lung, which follows the description given by Major General MacPherson—shortness of breath; those are exactly the words that Major General MacPherson uses. The man is admitted to be suffering from chronic bronchitis, which is found in almost thirty-five per cent of the gas poisoning cases, and yet the pension board will recognize only one symptom of gas poisoning, refusing to accept the other symptoms of gas poisoning as due to service, and those other symptoms are those of which the man complains most and which keep him from doing his work properly. Why the board and the department—

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not the department.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): Has the department ever taken it up with the board?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have referred the case to the board, I presume, with whatever arguments my hon. friend presented. We do not advise the board as to their judgments.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): Here is a case where for three or four years the board absolutely refused to acknowledge that the man had any disability whatever.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am very sorry to hear that.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): After the man had got the decision of the appeal board the pension board absolutely refused to accept any symptom of gas poisoning except chronic bronchitis, although the other symptoms are present showing that the man is suffering from chronic gas poisoning. I would ask the minister to take this case up with the board and see if they cannot be influenced to give to this man better consideration than he has so far received. I might add that I have this case before the board now. I asked to have this man brought before a board in the city of Toronto to consider whether his other symptoms could not be regarded as establishing chronic gas poisoning, so that he could be given consideration for that disability. He had been receiving free treatment for chronic bronchitis, but not for the symptoms of chronic gas poisoning.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be glad to bring the case to the attention of the board with the remarks which my hon. friend has made.

Item agreed to.

Unemployment relief, $250,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: How has this money been spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This expenditure is made by the board to those who are pensioners for disabilities incurred while on service, to those who have received a final payment by agreement, and to former members of His Majesty's forces, provided, however, that the disabled members of the imperial forces arriving in Canada not subsequent to December, 1924. Assistance is provided in winter where investigation indicates that distress would be occasioned if help were not forthcoming. Help is given to single men at the rate of $30 per month; man and wife, $45, man and wife and one child, $57; man and wife and two or more children, $67. Assistance is granted in kind in the form of orders on the local grocers, coal dealers, bakers, and so forth.

Mr. CAMPBELL: How much was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount spent was $378,000.

Item agreed to.

Operating expense and working capital, $300,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the reason for this increase of $10,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Contingent expenses of the board which heretofore were paid out of a separate vote granted to the commissioners are included in this appropriation. In other words, we have taken in $10,000 that was formerly paid out of their vote.

Mr. SPENCER: What is working capital in a case of this kind?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Office supplies and expenses, telephone and telegraph, travelling expenses, stationery, motor transport, advertising, transportation of staff, and so forth. The expenditure last year was $271,000.

Item agreed to.

Employers' liability compensation, $75,000.

Mr. SPENCER: How does this come under this department instead of the Department of Labour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The vote is used for this purpose: Where a pensioner seeking employment goes to an employer, and the employer says, "You are disabled; you are a bad risk in my mill; I shall probably have to pay a compensation fee," the government assumes the payment of the compensation awarded by a Workmen's Compensation Board in the case of injury to the pensioner of 25 per cent and upwards who gets employment under those conditions. It is a very good provision and has been in operation for some years. The amount spent last year was about $20,000.

Item agreed to.

Sheltered employment, $175,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is sheltered employment?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These are the vetcraft shops in Halifax, Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Victoria.

Item agreed to.

Federal appeal board, $130,000.

Mr. ESLING: To whom does the federal appeal board report, or does it make a report?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They make a report to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. ESLING: Has it been brought down yet?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not know.

Mr. ESLING: Is it in printed form?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think so.

Mr. ESLING: In the report of the Department of Pensions and National Health naturally you look for some details with regard to the appeal board, but it is impossible to find any.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be glad to get my friend a copy of the report.

Mr. ESLING: It is not even indexed. The only reference either in the estimates or in this report is that the amount is $130,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will make inquiry and let my hon. friend have the report.

Mr. ESLING: Is one printed each year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think so but I cannot say for certain. I believe it was tabled early in the session.

Mr. ESLING: I asked the minister the same question last year, and he was not able to give any information. It is the most natural thing in the world to read the report of the Pensions department in an endeavour to ascertain what the board is doing, but it is impossbile to find anything about it in the report.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be glad to give my hon. friend the information.

Item agreed to.

NATIONAL REVENUE

National revenue, salaries, $745,840; contingencies, $50,000.

Hon. W. D. EULER (Minister of National Revenue): I would ask that the item stand, Mr. Chairman.

Item stands.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

National defence—salaries, $764,875; contingencies, $70,000.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I would ask that the item stand.

Item stands.

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

Grant to last post fund, $20,000.

Mr. SPENCER: How many soldiers have been buried under this fund in the last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In Alberta, 19; in British Columbia, 24; in Manitoba, 15; in New Brunswick, 3; in Nova Scotia, 3; in Ontario, 43; in Prince Edward Island, none; in Quebec, 40; and in Saskatchewan, 17, a total of 164.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does that include headstones for indigent soldiers? In 1928-29 there does not appear to be anything but I know there was a considerable amount paid out of the grant.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, we supplement the amount required to carry on this work in each province. We are carrying in the estimates this year $20,000.

Mr. SPENCER: It does seem an extraordinary thing that eleven years after the war, in a new country like this with all its potential wealth, we should have to bury such a large number of soldiers at the expense of the state.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is done in conjunction with the organization that is looking after it.

Item agreed to.

Pensions—European war and active militia, $42,000,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the increase due to the recommendation of the soldiers' committee?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, $1,600,000.

Item agreed to.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, May 30, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING

Sir EUGENE FISET (Rimouski): I beg to lay on the table of the house the third, final and unanimous report of the select standing committee on railways and shipping owned, operated and controlled by the government.

On motion of Sir Eugene Fiset the report was concurred in.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Eighth report of the select standing committee on banking and commerce.—Mr. Hay.

On motion of Mr. Hay the report was concurred in.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. WILFRID GIROUARD (Drummond-Arthabaska) moved that the second report of the joint committee of both houses on the printing of parliament be concurred in.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the opinion was expressed by an hon. member that one or two of the reports should be printed. Perhaps it would not inconvenience the mover to let this motion stand so that an opportunity may be afforded that hon. member to look into the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion may be altered accordingly to-morrow.

Motion stands.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that many of the members whose names appear as sponsors for these bills are this morning attending committee meetings. With the consent of the house I will relax the rule which was applied when objections were raised, and call bills whose sponsors are not at present in their seats.

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, where a member is sick or is in attendance at a meeting of a special committee,

I do not think there would be any objection, but when a member is simply absent from the house I do not think the bill should be called.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Bill No. 314, for the relief of Barbara Elise Sewell de la Penotière.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 315, for the relief of Oliver Milton Martin.—Mr. Garland (Carleton), (for Mr. Harris).

Bill No. 316, for the relief of Catherine McRae Beattie McRae.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 317, for the relief of Mary Jane Teeson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 318 for the relief of Sam Gladstone.—Mr. MacLean (Prince) for Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 319 for the relief of Charles Smolkin.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 320 for the relief of James Franklin McDonagh.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 321 for the relief of Joseph Louis Philippe Corbeau.—Mr. Bancroft for Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 322 for the relief of Ruth Elizabeth Greene.—Mr. Kaiser for Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 323 for the relief of Frances Thirsa Edlund.—Mr. Kaiser for Mr. Anderson (Toronto High Park).

Bill No. 324 for the relief of Vivian Elizabeth Pearce.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 325 for the relief of Alice Clarke. —Mr. Church for Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 326 for the relief of Kathleen Mary Hambourg.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 327 for the relief of Florence Gertrude Singer.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 328 for the relief of Mabel Bullis. —Mr. Stinson.

Bill No. 329 for the relief of Fanny Elizabeth Reed Kendall.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 330 for the relief of Robert Henry Dunlop Ellis.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 331 for the relief of Evelyn Cowie. —Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 332 for the relief of Enid Marjorie Judd.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 333 for the relief of Vera Alice Griffin.—Mr. Milne for Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 334 for the relief of Christina Adams Bourne.—Mr. Church for Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 335 for the relief of Ruth Agnes Townsend.—Mr. Lawson.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

OTTAWA COMMERCIAL RADIO STATIONS

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. What number of commercial radio stations are in operation in Ottawa, and what are their names or letters?

2. What license fees are paid by each station?

3. What is the total revenue from these stations?

4. What operating hours, if any, are given each station?

5. That wave length is given each station?

6. What is the total number of radio receiving set licenses issued, and total revenue from this source per annum?

7. Is the department of radio telegraphy making any serious attempt to alleviate the chaotic conditions as between commercial radio stations and the radio receiving public, in so far as allotment of commercial hours, wave lengths, etc?

8. When will the radio department be in a position to stabilize the conditions of radio as at present existing, and what action is the department at present taking in this regard?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Two.

Canadian National Railways, Jackson building—CNRO.

Dr. G. M. Geldert, 282 Somerset street W. —CKCO.

2. Fifty dollars per annum.

3. One hundred dollars per annum.

4. CNRO—2.55 p.m. to 4.30 p.m. daily except Sunday; 7.00 p.m. to midnight Monday and Thursday.

CKCO—10.30 a.m. to 12.00 p.m. Sunday; 7.00 p.m. to 11.30 p.m. Sunday; 7.00 p.m. to midnight Tuesday.

5. 434.8 metres.

6. Total private receiving licenses issued in Ottawa during fiscal year ended 31st March, 1929, 7,030. Total revenue for same period, $6,415.65.

7 and 8. Wavelength allotments are made in accordance with standard practice on the North American continent, the separation between channels being 10 kilocycles. The channel assigned for Ottawa was selected from the limited number available for use in Canada after due consideration of the technicalities involved and with a view to the minimizing of interference between stations. Complete immunity from interference of this class is difficult in the case of receivers of the less selective type and those which are located in the immediate vicinity of a broadcasting station. Hours of broadcasting are arranged by the stations to their mutual satisfaction and are registered with the department. The department maintains a staff for the purpose of dealing with preventable interference, a great

deal of which has been suppressed throughout the Dominion. Special cars fitted for this work are operated in the larger centres including Ottawa.

REPARATIONS CLAIM OF FRANCIS WILLIAM CLARKE

Mr. CAHAN:

In the case of Francis William Clarke, who filed a claim (case 799) on account of the death of his wife and loss of personal effects by the sinking of the steamship Lusitania, but who was so ill at the time of the hearing before Commissioner Friel that he was unaware of the hearing being held, and whose claim was dismissed on account of claimant's absence, without prejudice to its being taken up again should occasion arise, will the government provide an opportunity for this claimant to be heard in support of his said claim?

Mr. RINFRET:

The case of Francis William Clarke, No. 799, will be dealt with under the provisions of an act to provide for the payment of claims for compensation for loss sustained by the civil population of Canada during the late war, which is now pending before the senate, as and when enacted.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Mr. TUMMON:

1. Is the position of Assistant Commissioner of Patents vacant?
2. If so, when will the vacancy be filled?
3. Will the standing of seniority be recognized in connection therewith?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Yes.
2. The matter is before the Civil Service Commission.
3. Seniority is one of the factors considered.

DREDGING AT AMHERSTBURG

Mr. GOTT:

1. What dredge is or has been working at Amherstburg, Ontario?
2. Where are provisions purchased for this work and under whose instructions?
3. Where is coal purchased and at what price per ton?
4. Where was coal purchased on last dredging job at Amherstburg?
5. Why?
6. Could coal not have been purchased at same price within a short distance of dredging job?
7. How far did tug travel to obtain coal supplies on last job at Amherstburg?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. Dredge "Q & R No. 1."
2. Provisions are purchased by captain of dredge with monthly allowance made him.
3. (a) Amherstburg; (b) $5.25.
4. Sandwich five years ago.
5. Because a contract had been entered into with a company at Sandwich to supply dredge "Q & R No. 1" during the season of 1924, while working in the neighbourhood of Sandwich, and when he was ordered to stop over and dredge at Amherstburg, the captain took from the company at Sandwich the 169 tons he would require during the two weeks he worked at Amherstburg.
6. No information.
7. Approximately 15 miles.

VALIDATION OF ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved:

That the following orders in council, laid on the table on the eighth day of February, 1929, be approved:—

Orders in council which have been published in the Canada Gazette between the 20th December, 1927, and the 28th November, 1928, in accordance with the provisions of Section 75 of the Dominion Lands Act, chapter 113, R.S. 1927.

Orders in council which have been published in the Canada Gazette between the 20th December, 1927, and the 28th November, 1928, in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph c, Section 21 of the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, chapter 78, R.S. 1927.

Orders in council which have been published in the Canada Gazette between the 20th December, 1927, and the 28th November, 1928, in accordance with the provisions of Section 31 of the Yukon Act, chapter 215, R.S. 1927.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Would the minister explain?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This is merely to carry out a provision of the Dominion Lands Act. Hon. members will recall that for a number of years a resolution was not passed in the house, and I was forced to get special legislation covering that omission to validate many of the cancellations of leases for Dominion lands and mining leases. This is simply carrying out the provision of the statute. The orders in council are placed on the table, remain there a reasonable length of time, and then by resolution are validated by the House of Commons.

Mr. BENNETT: Do I understand that all the orders in council that are mentioned in the resolution have been laid on the table?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: The difficulty is that we are giving approval to orders in council that may be ultra vires entirely of the executive. I apprehend, however, that a mere approval of the House of Commons gives no validity legally to an order in council that is otherwise ultra vires because the mere

approval of only one branch of parliament, instead of the three branches that constitute the legislative power, would not give validity, so I suppose there is no harm in approving them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is merely carrying out the provision of the act.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE

SALARIES OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL OFFICIALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. F. WHITE (London): I have a question to direct to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb). I have received several telegrams from professional and technical men throughout the Dominion the gist of which is that they are vitally interested in the report of the royal commission on salaries and would request the government to make provision so that the recommendations of the royal commission may become effective for this current year. I was not aware that the report of that commission was about to be issued, but evidently there has been a widespread report to that effect, and possibly the Minister of Finance could give the house some information upon it.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): I hope that my hon. friend will not run away with the idea that he is the only member of parliament who has been receiving these telegrams. It occurs to me that the so-called technical men must have more time and money to spend on sending out telegrams than on government work. So much for that. Considerable lobbying is being carried on, I observe, from telegrams coming into the department, so much so that it takes about the whole time of one secretary to reply to those coming into the Department of Finance. But that is not the only lobbying that is being carried on by people who are serving the state, and serving it well, and who think that they should be entitled to greater remuneration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The question that I was asked to put to the minister in the telegram that I received was whether or not he would make provision in the supplementary estimates to deal with the report that might be made by the royal commission on the salaries of professional and technical civil servants, so that they would not have to wait a year for the benefits of any recommendations made in their favour, but would get the benefit for the year 1929. Apparently the telegrams are so worded as to catch both the Minister of Finance on the one hand, and those who sit to the left of the Speaker on the other.

Mr. ROBB: Answering my hon. friend, who is a privy councillor, he understands quite well that anything going into the supplementary estimates must first have the O.K. of His Excellency the Governor General in Council before it can be submitted to parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: I never heard of the words O.K. in a statute.

REPORTS OF HARBOUR COMMISSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John-Albert): Yesterday I asked a question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin). Since then he has privately given me a certain amount of information, but I would like the reply to appear on the records of the house, and therefore I would ask if he would give the information to the house regarding the reports of the harbour commissions. I understand that the report of the St. John harbour commission has not yet been received. If that is so, I would ask the minister when these reports are expected to be submitted to the governor in council.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): All the reports of the harbour commissions have not yet been printed. We have received typewritten copies of the reports from the harbour commissions of St. John, Halifax and Vancouver. Up to the present time the only printed reports that we have received are from Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers and Chicoutimi. I understand that the other reports are being printed and will be available in a very short time. As soon as they are available I shall be pleased to give my hon. friend a copy of each of them.

Mr. MacLAREN: My question was rather: when should these reports be submitted to the governor in council?

Mr. CARDIN: There is no definite time fixed by the statute.

Mr. MacLAREN: The minister will agree that the reports have an important bearing on the passing of his estimates, and that we should have these reports before the estimates are under consideration.

Mr. CARDIN: The harbour commissions throughout the country are not considered or discussed under the estimates of the Marine and Fisheries department. There is no item in the estimates of that department giving the opportunity to discuss the harbour commissions. The operations of the harbour commissions are discussed when the affairs of the different commissions are before the house. They are dealt with under a special law governing them.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I think the minister will remember that last year and the year before we discussed this question and the undertaking was that an opportunity would be offered to discuss these matters in the light of the reports that might be made. I was under the impression that there was a definite time fixed by the statute within which the reports should be made, but apparently the minister has to make the collection himself, and must ask for and gather all these reports; otherwise, he would not receive them. I think it is highly desirable that they should be before the house so that they may be discussed when the estimates are under consideration.

Mr. CARDIN: I have no objection to repeating what I have already said, that an opportunity can be given to hon. gentlemen to discuss anything relating to these harbour commissions, and the discussion can be wide open. These reports, as a matter of fact, are published and distributed all over the country. According to the law these reports are made not to the house, but to the governor in council, but they are available to anyone desiring information in regard to the administration of any of these harbours. As far as I am concerned I am quite ready to give every opportunity to any hon. member and to the house generally to discuss the affairs of these harbours.

DOMINION ARSENAL, LINDSAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. A. PECK (Peterborough): I would remind the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) that an order was passed by the house on the 24th of April last for a return in regard to repairs to the Lindsay arsenal. The return would be a very simple one to prepare, but it has not yet been brought down.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): There was one return tabled.

Mr. PECK: This is a supplementary one. The order was passed by the house on the 24th of April last, and is overdue.

Mr. RALSTON: I will look into it.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE PROSECTIONS —MR. HARRY BRONFMAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): On the 16th day of November last in the town hall of Craik, the Attorney General of Saskatchewan told the electors in Arm River constituency—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EVANS: I am going to put a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Put the question.

Mr. EVANS: He stated that the prosecution of Harry Bronfman would be carried through to the bitter end. Did the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) give the Attorney General of Saskatchewan that assurance?

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Evidently there is an election going on in Saskatchewan. I may tell my hon. friend that I have nothing to add to what I stated the other day.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. LUCIEN CANNON (Solicitor General) moved the second reading of Bill No. 313, to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. BENNETT: Explain.

Mr. CANNON (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as the house will recall, early in the session a special committee was appointed for the purpose of examining into the Elections Act and to recommend amendments which would improve the electoral system which now prevails in the Dominion. That committee has sat throughout the session, has held numerous meetings, heard a large number of witnesses, and has brought in a report attached to which is a draft bill containing the unanimous recommendations of the committee. I wish, Mr. Speaker, not only on behalf of the government but on behalf of the members of the house, to offer my hearty thanks to all the members of the committee for the work which they have performed, and for the unanimity of the decisions which they have reached. And may I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to make a special reference to the work done by the chairman of that committee, the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power).

The legislation which is now introduced embodies the unanimous recommendations of the committee. I am ready to give any explanation on the bill that may be necessary when the clauses are considered in committee. May it suffice for me to state now that this legislation contains chiefly two new principles in our electoral system. The first concerns the appointment of the returning officers. Under the existing law returning officers were appointed by the governor in council upon the recommendation of the Secretary of State. There had been an attempt to give to the office of returning officer the character of permanency, but on account of the feeling which prevailed in the two leading parties in Canada, it has been the custom for the party in power to appoint the returning officers, and if that party did not happen to be returned to power the returning officers were dismissed and replaced by others. As a result, there has been among the members of the committee a feeling that this system ought to be altered, that the governor in council, that is the government or the party in power at the time of the issuing of the writs, or before, should no longer have the authority or the power to appoint the returning officers but that that authority and power should be vested in the chief electoral officer whose actions are surrounded by such safeguards as to guarantee his entire and complete independence in these matters. That is the first amendment, the first new principle introduced in this legislation, namely, the appointment by the chief electoral officer of all returning officers throughout the Dominion.

The second new principle introduced by this legislation is that of the appointment of enumerators to prepare the election lists in urban centres. It appeared from what was said by members of the committee, and by witnesses who were heard before that committee, that in rural constituencies the present system of making up the lists has given, if not complete satisfaction, at least considerable satisfaction, and that only minor alterations will be necessary. On the other hand, in the large urban centres, the present system of making up the electoral lists is open to a great deal of criticism, and that for three reasons. The federal list which was made up for the purpose of the election was based on the provincial list then existing, if there was such a provincial list, and that as a result there were many inaccuracies in the Dominion list and the candidates had to go to considerable trouble and expense to check up that list; that the delays were very often prolonged, and that as a consequence of those delays the lists were put in the hands of the candidates at a time so near the election date that they were practically useless. By this bill we do away altogether with provincial lists as a basis for the Dominion list, and the work of drawing up the list is assigned to officials, to be called enumerators, who will be appointed by the returning officers, and who will perform in the urban centres the work that at the present time is done in the rural constituencies by the enumerators.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): By registrars in the rural districts.

Mr. CANNON: Yes. My hon. friend is right.

Mr. CAHAN: Enumerators in the urban centres.

Mr. CANNON: They are called registrars in the act, but they are really enumerators on account of the character of the duties which they perform.

Mr. CAHAN: We have had a lot of contention about it. They are enumerators in the urban districts but the duties performed by the enumerators in the urban districts are performed by registrars in the rural districts. In the city districts they are called enumerators, and in the rural districts they are called registrars.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend is right. In the act they are called registrars. As a result of the introduction of this second new principle, the list will be completed in the rural constituencies twenty-one days before election day and in the urban constituencies eighteen days before election day. These are the main features of the bill.

I may say in conclusion that the bill also contains certain ancillary amendments to ensure the proper working, in view of the new provisions which have been introduced. This legislation is brought down at this session upon the recommendation of the committee because it has been represented by the chief electoral officer to the committee, and by Colonel Biggar, who acted as legal adviser to the committee, that it would take considerable time to work out these amendments and put them in such shape that they would be of practical use in the next general election, if this election is held within a year or later. I gathered from what was said that it would take a year practically to put these amendments into working condition. These are the main amendments brought in, and I repeat that I will give any additional information or particulars when each clause is being considered in committee.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Urban polling division.

Mr. HEAPS: The bill has not been distributed and I am at a loss to know what is before the committee.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): There are no copies of the bill available just now and I do not see how we can proceed.

Mr. McINTOSH: There are fifty copies for distribution and most of them are on the other side.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I have been told that there are none to be distributed.

Mr. CANNON: In a few minutes there will be a copy for every hon. member, but all the clauses of the bill may be found in votes and proceedings.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) is apparently of the opinion that we were favoured with a larger number of copies on this side. It is only a case of coming events casting their shadows before.

Mr. POWER: It was that contingency that this act was designed to cover.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I wish to call attention to the wording of paragraph (y) of section 3, which reads:

"Urban polling division" means a polling division which is wholly contained within a place having a population of more than 10,000 persons and being, under the provincial law, a city, town or incorporated village.

In my opinion the word "and" at the end of the third line should be "or." A place with a population of 10,000 cannot be a village; it is a city.

Mr. CAHAN: I suggest that the change proposed by my hon. friend will not meet the difficulty. There are two things necessary: first, that it shall have a population of more than 10,000, and secondly, that it shall be incorporated under provincial law. Being incorporated under provincial law it may be a city, town or incorporated village; but if there is any incorporated village having a population of 10,000 it will not come within the provision of this section of the statute. I am not interested to know whether or not there is an incorporated village having a population of more than 10,000, but if there is or should be then it would come within the statute, and not otherwise.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Am I to understand that this applies only to a municipality having a population of 10,000 and to no other? That is the effect of it now; as it stands, it applies only to a municipality with a population of 10,000.

Mr. CAHAN: A population "of more than 10,000."

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): But a town might not have a population of 10,000; the population might be only 5,000. As I read the section now, it applies only to a corporation having a population of at least 10,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: More than 10,000.

Mr. POWER: I am not prepared to discuss the question whether the legal phraseology meets the intention of the committee, but that intention was that any town or collection of dwellings, if I may put it that way, containing 10,000 persons, should be treated as an urban polling division. If a town contains a population under 10,000 it should be treated as a rural polling division, except that under certain circumstances the chief electoral officer might decide that it was an urban polling division. This was intended to cover cases of fast-growing towns, mining municipalities and so forth, where the people are not well known one to another, and where a system such as is in force in the cities should be brought into effect. It is left to the discretion of the chief electoral officer to decide whether or not a town of under 10,000 shall be subject to urban registration, every place with a population of over 10,000 being subject to such registration without any discretion whatever.

Mr. BRADETTE: There is an anomaly in this section. I believe that the ruling about the population of urban centres, as included in the revised Electoral Act, is not definite enough. The hon. member for Quebec South mentioned the rapid increase in population in certain mining centres, but that should not be a reason why we should not try to stop the abuse of creating urban centres out of sections which should remain absolutely rural.

Mr. POWER: The whole idea underlying urban registration is that there must be in such districts a closed list, and there must be an opportunity for checking that list, giving candidates some considerable time before the election. That is the idea underlying urban enumeration, registration and revision. In rural districts we do not provide for that because the people of a small community are

assumed to know one another and there are no opportunities for personation or for false entries on the list. It is different in fast-growing communities. As an extreme case I might cite a community with a population of 4,000, a community which has just sprung up within two or three months. I mentioned mining communities because it is more likely to occur in connection with that industry than with any other. It would perhaps be advisable that the chief electoral officer should have the right to decide that in such a community, in view of the fact that people do not know their neighbours, there might be a system of urban registration as a safeguard against the offences which might be committed under the act in connection with the other system where people are not acquainted with their neighbours.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Polling day to be half holiday.

Mr. HEAPS: Under the old act the voter was entitled to two additional hours off in order to go and cast his vote and nothing was deducted from his wages for that time. Under the wording of this new section it is provided that the afternoon of polling day shall be a general holiday in Canada. This means that the average working man—and the same applies to women—will probably have a part of his wages deducted for the time he is off. I think this provision is rather a backward step. Under the present act they are given two hours with pay, but now you are giving them five hours without pay. I would like to suggest an amendment to this section, but since I have had the bill in my hands for only a few moments I have not had time to draft a proper amendment which would give the working people the privileges they enjoyed under the old act. Perhaps the minister would be prepared to place such a provision in this act.

Mr. CANNON: The amendment as we have it now was carried in 1925, and at that time it appeared to have the support of the labour people; because of some mistake the amendment did not reach the Senate and was not included in the legislation of that time. I may state that the opinion of the government is similar to the opinion of the committee; we thought we were meeting the wishes of the labour people in Canada by reintroducing that amendment. However, if it seems more satisfactory to revert to the old provision I have no objection to dropping this section entirely.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. HEAPS: Perhaps this might be allowed to stand in order to give me an opportunity of considering the matter. I do not know whether it is the intention to complete consideration of this bill to-day, but I would like time to consider this matter.

Section stands.

On section 5 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

On section 11—Office for returning officer.

Mr. CAHAN: It would be well to correct the spelling in the last line. The word "noted" should be "notice".

Section agreed to.

Sections 12, 13 and 14 agreed to.

On section 15—Preparation of lists.

Mr. ARTHURS: Subsection 5 provides a penalty of not less than one dollar or more than five dollars in respect of each name illegally dropped off the list, and I would point out that such a fine is totally inadequate. Under this section an election could be vitiated very easily, and if fines were imposed the total amount would be very small. I think the penalty should be much greater.

Mr. CANNON: This is a special penalty imposed in addition to any other penalty which may exist. The other penalties contained in the act are very severe.

Mr. CAHAN: Section 12 gives the penalty which is applicable.

Mr. CANNON: If my hon. friend will look at page 5 he will see the other penalties. These officials are liable to the general penalities in addition to the penalty mentioned in this section.

Mr. ARTHURS: My contention is that in itself this penalty is a farce and does not amount to anything. If there is to be a penalty at all it should be much greater.

Mr. CANNON: The members of the committee had this idea. Some people are in no way frightened by very heavy fines; if you mention fines of $1,000 or $500 they are not at all impressed, but they understand a fine of fifty cents or one dollar much better.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is that the general idea of the Department of Justice?

Section agreed to.

On schedules A and B to section 32:

Mr. CAHAN: One paragraph of this schedule appears to have been drawn in a

slightly different way from what I thought was the intention of the committee. Rule 20 reads:

> Any voter qualified to vote in any polling division in the district allotted to any registrar, and duly entered in the list of voters for such polling division, may make oath before such registrar alleging the death, disqualification, or real residence and appearance in another list—

And so on. I think any voter in the electoral district, especially in our city districts should be entitled to make such a protest.

Mr. POWER: There is no objection to that, but I believe this is an exact copy of the former act, and that is why it remained in this amendment. That provision was in the old act, but there is no objection to my hon. friend's suggestion, and I think the point is well taken.

Mr. CAHAN: In a large city, where there are many tenement houses and a large number of people resident in a polling division, sometimes it is difficult to get a proper scrutineer. The man who makes that search and makes out an affidavit disqualifying another person should be a pretty reliable man, and I think you should be able to select him from the voters in the entire electoral district rather than from those in any particular polling division.

Mr. POWER: Then my hon. friend's suggestion would be that the clause read something like this: "Any voter qualified to vote in the electoral district for which the registrar has been appointed." Is that correct?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. POWER: Colonel Biggar has just pointed out that the registrar is not likely to have before him the complete list of all the voters in the entire electoral district. In the ordinary course he will have before him the list of twelve polling subdivisions which comprise his registration district, but he will not have the complete list of all the electoral divisions, so it would be fairly difficult for him to check up in order to see whether or not the objector is a voter in that particular electoral division.

Mr. CAHAN: I think it would be quite sufficient if an elector, coming before the registrar, made oath that he was a qualified voter. At least that would be presumptive evidence that he was a voter and he should be allowed to file an objection against a name on the list which properly should not be there. I think that should be sufficient, because it is so difficult in some of the city divisions where you are limited to the polling division to obtain the aid of those who are really qualified to examine into the qualifications of the voters on the list.

Mr. POWER: If the hon. member will permit thi ssection to stand, we will insert the proper amendments afterwards.

Mr. ROBINSON: Is any provision being made for the man qualified to vote but who objects to being put on the list because the assessor might assess him the $5 poll tax? In Walkerville and Windsor we find many cases where single men avoid being placed on the list in order to escape the $5 poll tax.

Mr. POWER: There is no provision made for compulsory registration or voting, if that is what the hon. member means. Where a man's name is placed on the list by the enumerator he will have a pretty hard time to get it off unless he is willing to swear that he is not qualified to vote.

Schedule stands.

On section 16—Polling day.

Mr. KAISER: Mr. Chairman, has an endeavour been made to ascertain how many people are carried to the polls in any constituency and having neighbours vouch for their being residents of the district?

Mr. POWER: In rural polling divisions it is done very generally, but I do not think any record is kept. The information could be obtained by looking at the poll books for the rural polling subdivisions throughout the country.

Mr. KAISER: I suppose the Solicitor General concurs with the chairman of the committee in stating that this practice is pretty general. I desire to state that it is not general, that very few people vote in that way. I believe that very simple factor prevented the committee from considering a matter which, in my opinion is of supreme importance. We all believe in what might be called educated democracy; we believe that the people should be the jury which pronounces upon governments. As a matter of fact, what happens? In Canada 66 per cent of the people who are entitled to vote go to the poles to register their vote, and of that 66 per cent, 33 per cent are carried to the polls by the energy and efforts of the political parties. One-third of the people of our country only are sufficiently concerned with the affairs of Canada to go to the polls and register a vote without being urged to do so. That condition is not peculiar to Canada; it obtains in a great many countries. We

have gone to a great deal of trouble to work out amendments to take care of matters which are insignificant as compared with this. Our efforts should be directed towards those who do not vote or who do not care to vote, just as is done in other countries.

In Australia, for instance, they had only 48 per cent of the people casting their votes in general elections; the percentage rose to 50 and the government of Australia began to recognize the fact that something should be done to induce the people to cast their votes without being carried to the polls. What was the result? In the two last general elections over 90 per cent of the people on the voters' lists went to the polls and voted. I am not saying that we in Canada should carry out the methods adopted in other countries, because that might be considered as compelling the people to vote. But what I do say is this: Something should be done with regard to the man who does not vote, and I consider that it is quite within the rights of the people who make the laws of the country to ask the jury to appear at the polls once in four years and pronounce upon the conduct of the government. It is surely not asking too much of a man to say that he should appear once in four years to register his vote. If there is a reason why he could not go to the polls, nothing should be done, but if there is no reason, measures should be taken to impress upon him the importance of casting his vote. The first and the simplest suggestion I have to offer is this: That man's name should not appear upon the voter's list for some little time. I would not say how long that time should be, but there is an absurdity in looking up these people every four years and going to the cost of preparing lists, putting the same people on those lists year after year, and election after election, and then having 30 per cent of them absenting themselves from the polls. Thirty per cent of the cost is absolutely wasted. I would like to place upon Hansard a letter which I received from the Prime Minister of Australia, dated March 16, 1927, as follows:

Dear Dr. Kaiser:

With reference to your letter of the 8th January, I have very much pleasure in forwarding you herewith copy of the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918-25, and copy of the Electoral and Referendum Regulations, Statutory Rules 1926/201. I am also enclosing a graph which shows in respect of each eection and referendum held since the inception of the Commonwealth:—

(a) the number of electors enrolled;

(b) the number of electors to whom ballot-papers were issued; and

(c) the percentage of electors to whom ballot-papers were issued to electors enrolled.

[Mr. Kaiser.]

I cannot recall press criticism of any consequence against the introduction of compulsory voting. At the 1925 federal elections the government was returned to power with a very strong majority in the House of Representatives and it secured every vacant seat in the Senate. In the press after the elections there was much comment as to whether compulsory voting had been responsible for the government victory.

Some sections of the press took the view that the introduction of the compulsory voting did not affect the proportion of votes in favour of the government, while other sections claimed that it had materially assisted the government. The outstanding feature of the voting, however, was the large number of electors who recorded their vote, the percentage for the last election being 91 per cent. Prior to the introduction of the compulsory voting in 1917, the percentage of federal voters was 78.30 and in 1922 it fell to 59.36.

It is rather difficult to gauge the effect of the compulsory voting at the last federal election, as at the time owing to the activities of the communistic element in Australia there were many people who had previously voted for the Labour party but who did not do so on the last occasion.

I very much appreciate the remarks which you have so kindly made regarding my recent visit to Canada.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd) P. M. Bruce.

Those are the simple facts in connection with Australia. I would like to see similar ideas given currency in this country to the end that greater attention might be paid to the 66 per cent who either do not vote or who have to be carried to the polls, and less attention to the 33 per cent who voluntarily go to the polls.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): In his opening remarks, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Kaiser) stated that the committee had no knowledge that many people had their votes sworn in on election day. In my experience in western Canada, and I think in the experience of practically all the members from that section of the country, we find that in the rural districts many votes are sworn in on election day. Our enumerators have long distances to travel. Some people live in remote parts of the polling divisions and are missed in making up the electoral lists. The result is that on election day, in practically every poll in the rural districts of western Canada, a few are sworn in who are entitled to vote.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): In answer to the last part of the remarks of the hon. member for Ontario, may I point out that it is a common thing in the rural districts to find from 75 to more than 90 per cent of the electors turning out on voting day. This is all a matter of whether the electors are interested in the election or not. If they are

not interested, no amount of law will make them vote. You could prosecute and go to a great deal of trouble in the matter and yet you could not force them to vote unless they were interested in doing so.

Mr. CANNON: The hon. member for Ontario put his views before the committee in a very interesting way, but the committee, after having considered the views as expressed by the hon. member, decided not to include them in their report. This legislation is along the lines of the unanimous report of the committee. I hope the hon. gentleman within a very short time will manage to have more converts on his side and then we shall introduce compulsory voting in Canada. This year, however, apparently the members who sat on the committee and considered the question, were not ready to go as far as the hon. gentleman was prepared to do.

Mr. KAISER: The Solicitor General was very courteous to me from the beginning of the discussion and I have no fault to find with him. All that I endeavoured to do was to begin casting a few seeds so that some day something along the lines I suggested might be done. There is no harm in doing that.

Mr. JACOBS: May I say a word or two with respect to subsection (2) which reads:

> The day fixed for the poll shall at any election be a Monday, unless the Monday of the week in which it is desired to hold the poll
> (a) is a holiday as defined by the Interpretation Act; or
> (b) at a general election, is a day which is generally observed by the residents of any province as a day for religious exercises and is declared to be a holiday by the law of such province.

Why is it that those who drafted this section fixed Monday as a rigid, definite day upon which the election should be held? Perhaps it is because it so immediately follows Sunday that the electors come to the polls in a holy frame of mind.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And it is two days from Saturday.

Mr. JACOBS: That would make people of my persuasion half as religious on Monday as those who attend church on Sunday. A number of holidays, which are observed by the people of my persuasion, take place in the autumn of every year. If it were to happen that the election should fall on any one of those days, it might mean that I would disappear from the house at the next election and also my good friend the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George. The latter would be a calamity frightful to contemplate.

Mr. CHAPLIN: For the hon. member.

Mr. JACOBS: It seems to me that this clause ought to stand over for further consideration. I am sure it is not the desire of any hon. member to have a law passed which would in any way interfere with the franchise of British citizens who hold religious views different from those of the majority. I am sure that is not the idea and there are people of my persuasion to be found in every electoral district in Canada. It is only right that I, as a member of that persuasion, should point out to the government the difficulty of adhering to a rule of this kind. There ought to be some flexibility. If it be found that Monday is a religious holiday observed by a number of people, it should be changed to Tuesday or some other day which would be agreeable.

Mr. CANNON: The reason why the amendment was inserted was that it was represented by the chief electoral officer and by Colonel Biggar that, by having Monday as election day, it was more convenient to fix the dates upon which several different things were to be done by officials and so forth. I appreciate the argument brought forward by my hon. friend. He wishes the clause to stand. I might point out that subsection (2), as it reads now, states:

> Unless the Monday of the week in which it is desired to hold the poll (a) is a holiday as defined by the Interpretation Act.

Mr. JACOBS: That would not apply.

Mr. CANNON: That would not apply to holidays which are not included in the Interpretation Act. We might let the clause stand for the present and see if we cannot devise some way of meeting my hon. friend's wishes.

Section stands.

Sections 17, 18 and 19 agreed to.

On section 20—Name not on list.

Mr. ESLING: We on this side have not had an opportunity of looking at the bill. I just want to ask the minister whether it has been made clear in this section as to a voter casting his vote in the electoral district or in the polling division. For instance, the act specifically provides for a residence of two months in the electoral district. Then when the man comes to cast his vote, the instructions sent to the deputy returning officer read

"in the polling division" and not "in the electoral district" so that one contradicts the other. I brought the matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. CANNON: The idea which underlies this clause is as follows: In a rural constituency, if a man found that his name was not on the list, he could, by taking the appropriate oath, register his vote, whereas the same privilege does not exist in the cities. But the returning officers were prone to interpret the act as meaning that if a man's name were not on the list, he was deprived of his vote. This amendment is inserted in order to make the matter very clear that if a man has his name on the list he is entitled to vote at the appropriate polling station, and in order to make the distinction very clear as between rural and urban polling divisions.

Mr. ESLING: I understand that. My question is whether the act has been changed so as to make it specific whether the qualifications call for a residence of two months in the electoral district or in the polling division.

Mr. POWER: The oath has been changed to suit the wishes of my hon. friend. I remember well that he made certain representations to the committee with regard to the oath to be taken by people in rural polling divisions, and I think the oath has been changed to suit his views.

Mr. FRASER: To be quite clear on that, do I understand from the answer that has been given, that the principle has not been changed, but that it has been made a little more specific?

Mr. POWER: Exactly. At the present time in order to vote under those circumstances the applicant for a vote must take the whole oath. He is not allowed to swear as he did before simply that he resides in the electoral division. He must take the whole oath, that he has resided in the division for two months, is a British subject, and so forth.

Section agreed to.

On section 21—Advance polls.

Mr. SPOTTON: I have not had time to read this section carefully, but I would point out that there has been a great deal of misunderstanding in the rural constituencies in regard to advance polls. If the chief electoral officer is advised that there is a certain number of railway men, commercial travellers and others who want to vote at an advance poll he will establish an advance poll for that town. It may be a town of three or five thousand people. The question did arise where there was an advance poll in one town and commercial travellers, railway men and railway mail clerks went to the returning officer of their own municipality and asked him for a certificate to allow them to go over to the neighbouring town and vote at the advance poll there. I can understand that in any city constituency there might be trouble about it, but there would be very little trouble in a rural constituency where everyone knows everyone else, and it would seem to me to be well that in a village or town where there are commercial travellers, railway men or railway mail clerks, they should receive a certificate from the deputy returning officer of their polling division allowing them to drive over to the neighbouring town and vote at the advance poll there. There was a difference of opinion about this question in our by-election, the Conservative lawyers holding that the men could go over and vote, and the Liberal lawyers holding that they could not. I should like the Solicitor General to make the point clear.

Mr. POWER: Under the law at that time the Liberal lawyers were right.

Mr. CANNON: If my hon. friend will read subsection 2A of section 21 he will see that it provides for the case he mentions.

Mr. SPOTTON: I take it, then, from the Solicitor General that a railway mail clerk, a commercial traveller or any of the classes I mentioned, has a right to drive over to a neighbouring town where there is an advance poll being held and vote in that constituency.

Mr. CANNON: Yes, if the chief electoral officer so directs. The chief electoral officer may direct that an advance poll may be used for a certain area, not only for the place where it is situated but for adjoining sections.

Mr. SPOTTON: He may so direct, but would it take in the entire rural constituency? It would be necessary to secure his ruling in the matter prior to election day.

Mr. CANNON: Yes, but under this law the returning officers will be made permanent officers, and they will organize their constituencies and be in a position to make all these arrangements with the chief electoral officer in advance, so I think the needs of the situation mentioned by my hon. friend will be met.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—When polls to be open.

Mr. LADNER: Instead of having the hours from two to ten o'clock on Saturday would it not be better to fix an earlier hour? What objection would there be to having it from eight o'clock on the day immediately preceding the voting day, because circumstances might arise which would make it advisable for citizens to vote in the morning.

Mr. POWER: The answer is to be found in the note. This matter was discussed in the committee. The note says:

> The proposed extension of hours on Saturday is thought likely to meet the necessities of the situation without compelling the election officers and candidates' agents who serve at advance polls to give up their regular employment for the purpose.

One of the reasons why voting day was fixed for Monday was that then there would be the whole afternoon of Saturday as well as Thursday evening and Friday evening for the advance polls. If it came in the middle of the week it would mean withdrawing from their regular occupation the number of people usual to man the polls. The same objection arises with regard to Saturday morning. It is a matter of convenience for the candidates and the electoral officials and for the public generally.

Mr. LADNER: Does not the hon. member think that any inconvenience to the candidates and electoral officials would be outweighed by the convenience to the public at large being able to vote on Saturday morning while in town on their business, and then they could have the whole of Saturday afternoon free.

Mr. POWER: These are advance polls for people who have no business in the towns—commercial travellers, railway men, mariners and so forth.

Mr. LADNER: But they may want to go away.

Mr. BRADETTE: Is it provided in this bill that newly naturalized citizens will have to have their naturalization papers with them in order to vote?

Mr. CANNON: There is nothing in the law about that.

Mr. BRADETTE: The law should provide for that because in my home town I have known fifty people to vote on the same naturalization paper who were not entitled to vote at all.

Mr. CANNON: If he takes the oath it is not necessary for him to show his naturalization papers.

Mr. BRADETTE: In this country a great many newly arrived people are easily made the tools of other interested people. I know for a fact that interested people, knowing that these newly arrived do not appreciate the value of their naturalization papers, will use them for fifty other people who are not entitled to vote.

Mr. POWER: That is somewhat in line with the suggestion frequently made that people who register at hotels should carry their marriage certificate with them. If we were to insert any clause of that sort in the act every person who went to the polls would have to produce his birth certificate or his naturalization certificate. It was felt that when we provided that people could be sworn as to their qualifications we were going as far as we could go.

Mr. CAHAN: And there is always the penalty for perjury.

Mr. POWER: Yes.

Mr. BRADETTE: In some sections of Europe they have to bring their papers to be allowed to vote.

Mr. CANNON: Not under the law.

Mr. BRADETTE: There is an anomaly there. A good many people with the best intentions are voting when they are not entitled to vote. I have a good many of them in my section, and some interested people make it a point to see that these people who are not entitled to vote do vote.

Mr. POWER: Swear every one of them.

Mr. JACOBS: There are a good many people who vote that way, but I do not agree with my friend that they do it with the best intentions.

Mr. HEAPS: If the suggestion of the hon. member were carried out it would prevent hundreds of legitimate voters from voting on election day. I have seen cases myself, of men who have been in this country for twenty or thirty years who have been precluded from voting on election day; their names were on the list but the returning officer positively refused to allow them to vote, and I am glad to have the assurance of the Solicitor General that these people will now be allowed to vote. As I say, I have known hundreds of men and women who have been in this country for many long years being sent out of a polling booth on election day because they did not have their certificates with them; they were told to go and fetch them, but they went out of the polling booth

anad never bothered to return. It should be the duty of the returning officer to see whether these men and women are naturalized or not. If he is not satisfied that a man or a woman is a Canadian citizen he should swear them, and if he feels then after they have been properly sworn that everything is in order they should be allowed to vote.

Mr. BRADETTE: In our section of the country practically one-fifth of the people are not on the list; there are many people up there whose votes were taken away from them in the manner mentioned by the hon. member, but that statement does not do away with the fact that hundreds, yes, thousands of people are voting and who are certainly not entitled to vote.

Section agreed to.

Sections 23 and 24 agreed to.

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, if hon. gentlemen will turn to page 29, there is a schedule which includes the constituencies where the fifteen-day system will exist instead of the eight-day system which is general throughout the Dominion. It has been generally agreed that this schedule 3 might stand, and any member of the house who wishes to have the name of his constituency included might so inform the officers of the house.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: What page is that?

Mr. CANNON: Page 28.

The CHAIRMAN: There are a number of other sections before we reach that.

Section 25 agreed to.

On section 27—Two weeks interval between nomination and polling days.

Mr. CANNON: This is under section 27, as to the names of the constituencies—

Mr. CAHAN: Let us pass this act up to the point—

Mr. CANNON: The said act is amended by adding to schedule 3 thereof—

Mr. CAHAN: We have had form 35. We have not yet passed form 36 following.

Mr. CANNON: No. We are at section 27 now, page 28.

Mr. CAHAN: We have not reached it. Let us pass everything up to section 27, which we have not yet done.

Mr. CANNON: Yes, that is done.

Mr. CAHAN: Well, I have been listening and I did not hear the forms.

[Mr. Heaps.]

Mr. CANNON: We are at 27 now.

Mr. GARDINER: Is it proposed to allow this section 27 to stand for further consideration?

Mr. CANNON: Yes.

Section 27 stands.

Sections 28 and 29 agreed to.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish this committee to have any misunderstanding. We have passed clause 25—

Mr. POWER: There is a section missing.

Mr. CAHAN: Which included form No. 36, but I did not hear you call section 26 of this act.

Mr. POWER: No, it appears to be missing.

Mr. CAHAN: I mean section 26 at the bottom of page 26. I have not heard that section called. It may be because I did not understand, but that section 26 is important.

Mr. CANNON: If my hon. friend has any remarks to make let us go back to section 26.

Mr. CAHAN: It is not a case of my making any remarks, it is a question of this committee passing 26.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend misunderstands me. If my hon. friend did not hear 26 being called let us go back to it, because I would be delighted to hear from him.

Mr. CAHAN: It is not a question of hearing from me. I have nothing to say, but every section should be called.

Mr. CANNON: It was called.

Mr. CAHAN: Then I am in error, but I did not hear section 26 called.

Mr. CANNON: Well, it was called.

Mr. CAHAN: I was listening carefully. If section 26 was called there is no doubt about it. I have no objection then to going to 27.

Mr. POWER: May I call the attention of the committee to section 27 which has been allowed to stand? The chief electoral officer, during the course of his period in office, came to the conclusion that a large number of constituencies which were not now in the schedule of what I might call two-week constituencies, that is to say, between nomination day and election day two weeks must elapse, should be added. For instance, in the western provinces: Manitoba—Brandon, Dauphin, Lisgar, Macdonald, Marquette, Neepawa, Portage la Prairie, Souris; in Saskatchewan—

Assiniboia Humboldt, Kindersley, Last Mountain, Long Lake, Mackenzie, Melville, Moose Jaw, Qu'Appelle, Rosetown, Saskatoon, South Battleford, Swift Current, Weyburn, Willow Bunch, Yorkton; in Alberta—Acadia, Battle River, Bow River, Calgary West, Camrose, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Vegreville, Wetaskiwin. It was suggested in the committee that members of parliament who thought it was in the public interest that their constituencies should be placed in the schedule could have the same done by way of amendment.

Mr. CAHAN: But election day would be the same for all of those constituencies.

Mr. POWER: Yes.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): With regard to section 29, would the Solicitor General say whether that applies to past elections or future elections?

Mr. CANNON: Future elections. The committee was of opinion that these amendments should apply only at the next general election, that they should not apply to the by-elections which will be held during the present parliament.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): But if the present members of parliament are candidates at the general election will this apply to them or not?

Mr. CANNON: Any member of the present parliament.

Mr. LADNER: What about future parliaments?

Mr. CAHAN: The act is amended for that purpose, and we have this last clause saying:

This act shall not apply to the election of any member to the present parliament.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): It seems to affect general elections as well as byelections.

Mr. CANNON: It will be in force at the next general election.

Mr. CAHAN: Could not that be stated a little more clearly?

Mr. CANNON: I do not know how it could be worded any more clearly than it is; the word "to" makes it perfectly clear. It is not "of."

Section stands.

On section 4—Polling day to be half holiday.

Mr. THORSON: I suggest that instead of taking the clause which is now in the bill we should go back to the old clause and substitute the word "three" for the word "two" in the second line thereof. That would give the employee three hours in which to vote and it would not deprive him of pay for any portion of time on election day.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why does he need three hours—to have a drink?

Mr. THORSON: In parts of Winnipeg many persons work as far as ten miles away from their polling division.

Mr. POWER: I understand that the government have no objection to accepting this amendment, but as chairman of the committee I wish to dissociate myself from it. We considered the matter thoroughly and came to the conclusion that the federal parliament had no authority to grant a holiday with pay.

Mr. CAHAN: With compulsory pay.

Mr. POWER: There is, it is true, a clause in the Dominion Elections Act providing that every employer shall on polling day allow every elector, his employee, at least two additional hours in which to vote and that no employer shall make any deduction from the pay of such employee. I think it is a question of civil rights and contract and not one for the federal parliament.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at three o'clock.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS COMMITTEE

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): With the unanimous consent of the house I would like to present the thirteenth report of the select standing committee on railways and canals.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF CANADA

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Mr. A. M. YOUNG (Saskatoon): With the consent of the house I desire to move that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill 84, to incorporate the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, be now read a first and second time and concurred in.

Motion agreed to, amendments read the first and second times and concurred in.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONTREAL TERMINAL FACILITIES

The house resumed from May 27 consideration in committee of Bill No. 254, respecting the construction by the Canadian National Railway Company of certain terminal facilities with grade separation and other works at and in the vicinity of the city of Montreal.—Mr. Dunning.—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. DUNNING: Certain sections of this bill were allowed to stand in order to give me an opportunity to consult the law officers in order to make sure that the intentions which I expressed to the house and which were agreeable to the house really had been carried into effect in the bill. A careful check of the matter with the law officers of the department and those of the Department of Justice convinces me that the bill as drafted does in fact leave the Board of Railway Commissioners in exactly the same position with reference to this work as they would be in reference to any other piece of work done by the Canadian National, but in order to establish that fact beyond question and to satisfy the house generally as to the clarity of the legislation, in connection with section 7, which was allowed to stand, I propose to eliminate these words, commencing on line 13:

> Detail plans of crossings of railways and crossings by the railway of streets or highways shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

By the elimination of those words there can be no doubt but that the provisions of the Railway Act with respect to the powers and duties of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and those of the Canadian National Railway Act, will apply to the works contemplated by this bill.

In connection with section 8 a similar question was brought up by the hon. member for South Toronto, and I now propose a redrafted section in order to make it quite clear that the matters dealt with in this section are not within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners in any case, and to provide a manner whereby they may be dealt with. The redrafted section reads:

> Where streets or highways are affected by the said works but are not crossed by the company's tracks or diverted incidental to any such crossing and by reason thereof the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada has no jurisdiction under the Railway Act with respect thereto, the company may with the approval of the governor in council, enter into agreements, where it may be desirable, with the city of Montreal or with any other municipality with respect to such streets or highways or with respect to the opening of new streets, the closing of existing streets and ways, the making of diversions or widenings of such streets or highways, and the making of sub-streets, subways or overhead facilities in connection with such streets or highways, and the apportionment of the cost thereof.

I think that amendment will make it quite clear that the agreement contemplated is one with respect to improvements, which, under the Railway Act, are not within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Many objections were offered to section 10 of the bill, and I propose to move that that section be struck out. I think these amendments will meet the various objections raised the last time this bill was in committee.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, before this amendment is taken up I would like to take this opportunity to present a few views on this matter. This proposed station will not be a union station, but a station for one railway only. Does the minister propose the same equality of treatment for other places as for Montreal herein?

The port of Montreal has developed in a wonderful manner. The city of Toronto has had to pay about $12,000,000 to have a viaduct constructed there. During the past eight years, since I have been a member of this house, the Dominion of Canada expended $15,000,000 to construct a great bridge at Montreal. This parliament should only be concerned with interprovincial or international bridges, or where navigation is affected, but the Dominion government paid the full cost of this purely municipal bridge for the city of Montreal or a bridge between two provincial municipalities. A great real estate movement is taking place in the city of Montreal in connection with this particular proposition. Land is being bought up by speculators whereas the whole business should be handled by the government. The government could buy more land than is needed and then take advantage of the unearned increment. The city of Montreal should be contributing 50 per cent of the cost of this work. In the old days of the railway commission, the late Mr. Justice Mabee gave a ruling which affected every municipality making an application for the removal of level crossings. His ruling was that where the highway had been there ahead of the railway, the railway paid, but where the railway had been there first then the municipality should shoulder the whole burden of the work.

The city of Toronto gave the Canadian Pacific Railway a right of way down the Don river for $600 per year, when it would have cost them hundreds of thousands of dollars to get into the heart of the city. The

city leased the station site, that is the new union station site, to the Grand Trunk for a station and the railway leased part of it to the post office. The cost of the station at Toronto will come to about $6,000,000, while the viaduct will cose about $32,000,000. The member for South Toronto (Mr. Geary) said that it would cost $10,000,000 before they got through, but the city of Toronto will have to pay over $12,000,000 in order to provide a viaduct and rights of way for the railways for a distance of fifteen miles along the water front. The minister's amendment does not cover this phase at all; the railway commission cannot change the agreement between the government of Canada and the Canadian National Railways and a third party, such as the city of Montreal. They cannot interfere with vested rights; their duty is to enforce the Railway Act and any provisions of that act as to plans, routes, and other technical layouts.

I have no desire to cripple the national railways, far from it; I hope they grow in strength from year to year. I think they have been doing far better than anyone expected. This burden of $50,000,000 is being put upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of Canada. If this amount were not being expended in this way reduction in the income tax and sales tax would be possible but the government insists upon continuing to spend money like water. It seems to me that this particular matter might stand over for a while. The government should say to the city of Montreal, "We are not going to continue to place the municipal burdens of the city of Montreal upon the people of Canada." New highways, town planning, new subways, widening of street, and other local improvements are to be made at the cost of the people of Canada. The principle property and civil rights in the province is involved when a municipality receives consideration of this kind. If the minister were up and doing he would say to the people of Montreal, "It is nearly time that the municipality paid for its own municipal work," and not have that cost saddled upon the people of the province of Ontario and other provices in the Dominion of Canada. The rest of the country has been asked to pay too much money for the benefit of this municipality: this city is well able to take care of its own municipal burdens.

If this were a union station the argument might be a little different. The suggestion was made that union station should be built in the city of Hamilton, to be used by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Railway, and the Grand Trunk, but nothing has come of that proposition. The city of Hamilton, like Toronto, was asked to contribute. The government can build an elevator in Port Huron, which might just as well have been built in Sarnia, and they are quite content to pay the cost of the elaborate improvements which are being made in the city of Detroit instead of having that city pay a fair share of the cost of those Canadian National improvements.

This is a very improvident bargain as far as the people of Canada are concerned, and it might very well stand for another year. The government should ask the city of Montreal to pay $20,000,000 towards the cost of this work. The time has come for someone to stand up and say something about this matter. Does the minister propose similar equality of treatment for the other cities in the Dominion, or similar grade separation? If that is the case, then the city of Toronto would have a good claim for a refund of the money it has paid. In 1911, 1912 and 1913 we attempted to arrive at an agreement with the railway commission, but we were told that not a dollar would be spent in Toronto unless we came across with $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 for the grade separation viaduct work along the waterfront. I do not know of any state government in the United States that is doing this for the municipalities. Certainly the state of New York would not do it. The cities of Buffalo, Rochester and Cleveland have had to spend millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in order to carry out similar improvements. If you go along lake Erie, the cities of Toledo and Detroit have had to spend money to remedy the evils of these level crossings. If the city of Montreal is to go scot-free in regard to level crossings and bridges as well, what is the next municipal service that that city will want the Dominion to pay for? It will not be long before they want the country as a whole to pay for a new trunk sewer service or a new water supply. If you read the Municipal Act in the Code of Quebec, you will find that these services are all municipal. I have looked over the situation and what is proposed to be done is nothing but municipal town planning. The government is going to contribute more than half of this money in order to do town planning in Montreal. Look at the own planning in Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton, where they have widened boulevards which are a great credit to the people of those cities. Are they going to come to parliament to ask the government to pay part of their cost out of the public treasury? No. If we are going to pass this legislation, there will be an

agitation made to the government for the refund of the cost of improvements such as these. The city of Toronto could make out a strong case for a refund of $10,000,000 for viaduct work from this parliament.

The port of Montreal is one of the largest ports in the world. The administration of that port is not, I think, excelled anywhere else, and the people are going to get back every dollar spent on that port. But as regards this local town planning scheme, a very strong case could be and has been made out that the city of Montreal should shoulder some of these burdens itself and not unload its town planning and other municipal improvements upon the Dominion.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robb moves that section 7 be amended by striking out the words beginning in the thirty-sixth line with the word "detail" down to and including the word "commissioners" in the thirty-ninth line.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robb moves that section 8 be amended to read as follows:

8. Where streets or highways are affected by the said works but are not crossed by the company's tracks or diverted incidental to any such crossing and by reason thereof the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada has no jurisdiction under the Railway Act with respect thereto, the company may with the approval of the governor in council enter into agreements, where it may be desirable, with the city of Montreal or with any other municipality with respect to such streets or highways or with respect to the opening of new streets, the closing of existing streets and ways, the making of diversions or widenings of such streets or highways, and the making of sub-streets, subways or overhead facilities in connection with such streets or highways, and the apportionment of the cost thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 10 has been struck out.

Mr. BENNETT: I was about to suggest to the minister, looking at the bill in its amended form, that it would make it perfectly clear if a special section were added stating that matters with respect to the crossing of streets or highways by railways and the crossing of railways by streets or highways, shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners as provided by the Railway Act. As the bill stands now, there is no reference as to how the matter is to be dealt with. My hon. friend's submission is that the provisions of the Railway Act will therefore apply. Might it not be desirable to state in the bill itself that the provisions of the Railway Act with respect to crossings of railways and so forth shall apply? I am offering this as a suggestion, and another suggestion which I have in mind and which, I suspect from the conversation I have had with the minister, he will not accept, is that an amendment be made to the legislation by adding a section declaring that:

This act shall come into force on proclamation by the governor in council after approval of the plans of the said works by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

Mr. DUNNING: That is the whole scheme?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. I am still most desirous, if possible, of bringing about a simplicity of terminals which, admittedly, this does not do. Whether or not, as I already said to the minister the other day, if an opportunity were afforded before an independent tribunal for all parties concerned to be heard, a plan might result that would bring about the creation of union facilities, I cannot say, but I have thought a great deal about this. I sent to the library and got the life of the late J. J. Hill for the purpose of refreshing my memory about what he said of the desirability of great terminals in a large city like Montreal. I have not forgotten the fact that these terminals can in no sense be made profitable by passenger traffic. I remember that the president of the road has said that the passenger traffic produces no profit so far as this terminal is concerned, and I realize that something between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000 per annum must be provided by the traffic on the system to pay interest and depreciation upon those properties. The amount may be a little more. When I say that, I mean not only the sum now presently contemplated to be spent, but the $12,500,000, authorized and expended on the previous scheme, together with the accumulated interest which is large, and the $1,500,000 of securities which the hon. member mentioned the other day. This means that when the property is completed five or six years hence, it will involve a fixed annual charge of between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000, and if my idea as to the ultimate cost is fairly correct, the fixed annual charge will be nearer $5,000,000 than $4,000,000. That money will not in any sense be made out of passenger traffic except that there may be in suburban areas some passenger traffic that may be profitable. Within the last five years the Illinois Central have spent $30,000,000 in terminal facilities in Chicago. They have changed from steam to electricity, and the result has been that a loss of $5,000,000 in the terminal traffic

of the Illinois Central has been converted into a yearly profit of $1,000,000, a change altogether of $6,000,000 by reason of an expenditure of $30,000,000 in electrifying the terminal facilities and suburban lines of the Illinois Central in and about the city of Chicago. That is an exceptional situation owing to the lake front and the heavy congestion of passenger traffic to the east of the city of Chicago, providing revenue on a very large scale.

This scheme has been described in some quarters as ambitious. It must be so, if the principles in connection with terminals as laid down by Mr. Hill are to prevail. After all, a great railway must have great terminals. It must look to the future. It is not sufficient to look to to-day. It must look beyond the conditions of to-day and see to-morrow, and more than to-morrow; it must see the day after.

There are acute differences between the two systems with reference to these terminals. The minister and I have discussed this matter. One system thinks that a through traffic terminal is not necessary. The other says that a through traffic terminal is essential both for traffic south, east and west. I realize that the expenditure of money sometimes is the best method to ensure the making of money. In other words, I realize that money that is not profitable can at times be made profitable by the expenditure of large sums of money. I have not forgotten the boldness of Mr. Harriman and the courage with which he crossed Salt lake at an expenditure of $9,000,000, with a short cut-off or his construction of 332 miles of road to take the place of 374 miles of abandoned road, in order to make large sums of money. I am not unmindful of other similar instances in the history of railroading, but I am also remembering that this is a country of only 10,000,000 people.

There is one factor that I hope the minister will not overlook. We own a railroad a very considerable portion of which is in the United States, and the president of the road has told us that the most profitable mileage that we have to-day is that portion of the Grand Trunk that lies in the United States. That is a very serious situation because it must be admitted by every thoughtful observer that when you have a very substantial section of your national railway in another country, the question as to its profitable operation does not depend on anything that you can do, but depends upon conditions as to traffic that exist in that other country, together with the maintenance of a rate that will enable a profit to be made. We have no control over those conditions. We cannot control the situation on the Vermont section as to profit and loss after we have completed our investment and taken up our receivers' certificates. We cannot change the situation in respect to Portland and the terminals there, or in respect to the Grand Trunk Western and all that is involved in the consolidation of the many lines included in the system. These are matters that are beyond our control, and at the present time some sections of the road are highly profitable. We realize in the light of what the president of our own railway has said that we must rely on freight traffic proper to pay the annual interest and charges on this terminal; in other words, passenger traffic will produce no profit, and that directly affects every producer of freight on the system. It affects the man on the prairie, the manufacturer in the east, the automobile manufacturer to some extent on the Grand Trunk Western lines, and I do not think it would be too much to ask that before these plans are finally acted upon by the governor in council the whole matter should be considered by an independent tribunal. I confess to the minister that in looking about for that independent tribunal, the only reason why I fixed upon the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada was because it is the only tribunal which is charged under our general laws with responsibility in connection with railroads. I do not say that I think it is the best tribunal in the world. There are many difficulties that I see. Mr. Ruel's view is that it is undesirable to submit any Canadian National railway matters to the Board of Railway Commissioners. In putting this amendment before the minister for his consideration I apprehend, as he said to me in discussing the matter, that he may not accept it, and that it may be my duty when the bill is read a third time to-morrow formally to offer this amendment for the consideration of the house.

I had not intended to speak at such length at the moment, but I do confess after having followed the development of the railroad situation in Canada with a good deal of interest for the last thirty years, and having been particularly interested in it in the days of the old Grand Trunk and National Transcontinental, I ventured upon the role of a prophet and made a prediction which, though it was not generally accepted at the time I made it, proved to be right in the end, and both Alberta and Saskatchewan were called upon to pay on their guarantees of interest on branch lines of $13,000 and $15,000 a mile respectively.

Few people realize what it has meant to those provinces to have the national railways consolidated. Had they not been consolidated and taken over by the crown, a burden would have been imposed upon the provinces that would have been very considerable and although some people think that British Columbia would have escaped, I think that thoughtful observers who have studied the economics of the situation, as did at least one of the directors of the Canadian National, who is now the deputy minister, will agree that the province of British Columbia would have been called upon to pay substantial sums of money but for the taking over of the Canadian Northern by the crown. Bearing in mind the six or seven lean years that Joseph experienced in Egypt, which lean years have also been known in Canada, and that these days will come again, and that somebody must find between $4,500,000 and $5,000,000 every year to pay the interest on the investment which we will have in these terminal facilities, I have made the suggestion I have. I am sorry the minister feels that it cannot be accepted. I shall have to turn over in my own mind the desirability of submitting the suggestion in the form of a formal amendment when the bill is under consideration for third reading.

I want to say that the minister has approached this matter certainly not with a desire to press it upon the house in a sense of it being a government measure, although, of course, it is a government measure, and he has endeavoured to eliminate, by striking out the section to which I directed attention the other day, and in making the changes which he has submitted to the house to-day, those sources of difficulty which I think he will admit the experience of the past has taught us are present, with a view to ensuring so far as possible that there shall be a minimum of such difficulties to be encountered in connection with this undertaking; but there are still many matters of great moment that will rest for their solution upon the discretion and ability and fidelity of the men concerned. It is for these reasons that I have ventured to make this suggestion to the minister, and as the bill will not be read a third time to-day I shall in the meantime consider whether or not it will be desirable to submit a formal amendment.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall not deal with the remarks of the hon. member for Toronto Northwest for the reason that it is quite apparent that he is under a complete misapprehension as to the scope and purpose of the bill before the house, and the leader of the opposition and others I feel sure would not associate themselves with his remarks in that connection.

With regard to the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, as I stated at the outset careful consideration was given to the suggestion which he made, and I fully appreciate the force of his remarks just now in relation to the importance to the national system of that portion of the railway which is located in the United States. I should not like, and I feel sure that he would not like, his remarks to be interpreted as implying that the national system is dependent for its profitable operation upon that part which is located within the United States. Some 1,600 miles out of a total of 22,000 miles in the system are located in the United States.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that the system was dependent upon it.

Mr. DUNNING: I was saying that I felt sure my hon. friend would not want that impression left.

Mr. BENNETT: I made it perfectly clear that the president had said that that was the most profitable mileage which they had. That is on record.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not disputing the record; I was proceeding to analyse it in order that there might not be an impression left in the country by the hon. gentleman's remarks that the system was in any sense dependent upon its American mileage. Some 900 odd miles of that American mileage, which is comprised in what we call the Grand Trunk Western system, undoubtedly is the most profitable 900 miles of the system, but it is only 900 miles out of a total of 22,000 miles. The rest of our American mileage, comprised within the Vermont Central, of something over 400 miles, and the line down to Portland in the neighbourhood of 200 miles, cannot be described as exceptional money-makers, but I would not depreciate for a moment the value of the Grand Trunk Western portion of the system.

I wish to examine for a moment my hon. friend's suggestion that he might move an amendment on the third reading. I do so in order that we may get an appreciation of what it would mean, and in order that the house may get an appreciation of the reasons which prompt the government in hesitating very much to accept any such suggestion. In connection with the expenditure of any money on railroads in Canada, whether publicly or privately owned, the first move

would be the action of the proprietor in authorizing their management to expend the money, and we are, as I pointed out the other day in this house, in the position of representing the proprietors.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the government.

Mr. DUNNING: Parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: No, it is the governor in council.

Mr. DUNNING: Parliament is conferring authority upon the governor in council to authorize the management to expend, under terms set out by parliament, the moneys dealt with in this bill. The proprietorial relationship must not be lost sight of. The Board of Railway Commissioners has, under the law with respect to all railways, a very definite function, and it is not in any sense to be confused with the function of proprietorship; they are not in the position under the law of advising the proprietors of a railway as to how and upon what works the proprietors should expend their own money.

Mr. BENNETT: Not their own money.

Mr. DUNNING: The proprietor's money.

Mr. BENNETT: Not the railways' own money.

Mr. DUNNING: The proprietor's money I said. The Board of Railway Commissioners, to put it in a manner I feel sure my hon. friend will not disagree with, is not under the statute creating it placed in a position where it can advise the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian National Railways, or any other railway, as to the manner in which those railways shall expend the money of the proprietors. The function of the Board of Railway Commissioners is judicial as between those proprietors represented by their management and the public who may be affected by the works which are to be built, constructed or operated with the moneys which the proprietors have allocated for that purpose. My hon. friend, I am sure, sees the principle I am trying to point out. In no other case has it ever been proposed that the Board of Railway Commissioners should be called in to pass upon what the proprietors themselves should authorize to be expended upon their own works. But the Board of Railway Commissioners are always authorized to come in and examine the relationship between that expenditure and the rights of the public, or the rights of individuals in relation thereto. We are proposing in this case to preserve intact the functions of the Board of Railway Commissioners and their relationship to undertakings of this character. And I hesitate very much to establish that, in addition to exercising that function, which is judicial in character, the Board of Railway Commissioners should assume one of the functions of management in determining the nature of the works to be built with the moneys provided by the proprietor. That is the matter of principle which I had in mind as an objection to what is proposed by my hon. friend.

Having said that, let me go further and say. that so far as the government is concerned it is under no illusions as to the far-reaching character of proposals of this kind. The government appreciates to the full the responsibility of embarking upon an enterprise of this kind. But we all recognize, all of parliament I think recognizes, representing as we wo the proprietors, that this is something which we must undertake. We have, whether we will or not the responsibility, and the final responsibility for the operation of two billion dollars' worth of the people's property in this railway system. And here is a problem which has been studied for many years, a problem which is recognized on all hands as one which is crying for solution as no other single problem on the railroad is crying for solution. A result of the studies which have been made by the officials of the railway and by the management, has been submitted to outside opinion; that outside opinion has been submitted to the house, and we have gone as far as we think we can go in that direction. But, nevertheless, I would say to my hon. friend this; the government does not take the position that the door is closed in so far as unionizing this work is concerned. I think I can say that with the entire concurrence of the government.

Mr. CAHAN: What do you mean by "unionizing"? It seems to me an awful word.

Mr. DUNNING: Making of the terminal a union terminal. The door in that respect is not closed. The door in that respect will not be closed during the years in which the project is being developed, during the building years; it will still be open for other parties desiring to come in and to create of this project a union terminal; the door will still be open for them to do so; the field for negotiation is still open.

Mr. CAHAN: That means the field with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. DUNNING: Absolutely. It is still open. But we may as well face the facts, Mr. Chairman. The leader of the opposition stated them in one way. I will state the same set of facts in another way although there would not be any difference of opinion between us as to what the facts are. They were related in the committee and again when this matter was before the house previously, that the Canadian Pacific Railway does not believe that a union terminal at the tunnel site would be suitable or economical from the point of view of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian National Railways do not believe that a union station at Windsor street would be suitable or economical from the point of view of the best interests of the Canadian National Railways. That difference does exist. We cannot overcome it. The leader of the opposition the other day pointed out very clearly that the only way to overcome it would be to exercise the powers of this parliament to force one or the other to go into the terminal of the other. And no one has yet suggested that the power of parliament should be used to force the Canadian Pocific Railway to go into the tunnel terminal, and no one has yet suggested that the power of parliament should be exercised upon the Canadian National Railways to force them to go into Windsor street. The issues are too great for parliament to attempt to exercise force in connection with that matter.

That is, I think, all I have to say on the matter. I trust my hon. friend will appreciate the reasons which prompt me in hesitating very much to set up the Board of Railway Commissioners as advisers to the management of any railway. To my mind it would impair, and possibly conflict with, the operation of their judicial function which they would undoubtedly be called upon to exercise in connection with many phases of the same matter.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course, the minister appreciates that the commission could be authorized to do so. I felt after looking casually through the report that the hon. minister was good enough to give me the other day that if the wealth of learning about terminals that could be brought before the commission was brought before the commission by experts of outstanding ability on this continent it might create such a situation as would inevitably induce the management of the two enterprises to go into a union station enterprise. I might say that I wholly agree with my hon. friend that the commission as such is neither qualified nor empowered to compel either one road or the other to take the action suggested, but my hope had been rather that with the evidence that might be brought before the commission as such the deferring of the coming into force of the act would bring about such a state of affairs as might induce the parties affected to realize the desirability of taking the action which we so much desire, and thereby lessen what I conceive to be a very heavy load to be borne by our national system. That is the whole reason behind my suggestion. I did not go into detail because I thought the minister realized that I was not for a moment suggesting that some of his appointees on the Board of Railway Commissioners would be the best people to determine on a plan of the magnitude of the one now before the house.

Mr. DUNNING: I had in mind previously that my hon. friend apparently had more faith at this stage in the Board of Railway Commissioners than he had at an earlier stage in the session. But I would say in that regard, to repeat in rather more amplified fashion what I said a moment ago, so far as the government is concerned, in authorizing the carrying on of these works, the door is still open. And, of course, as my hon. friend knows, it is within the power of the government, if the government so determines, to refer any matter such as this to the Board of Railway Commissioners. And I can go as far as this: If there does appear any hope of a solution, more advantageous to the country, to the national system and to the Canadian Pacific system, being arrived at by conference or in any other way, the government will not hesitate to use the power which it has to refer to the Board of Railway Commissioners any question the solution of which might involve a better scheme or a better arrangement than the one now proposed.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Has not the railway commission power to compel the railway companies to have a union station in any town? Is that out of their jurisdiction entirely?

Mr. DUNNING: They have no such power.

Mr. CAHAN: I find very confusing indeed the explanation of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) with regard to proprietorship and the suggestion that the members of this house represent the proprietors. Is it not clearly expressed in this bill, and in the other enactments which apply to the Canadian National Railways, as an entity in itself, that it so far comes under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners that, acting in its judicial capacity,

the board has the same jurisdiction to decide as between the Canadian National Railways and any other public interest, as between the Canadian National Railways and any city or municipality, and as between the Canadian National Railways and the harbour commission of Montreal, for example, in so far as the Canadian National is a railway corporation, as it has when any similar issue arises between the Canadian Pacific Railway and any public interest, between the Canadian Pacific Railway and any municipality, or between the Canadian Pacific Railway and any other public corporation?

Mr. DUNNING: The only difference is—I think this has been mentioned before—that with respect to the approval of actual detailed plans of a railroad, the Canadian National Railways, by virtue of its original statute enacted in 1919, is required to secure the approval of the Minister of Railways, whereas any other railway is required to secure the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Subject to that one qualification, what my hon. friend says is perfectly correct as to the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners over the Canadian National Railway. But I cannot understand what the hon. member means about being confused as to the term proprietor which I used. The proprietors of an ordinary railway are, of course, the shareholders.

Mr. CAHAN: We all know that, of course; it passes without comment. But we are not dealing with this matter now as merely the proprietors of the Canadian National Railways; we are dealing with it as the parliament of Canada, giving powers to an institution known as the Canadian National Railways which we have already constituted by statutes of this parliament. I would rather deal with the matter from that point of view, and I do still think that in all respects in which the Board of Railway Commissioners, as a judicial body, has jurisdiction as between, for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway and any public interest, or between the Canadian Pacific Railway and any municipal or civic interest, or between the Canadian Pacific Railway and any other corporation constituted by this parliament, the Board of Railway Commissioners might well have the same jurisdiction when a similar issue arises between the Canadian National Railways and such bodies as I have mentioned.

Mr. BENNETT: The section in the Railway Act to which the minister has referred is not broad enough to enable him to make reference to the board. I looked it up the other day and this was one of the reasons that impelled me to offer the suggestion I did. The section in question is 69:

(1) The board may appoint or direct any person to make an inquiry and report upon any application, complaint or dispute pending before the board, or upon any matter or thing over which the board has jurisdiction under this or the special act.

(2) The minister may, with the approval of the governor in council, appoint and direct any person to inquire into and report upon any matter or thing which the minister is authorized to deal with under this act or the special act.

The limitation as to the reference is that it must be a matter which the minister is authorized to deal with under the Railway Act or under the special act.

Mr. DUNNING: Under this act.

M. BENNETT: But this is a special act empowering the minister to deal with a limited number of matters. For instance, the very section with which we were dealing, section 7, authorizes the Minister of Railways to deal with the question of railways and canals and the crossing of canals. The Minister of Marine must deal with the harbour of Montreal, but the minister is not as such authorized to deal with the plan as a whole.

Mr. DUNNING: I will give my hon. friend the section in a moment.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think my hon. friend's construction can be placed upon it.

Mr. DUNNING: Take the beginning of section 7; that will help my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well. That section begins:

The general plan or plans of the said works and amendments or additions to such general plan at any time made, shall, on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be subject to the approval of the governor in council.

But that is not the point. What we are dealing with is, for instance, the question of cost. We have had no details yet as to the question of cost; no engineers' estimates have been submitted. We have merely men standing up and saying that in their opinion it will cost so much. But this vote is for $50,000,000. So far as we are aware, it might be $10,000,000, because that is all that is to be spent this year; and the total cost is said to be $51,400,000. It is abundantly clear that four years from now, if the appropriations overrun, the matter is to be dealt with in the way I have indicated; and the only difficulty I see is this—and the minister put his finger on it a moment ago: How is the governor in

council to obtain its knowledge to deal with this matter in the public interest, representing the people of Canada as a whole, as distinguished from its political action as the government of the day? It was for that reason that I made the suggestion I did, rather than that the matter should be dealt with simply by the governor in council. In other words, I was endeavouring to ensure that there should be detailed information in connection with this matter placed before some tribunal that would approve generally of the enterprise, beyond mere statements such as I heard the other day—I do not care how long the situation has been studied—and the views of the minister himself. The minister knows more about this matter than any other member of the government; yet I venture to say that if I examined him to-day I could within a few minutes indicate that his knowledge was not such as would warrant him in undertaking to expend such large sums of money if he were in the position he once occupied in connection with a great industry in western Canada. In short, he has not secured that detailed information which he would insist upon having in connection with any enterprise he had to do with, before authorizing so relatively large an expenditure as that which is here involved. All I am urging is that the approval should be secured of some body, with a volume of expert testimony behind it, as to the cost of the scheme, the plans, feasibility, general relation to the future, the adequacy of all the facilities, and every other question involved in the undertaking, having regard to what Mr. Hill pointed out as being in the ultimate analysis the important thing to consider. I was trying to make sure that all these matters would be dealt with before the minister and the government were pushed—I am not using the word offensively—into the position where they had to decide upon some course of action.

Mr. CAHAN: I should like to illustrate what I had in mind a moment ago when I addressed a question to the minister. The last three lines of section 7 are as follows:

> Detail plans affecting the property of the harbour commissioners of Montreal shall be subject to the approval of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The harbour commission of Montreal is a corporate body having certain express powers delegated to it by this parliament; the members of that board have a practical knowledge of the conditions of their property and a large experience in dealing with the whole undertaking. Suppose a difference of opinion arises between the management of the Canadian National Railways and the harbour commission, with respect to detail plans which affect the property of the harbour commissioners of Montreal. Should not such a difference of opinion be referred for settlement to a judicial body such as the Board of Railway Commissioners?

Mr. DUNNING: This has reference to detail plans.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, and those are the important plans. If this section provided that general plans should be first approved by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that would have had another signification, but the actual plans which are prepared by the management of the Canadian National Railways, when once approved by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will have full force and effect in so far as they affect the property of the Montreal harbour commission. I do not think the political head of such a department as that of Marine and Fisheries should have the sole and exclusive decision in regard to issues which may arise, which are likely to arise and which in my opinion inevitably will arise between the harbour commissioners of Montreal and the executive of the Canadian National Railways in carrying out the detail plans for this enormous development. I am not in the confidence of the harbour commissioners at all; I have not approached them nor have they approached me, but I am sure they have very definite opinions as to the best method of carrying to completion those terminal facilities having regard to that harbour, and I understand that the leader of the opposition has suggested that in matters of this kind, where issues arise between the Canadian National Railways and other corporate public bodies, those issues might well be placed before a judicial body such as the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. DUNNING: The point raised by my hon. friend is of some importance, but I should like to explain why the particular phrase to which he is referring was inserted in this bill. It will be noticed that in the first part of section 7 the authority to approve of general plans is given the governor in council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals. In connection with the detail plans affecting an enterprise which, in its relation to parliament, is under the overseeing eye, if I may use that term, of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it was thought that in case any difficulty arose between the harbour board and the railway

executive the harbour board should not be placed in the position of having to appeal to the Minister of Railways, but rather to that minister who is particularly charged with looking after harbours and harbour interests.

Mr. CAHAN: Does not that mean that the issue will be settled by political considerations?

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot quite see that.

Mr. CAHAN: Let us assume for the moment that grave differences of opinion do arise between the harbour board and the management of the railways, just such issues as might arise between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the harbour board, with reference to electrification or any other matters which might come up. It would take us days to consider these plans in all their details. Now, why should that decision be left to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; what special knowledge does he possess of matters of this kind? I am not speaking particularly of the present minister, but what equipment, what qualifications are possessed by the minister presiding over the Department of Marine and Fisheries which enable him to decide intricate engineering problems such as those which may arise between these two corporate bodies? Why should such issues be left to the decision of a mere political head; why should they not be left to the Board of Railway Commissioners, who at least have expert advisers to assist them and who have a procedure, a practice and a method whereby they may summon all interests affected and hear expert evidence as the basis for their decision?

Mr. DUNNING: I might point out to my hon. friend that this does not take away any of the powers otherwise possessed by the Board of Railway Commissioners; if the matters affecting the property of the Montreal Harbour Board do come within the purview of the Board of Railway Commissioners, under the Railway Act, then their approval certainly must be secured. As a matter of fact my hon. friend is inaccurate in one particular; he says that the plans do involve works on the property of the Montreal Harbour Board. That is not the case.

Mr. CAHAN: I may be mistaken, of course, but on the plan I saw that line running through property which either has been acquired or is in process of being acquired by the board of harbour commissioners, and I think issues are likely to arise in that connection. Perhaps I should not say so decidedly that these issues are likely to arise, but they may arise, and it is so probable that they will arise that in the bill before us the minister is providing a method of determining such issues if they come to a head. By the express terms of this section he has placed the power to make such a decision entirely within the discretion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, while he has a certain oversight over the Montreal harbour commissioners, should not it seems to me be vested with jurisdiction to decide issues which may arise as between those harbour commissioners and the management of the Canadian National Railways. I do not think I can say more.

Mr. DUNNING: Just to complete what I was saying regarding the harbour commission property and the work to be done thereon, I might say that the plans contemplated by this bill cover work to be done by the Canadian National Railways which will connect the harbour commission's tracks. The plans contemplate also certain work which will be carried out by the harbour commission and which it is agreeable to carry out. I would point out to my hon. friend that the Montreal harbour commission have been made fully aware of the contents of this bill as they relate to themselves, and that commission is quite satisfied with the arrangements made.

Mr. CAHAN: My information was that they had not been fully consulted. I was not told that by one of the harbour commissioners, but received my information from another source. Why vest in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the sole discretion of deciding such issues as they arise?

Mr. GUERIN: Mr. Chairman, there is one matter which should be included in this particular bill, and that is provision for the electrification of the system within the city of Montreal. The railway is to be elevated over certain portions of the city but, as far as I can see, there is nothing in the bill which provides that the system shall be electrified. Electrification is absolutely necessary; otherwise the undertaking will be most destructive to property in the vicinity. We are suffering a great deal of inconvenience at the present time due to the non-electrification of the railways within the limits of the city; in fact, I believe Montreal is the only city on the American continent which puts up with the smoke nuisance existing in the city. We are suffering from the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway as well as from those of the Canadian National Railways, and I think something should be done to ensure that in densely populated municipalities the health of the people shall not be endangered by the continued use of coal-burning locomotives

within the municipal limits. I had hoped that provision would have been made in this bill for the electrification of the system within the city limits. I believe that all railway systems within the city of Montreal should be electrified.

Mr. DUNNING: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for St. Ann (Mr. Guerin), I might inform the committee that it is proposed to electrify the tunnel.

Mr. BENNETT: The tunnel is electrified now.

Mr. DUNNING: To provide for the increased traffic which will be brought about by the completion of this larger scheme. The Canadian National Railway has conducted some very successful experiments and tests in the use of Diesel locomotives, and it is proposed to use Diesel powered locomotives very extensively in the operation of the terminal scheme.

The matter of general electrification comes within the realm of railway economics. Such schemes depend upon the density and the constancy of the load, because hon. members will appreciate that the power must be there at all times. The cost of producing the power must be paid whether or not it is uitlized to the fullest extent. I cannot give offhand what might be called the datum point of economical electrical transportation, but there is a point at which the traffic becomes heavy and constant enough to make it economical to electrify a line. For instance, at the present time it would not be good practice to electrify the line between Ottawa and Montreal; the load is not sufficiently constant to make that proposition economically sound, as it would cost far more than to operate under the present method. On the other hand, in a terminal such as the Pennsylvania station in New York city, where the density is ever present, electrical operation is very economical. I can say to my hon. friend from St. Ann that the Canadian National is watching very closely the development of traffic densities in and around the city of Montreal, and I can assure him that no time will be lost in putting in such improvements when they are warranted.

Mr. GUERIN: Would the use of the Diesel engines mean that coal would have to be burned?

Mr. DUNNING: They are powered by oil.

Mr. GUERIN: There would be no smoke?

Mr. DUNNING: There is very little.

[Mr. Guerin.]

Mr. CAHAN: It is an explosion of oil rather than the burning of it.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the citizens of Montreal upon having such excellent terminal facilities for that metropolis of the Dominion of Canada.

Sir EUGENE FISET: What about Quebec?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: This city is in the province of Quebec. They should take great pride in the facilities which are being provided by the Canadian National system. I think the declaration has been made to the house by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that it is the policy of the Canadian National system to provide proper terminal facilities in most of the large cities of Canada. While I congratulate the citizens of Montreal upon the treatment they are receiving at the hands of the government, I would like to see the people of the old city of Quebec treated in the same manner. Montreal, Toronto and many other cities in this Dominion have been treated quite generously by the Canadian National system while we have been endeavouring for over twenty years to obtain the proper terminal facilities in the city of Quebec. We were told by the government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier that the city of Quebec was the real terminal of the Transcontinental and the Canadian National railway systems, and that we would have proper facilities. We were promised those facilities in 1910, when the Hon. S. N. Parent was chairman of the National Transcontinental railway commission. Proper engineering plans were prepared; a site was decided upon, and a contract was entered into between the city of Quebec and the Transcontinental railway. The city of Quebec consented to give a most valuable property fronting on the St. Lawrence, the Champlain market, a property worth more than $5,000,000. A contract was given to a contracting firm to erect a million-dollar railway station, and there was constructed from the Quebec bridge to that station a road six and a half miles long. After the change of government in 1911, a year later, the contract was cancelled; all work was postponed, and an agreement was entered into between the Transcontinental and the Canadian Pacific whereby the Transcontinental was to use the Canadian Pacific railway facilities at a rate, if I am not mistaken, of $200,000 a year which the Transcontinental paid to bring people into the city of Quebec and then hand them over to their competitor, the Canadian Pacific.

As I have said, the citizens of Quebec have been making requests of the governments that have been in power from 1911 to 1921, but they have always been told that their requests were under consideration. I remember in 1917 and 1918 asking some questions of the then Minister of Railways, the Hon. Doctor Reid, and the then Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Mr. Carvell, and that was the answer which was given. The Minister of Public Works at that time said that the way in which the work had been carried out in the city of Quebec was a tragedy. They admitted that our need was most urgent and that something should be done. The present government seems to be well disposed towards the city of Quebec, but we fail to see that anything is being done in our city. A few weeks ago I put a question on the orders of the day, but the same answer was given me by the government, namely, that the matter was under consideration.

Quebec is the oldest and one of the most important cities of the Dominion; it is the only one which has contributed towards railway development, towards the building of the Quebec and Lake St. John railway and the building of the Canadian Northern railway, and it has given to the Canadian National railway system a property worth more than $5,000,000 in order to obtain proper facilities in the city of Quebec. We are ashamed to say that we are treated as a flag station rather than in the way we should be treated. I do not blame the government, but I say that there is lack of attention on the part of the administration of the system. Sir Henry Thornton does not treat the people of the city and district of Quebec in the way in which we should be treated, and whenever an opportunity is afforded me I will protest as I have done to-day against the way in which we are treated in our city. I am glad to see that the government is dealing so generously with the city of Montreal and I hope it will press the urgency of our needs upon the administration of the railway and do something to render justice to the citizens of Quebec in whose behalf I will continue to protest.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee has considered all the sections with regard to which the bill was allowed to stand.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the minister was going to make an amendment to paragraph (d) in the schedule.

Mr. DUNNING: That was done.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Pensions—civil flying, $5,000.

Mr. SPENCER: How much of this vote was spent last year?

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Pensions and National Health): Only a very small amount, $240.

Mr. SPENCER: Could the minister give us some particulars of this item? We do not get much information from the two words "civil flying." Is it for encouragement to civil flying or for damage to men who may be hurt?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): For men who may be hurt in the government service.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Dominion roads and bridges—generally, $5,000.

International bridge over river St. John between Clair, N.B. and Fort Kent, Me., the state of Maine to provide $130,000, $130,000.

Interprovincial bridge over Ottawa river at Hawkesbury, the Quebec and Ontario governments each to contribute one-third of the cost, $40,000.

Ottawa—maintenance and repairs to bridges and approaches, $12,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Before we take up any item I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that the air in the chamber is very hot. It is very close in here, and I wonder if there is no way in which it can be remedied to give us a chance in this hot weather. Is it not possible to have some of these windows open or electric fans going?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is very warm, and just half an hour ago I requested the engineers to see if it was not possible to get in some colder air. The difficulty is that it is pretty hard to find any cold air to-day.

Mr. BENNETT: Are these windows permanently fastened?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, but if they are opened they let in air of a temperature of ninety degrees.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Why not damp the curtains as was done last year and then open the windows? You would then have cooler air in the chamber?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: It is not a question of getting cold or hot air, but a question of getting some air.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Just a few moments ago I felt just as my hon. friend does and I looked at the thermometers. The one at the end of the chamber read 75 degrees, and the one that I keep here shows a higher temperature than that. I will read a memorandum that I have just received from my secretary, and I shall be glad to have any suggestions that hon. gentlemen can give:

I have just been down to the basement with the engineer of the building and gone over the machines with him. The air which is being pumped in for ventilation purposes registers ninety degrees. With the machines going as hard as they can, this is being reduced to seventy-six degrees. It has been pointed out, however, that with the windows and doors around the chamber open, hot air is flowing in which is raising the temperature above the temperature of the air which is being pumped into the chamber through the ventilating machines.

I have urged the engineer to keep the machines going just as hard as he can, and to do everything possible to lower the temperature in the chamber.

Mr. MANION: I have listened to this story from the Minister of Public Works—I am not reflecting on him personally at all—every time that we have sat here in June. Personally I am tired of these engineers' opinions; I do not think they are any good. Here we are in a stone building and it should be one of the coolest places in the capital. Even the rooms upstairs are cooler than this chamber. I think it is time that we ignored the opinions of the engineers and got some of these windows open and let this air out. It is a case of letting a breeze through the chamber. The engineers have made a complete fizzle of it, and it is time we tried another scheme. The air is absolutely unbearable here to-day.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The air is being changed all the time. It is not a question of pumping in fresh air and getting the old air out, because the air is being continually changed. There is no place very cool in the city to-day.

Mr. MANION: I differ. You can go into all kinds of residences in the city to-day and be perfectly comfortable, yet this big stone building is one of the most uncomfortable buildings in the city of Ottawa. I think that the ventilation system is defective; I have thought so ever since we came into this new building. I will admit that during the winter this year it was better than past years. I am not criticizing the minister at all, but I do not believe that the engineers are familiar with what they should do. This chamber should be a cool chamber, and it is anything but a cool chamber. It is terribly hot.

Mr. BENNETT: At times I have seen it pretty hot in the winter.

Mr. GUERIN: The air should be put into circulation by means of fans or something of that kind. The value of that is quite generally recognized. Even if a person is confined to a room, if the air is put in motion he does not suffer. If there is nothing better to be done I think it would be well to install a certain number of electric fans to keep the air in circulation and give us a chance to breathe.

Sir EUGENE FISET: I would suggest to the minister that first of all the heat in the radiators should be turned off, because there is heat in these radiators at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT: That is right. I found heat in the radiators the other day. Somebody did not have the coal supply all burned up.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Damp the curtains and open the windows, and then you can get fresh air in. We did that last year.

Mr. ARTHURS: The minister was good enough to allow discussion on any subject relating to public works on this item which stood over. I am desirous of calling his attention again to the fact that there is a very pressing need at the present time of a reasonably small grant for dredging in the harbour of Parry Sound. The harbour of Parry Sound is probably one of the best harbours, if not the best, on the great lakes. It usually has water enough to float any boat on the great lakes, but unfortunately conditions there are somewhat peculiar. The government wharf at that point is situated near the mouth of the Seguin river and below a point where there existed for many years one of the largest sawmills on the Georgian bay. The result of the year's activities of that mill was that a great accumulation of bark and other mill refuse was deposited in the stream. During the last two or three years in succession we have had, unfortunately, high water in the river, and on two or three occasions large dams have broken away causing an extremely heavy flood which moved this mill refuse and deposited it at or about the government wharf. The government have attempted to remedy this condition during the last two years by using one of the

boats belonging to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, tying her up to the wharf and endeavouring to blow this sawdust and refuse out of the way by the revolutions of her screw. This has not been successful. The only result has been to blow it away for a distance of about twenty feet immediately opposite the wharf and the refuse has piled up in a heap where it is an obstruction to any boat trying to approach the wharf. The result is that many boats have had difficulty approaching the wharf and some have been unable to tie up to it at all. A large shipping company in Chicago which operates several of the largest passenger boats on the great lakes runs a seven-day excursion every week from Chicago to various points on the great lakes. The only Canadian port of call is Parry Sound. These boats carry an average of 800 passengers on each trip, so that they are one of the greatest advertising agencies that we have for Canada. These boats coming in and going out of Parry Sound pass through a part of the Thirty Thousand Islands of the Georgian bay in daylight, both ways. Many people from Chicago take advantage of these weekly trips and become regular tourists in Canada. Many of them have purchased cottages in various parts of northern Ontario. It is very desirable therefore, that these boats continue this service. This steamship company has advised the town council of Parry Sound that it will be unable to make Parry Sound during the present season on account of the depth of water, as they have no desire to jeopardize their boats. The matter was taken up with the Department of Public Works, and assurance was given to the council that a grant would be made sufficient to do this small amount of dredging in order to remove this refuse in front of the wharf during the present season. Well, the main estimates are down and nothing has been put in. After all, these boats are so large that they are the ones principally affected. These people visiting Parry Sound on these weekly trips—probably a thousand or fifteen hundred per week—have the privilege of taking back with them to the United States goods to the amount of $100 free of duty, and very many of them take advantage of that privilege. The result is that a large trade has grown up there, principally in woollens and linens, all of which is advantageous to us as Canadians. I would therefore impress upon the minister the necessity of making at least a reasonable grant in the supplementary estimates for this very necessary work. I would also point out that this is not going to be a recurring vote. The circumstances are as I have stated them. The refuse from this old mill has been swept down and is now lying in front of the government wharf in Parry Sound. When it has been removed there will be no second visitation; everything has been swept away and the river is absolutely clear owing to the very heavy freshets that we have had in the last two or three years. I hope the minister will take this into his most serious consideration.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend but I will say to him that a deputation interviewed me in regard to this very matter not very long ago—I would say within the last two weeks, probably—and urged upon the department the very things that he has now urged.

Mr. ARTHURS: I may also say, Mr. Chairman, that this matter has been before the minister for the last two years.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, the information that was given to me by this committee is not as accurate as I had thought, because I was told that on account of the extra flooding this spring the amount of sawdust and other refuse brought down from where they formerly had saw mills made the harbour much more impossible of access this spring than it had ever been before. Of course, as my hon. friend knows, the water has been particularly high this year, and this is a matter which comes or could come properly within the category of the things that could not very well have been foreseen at the time the main estimates were prepared. I would say to my hon. friend, however, that it has already received the best consideration the department can give it.

Mr. SPOTTON: Mr. Chairman, in these dying hours of the session I hesitate to take up very much of the time of the house, especially in view of the extreme heat which many of the thin men in the house feel so greatly. But I have not unduly trespassed on the time of this house during the present session, consequently I feel that it is my duty, on behalf of my constituents in the town of Goderich, to place upon record the great national importance of Goderich harbour, and to try to show that it is a national necessity that the work there should be proceeded with in a more energetic manner.

I have not risen to criticize the Minister of Public Works with regard to the amount placed in the estimates this year for harbour improvements at Goderich, namely $205,000, which, when he viewed Canada from coast to coast, was perhaps the amount he thought

we were justly entitled to. I am not at the moment complaining of the amount of the vote. What I am asked by his own political friends to do is to stress the fact that the work should be proceeded with energetically and that the amount placed in the estimates be spent. Last year there was placed in the main estimates $75,000 for this purpose, and the people of Goderich and western Ontario were delighted when the minister brought down in the supplementary estimates an additional $100,000. But they were not so delighted when they found at the end of the year that out of this $100,000 which he brought down in the supplementary estimates he had spent only $10,000. The minister may meet with difficulties which I do not understand, but what we would like to have done is—

Mr. ELLIOTT: Just a moment, so that there may be no misunderstanding. Is my hon. friend under the impression that only $10,000 was spent on the harbour of Goderich last year?

Mr. SPOTTON: No, I did not say that. I said that $75,000 was brought down in the main estimates. Then the people of the town of Goderich and western Ontario rejoiced to know that the minister had brought down an additional $100,000 in the supplementary estimates. But of this additional $100,000 they were chagrined to learn that only $10,000 was spent. In other words, of the $75,000 in the main estimates and the $100,000 in the supplementary estimates—$175,000 in all—the department expended only $85,000; $90,000 was returned to the treasury and is handed back to us again this year.

This is the point that I am trying to stress; we are satisfied with the $205,000 which the minister has placed in the estimates, provided it is spent. But when the government and the department sent out the information that for the purposes of a certain public work, $175,000 is to be appropriated, thus getting the advertising effect of that announcement, and then spend only $85,000, holding back $90,000 and handing it to us again the next year, we think they are very much in the position of an old gentleman up in my native township who used to give his son a penny to go to bed without his supper, and when the poor little fellow was sleeping the old man stole the penny and gave it to him again the next night. Now, I admit that this administration is an excellent advertising institution, and I want them to get full credit for everything they do. But I wish to state this: that every school child in the town of Goderich knows that this government took the advertising effect of $175,000 last year but spent only $85,000. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you take the revotes of the last four years the total almost equals the $205,000 which we are getting this year. The minister explained to the deputation that he had his troubles, that as the estimates were late in going through it necessitated some delay in getting the work started. I should think that with unfinished contracts, and with a government who have a large submissive majority at its back, there should be no difficulty in the administration carrying out any work they wished to undertake. Any contractor should know that.

Now I wish to place a few things on Hansard. I do not propose to be taking this matter up every year if I am longer in the house, but I do wish to make a brief review of Goderich harbour as presented to me by friends of this government, and which they wish to have presented to the Minister of Public Works. In 1896 Mr. Cameron, who had represented since confederation the constituency in which the town of Goderich is located, made the statement that in 1870 at his request Sir John A. Macdonald had appointed a commission to take evidence and to view the situation right along the coast line from Sarnia to Tobermory. That commission reported that Goderich was the only harbour of refuge along that stretch of 150 or 200 miles, and Sir John Macdonald's administration, at the request of a Liberal member representing that riding, took action in the matter. Sir John showed him every courtesy, without striving to make Mr. Cameron believe that because he was of a different political persuasion he should come hat in hand and on bended knee before the throne of the Minister of Public Works. Yet the other day, when I rose in the house to ask that another town in my constituency be given a public building, the answer of the Minister of Public Works was in effect that I had a nerve to ask for anything else in my constituency in view of the expenditures that had been made on this great national port, which was founded by the party to which I belong and which has been maintained by every government up to the present moment, despite the fact that in nearly every instance the sitting member has been politically opposed to the administration of the day.

The Hon. James Sutherland, Minister of Public Works in 1903, stated that up to that time Canada had spent $713,341.43 on the harbour. Before I proceed I wish to point out to hon. members of this house that this

is no ordinary harbour seeking a little donation. Through the activities of this harbour the Canadian National Railways, our own system, takes in over $1,000,000 of revenue in freight annually while the Canadian Pacific Railway takes in over three-quarters of a million. We had afloat in the harbour last year 22 vessels carrying five and three-quarter million bushels of wheat. Last year twenty million bushels of wheat were handled at this port. In cargo deliveries to Canadian ports Goderich stood third, exceeded only by Port Colborne and Montreal. In cargo deliveries to lake Huron and Georgian bay ports Goderich stood first. It appears to me that the Hon. James Sutherland, the former Minister of Public Works, had a very good grasp of the situation and he sounded somewhat of a prophetic note. According to Hansard, Mr. Kemp of Toronto arose and asked this question:

> Does this constitute all that the people of Goderich demand from the Department of Public Works?

The then Minister of Public Works replied:

> No,. demands have been made, not only from Goderich, but the whole of the district and from Toronto west, that a breakwater should be built at that port. I myself believe it is a matter of necessity, if we are to have the benefit we should have on lake Huron. At present mostly all the shipping goes up the American side of the lake because we have not any harbour of refuge on the Canadian side. There are in addition splendid facilities already erected there in the shape of an elevator and other improvements at the harbour. I am very much impressed with the representation that a great deal of the grain of the west might be taken care of here if we had the proper facilities. However, the discussion of that matter will come up more properly when I ask the house to consider an appropriation for the purpose of improving Goderich harbour.

I should like the minister and the house to note this particularly:

> I do not think it is a local work, but national in its nature. And the shipments to Canadian ports depend a great deal on our being able to take care of the grain which comes to these lake ports. Larger vessels could come to Goderich than to many of the other places. I am informed by the Grand Trunk that they would be prepared to take care of the grain, and that perhaps from fifteen to twenty millions of bushels could be easily handled if there was a very moderate expenditure on the harbour.

This was in 1903, and twenty-six years later —a quarter of a century—I am glad to be able to rise in this house and say that the prophetic utterance of the Hon. James Sutherland, a Liberal Minister of Public Works, has come true, and that in the past year there have been twenty million bushels. Mr. Maclaren, who represented North Perth at the time, said:

> I have many communications from that part of the country with regard to the harbour, and they say that for two hundred miles along the shore of lake Huron there is not a safe harbour for steamers to enter in case of storm. The grain men and millers all through that part of the country are very anxious to have the harbour put into proper shape. I may say also that I have a resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Stratford, and letter and telegrams from Mitchell, Seaforth, Goderich and all along the line; and I think the government should do something to put the harbor in proper shape. So far as I am concerned, I will do everything in my power.

I do not wish to go into any historical review of the situation by taking up the Hansards of the various years since confederation, but it has been freely admitted by every Minister of Public Works that Goderich is a harbour of national importance. Once more I would impress upon the minister the fact that any harbour which will contribute $1,000,000 in freight rates to the Canadian National Railways and three quarters of a million to the Canadian Pacific Railway is a harbour that should receive every consideration. On the strength of the sympathetic attitude of the present administration the Goderich Elevator Company has gone ahead with an expenditure this year, there being in course of erection a one million bushel extension to their elevator, at a cost of $350,000; and they confidently anticipate that the work will be proceeded with vigorously.

If we are going to have sessions of parliament lasting away on into midsummer, with estimates being brought down only at the close of the session, then we are going to have a perpetual excuse for holding up a work of such importance nationally; and if that be the case I would appeal to the Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Mackenzie King) to call this house in session earlier in the year, say in the month of November, and let us get home by Easter. This would give the public works of Canada a chance. It is not the fault of hon. members on this side of the house that these estimates are going through at this late hour. I believe there are some unfinished contracts in connection with these public works, and while we are satisfied with the amount of $205,000 we believe all that money should be spent. We feel that it should be more; we feel that this government as well as previous governments has not kept pace with the activity of that harbour, but at all events we desire to get away from this business of putting $175,000 in the estimates and then spending less than half that amount.

I want to leave that thought with the government; I know the Minister of Public Works feels his responsibility, and I would appeal to the government to get away from petty

politics. They should not go into constituencies during by-elections—I am not speaking of my own riding in particular; this has reference to the constituency of Victoria and others—and try to bribe the people of Canada with their own money. We believe that this is the money of the people of Canada which will be spent for the development of Goderich harbour. If it is to be a personal donation from this government I would suggest that the minister dress up as Santa Claus, get a few reindeers, have the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who knows the blue water highway well, drive him there and present the gift, if it is a national necessity it should be proceeded with vigorously, but if it is not a necessity not one dollar should be spent. We are just asking what the merits of the case demand, and I want to protest against the administration making promises during both by-elections and general elections which apparently they have no intention of fulfilling. I think it is not a very big jump at all from that sort of thing to the man who, running for alderman or mayor of a city, goes around promising public works in order to get votes. In fact Mr. Chairman, to my mind there is no difference between offering a public bribe for a bunch of votes and the straight purchase of so much per head.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Just a moment. My hon. friend knows very well that I was Minister of Public Works at the time of the last by-election in his riding. Does he mean to suggest that I went about promising public works to anyone in that riding, or making suggestions of that kind?

Mr. SPOTTON: I do not; I think I placed myself clearly on record last year to the effect that the Minister of Public Works did not do so, and I am prepared to stand by what I said then. However, I never heard of his slapping on the wrist any of the fellows who did that sort of thing, and I appealed to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works through the press to come out in the newspapers and say that regardless of how the vote went this harbour would be treated in a businesslike manner.

Now I wish to place on Hansard a report from the Lake Shippers' Clearance Association showing the relative importance of the various harbours, together with the statement of a gentleman who is deeply interested in this matter and who knows much more about it than I do. I have never wearied the house very much by reading articles, but I propose to place this statement on record for all time:

Grain Traffic Through Goderich

Annually we handle from fifteen to twenty million bushels of grain from vessels to cars, principally of Canadian origin, shipped from Fort William and Port Arthur. The major portion of this grain is destined for domestic milling and feeding requirements in Ontario and Quebec, with the balance going for export abroad through our Canadian eastern seaboard ports, and for domestic distribution in New England states. In 1929 we have handled through the "transit" elevators 17,000,000 bushels of Canadian and American grain, while an additional 4,000,000 bushels has been handled through the elevator of the Western Canada Flour Mills. The freight revenue on this will amount to over $1,800,000 of which our Canadian National Railways secures over 60 per cent. Additional to the grain traffic from our harbour is that of salt, coal, timber and other merchandise.

The first grain elevator at Goderich was built in 1860 by the Buffalo and Lake Huron Railway, as a utility for handling grain from Milwaukee and Chicago for furtherance to New England points by the Buffalo gateway. In 1890 it was converted into a facility for handling Canadian western grain from vessels to cars, for distribution to Ontario millers. In 1898 a company consisting largely of Ontario millers built a more modern structure of 500,000 bushels capacity, replaced in 1906 with one of concrete. The extension of the Canadian Pacific to Goderich in 1907 increased the field for domestic distribution, which necessitated the addition of another 500,000 bushel storage. In 1923 this was doubled to 2,000,000 storage capacity, and now in 1929 the capacity is being increased another 1,000,000 bushels, and the mechanical equipment being enlarged and speeded up to make this elevator second to none on the lakes. Similarly the flour milling industry has grown at Goderich, and with it the manufacture of coarse and table salt. A mill of Ogilvies and Hutchinson which in 1875 served the local community and ground out probably 100 barrels a day, now the Western Canada Flour Mills, works to a maximum capacity of 2,300 barrels of flour and fifty tons of salt per day, every day in the year but Sunday.

That Goderich still stands to the fore in the handling of Canadian grain shipments through lake and bay ports is evidenced in the statement published by the Lake Shippers Clearance Association, Fort William, for the year ending July 31st., 1928, copy of which is herewith attached. This, of course, is exclusive of American grain. You will observe that with the exception of Port Colborne and Montreal, which are principally export points, Goderich exceeded Port McNicoll, Midland, Tiffin, Depot Harbour, Owen Sound and Sarnia.

Goderich, in the earlier schooner days, was established as a harbour of refuge, but in 1880 when steam carriers were supplanting the slower sailing vessel, the safety of this port for the larger craft was no more. Shallow draft in the harbour and an unprotected entrance made the mariner shun the place in stress of weather. Fortunately our governments realized the possibilities of the port and after private enterprise had demonstrated a determination to develop grain distribution and flour milling it was found necessary to build breakwaters and deepen the channels and harbour basin. But our Public Works departments have not kept pace with the development of traffic, especially in the accommodation of winter storage cargoes.

Last fall some twenty-two steamers held cargo for winter unloading, utilizing every available foot of space, and when this was filled other consignments had to proceed to Buffalo, Toledo, Erie and Fairport, where American railways secured the haulage on their export cargoes. Most of these storage vessels are American owned, which seek winter mooring at lake Huron ports so that they may make an early start in spring, to lake Michigan ports or to the westerly coal ports of lake Erie before Buffalo may be freed of ice. They find their winter mooring charges and shifting much cheaper at lake Huron ports than obtains along the expensive frontage of American ports. That the almost land-locked harbour of Goderich is secure is evidenced from the results of the gale of March 7th of this year, which shifted many and sank one or two steamers at lake Erie ports, to say nothing of the damages to wharves and bridges, while at Goderich every steamer remained secure.

While these twenty-two steamers of varying capacities held five and three quarter million bushels of grain last winter, there is ample area, if properly developed, for from thirty to thirty-five steamers of larger capacities which would easily accommodate twelve million bushels. The rail haulage on this grain would serve to keep our railways quite occupied throughout otherwise lean months, and similarly distribute valued wages to a number of men when they most require it. To attain this it is necessary that our Government prosecute promptly and expeditiously the program of improvement which has been requested of the Department of Public Works.

The following comparative statement taken from the records of the Lake Clearance Association, for the week ending December 14th., 1928, shows the quantities of grain carried afloat for winter storage, ex-Fort William and Port Arthur shipments:

At Canadian Ports:	Bus.	American Bus.
Goderich	5,268,067	446,867
Montreal	1,753,921	
Midland	4,880,495	
Owen Sound	2,107,064	
Kingston	138,801	
Port Colborne	3,659,668	
Port McNicoll	2,248,982	
Sarnia	4,739,694	
Tiffin	1,160,632	
Toronto	1,031,391	
	26,988,715	

At American Ports:	Bus.	
Buffalo	14,414,738	Unknown
Cleveland	215,148	"
Erie	5,360,084	"
Fairport	1,927,679	"
Milwaukee	102,802	"
Toledo	1,368,667	"
	23,389,118	

It has been conclusively demonstrated that the handling of grain through Goderich is of a permanent character and that any harbour development is of national advantage, directly benefitting those who grow the grain in the west, the transportation facilities, lake and rail, the milling and feeding trade in the east, and in fact the consuming public in Ontario. Quebec, and abroad.

The expenditure in harbour deveopment at Goderich is not of any speculative venture; on the contrary, it is returned four-fold to the public in the economic distribution of their cereals through a most convenient gateway, and to our railways in profitable haulage on the grain and subsequently on the flour product. Once dredged this harbour stays dredged—there is no river or back wash to deposit silt, gravel, or other debris.

Lake Shippers' Clearance Association

Statement of grain shipped through the Lake Shippers' Clearance Association from Fort William and Port Arthur, lake and rail, during period August 1, 1927, to July 31, 1928

Destination	Wheat	Oats	Barley	Flax	Rye	Totals
Buffalo	130,562,682	2,263,893	14,217,502	1,152,566	4,763,885	152,900,528
Chicago	.....	51,524	.....	573,625	.....	625,149
Cleveland	.....	.....	.....	669,339	.....	669,339
Erie	5,483,293	.....	134,556	.....	.....	5,617,849
Fairport	5,897,337	.....	233,000	.....	803,772	6,934,109
Duluth	.....	73,470	.....	.....	.....	73,470
Toledo	2,778,458	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,778,458
			United States total			169,598,902
Depot Harbour	748,751	.....	.....	.....	863,926	1,612,677
Goderich	11,516,385	794,203	222,582	566,992	364,535	13,464,697
Midland	10,189,220	1,332,166	348,331	40,000	439,341	12,349,058
Montreal	8,855,026	4,258,653	2,086,472	161,121	584,778	15,946,050
Owen Sound	3,985,102	1,427,875	370,248	60,000	107,996	5,951,221
Port Colborne	55,225,014	8,468,448	4,678,506	695,428	3,788,348	72,855,744
Port McNicoll	9,076,762	.....	60,000	.....	197,604	9,334,366
Port Stanley	266,000	.....	55,216	.....	.....	321,216
Quebec	411,259	461,546	.....	.....	.....	872,805
Sarnia	2,415,921	96,293	91,342	.....	33,874	2,637,430
Tiffin	6,268,473	76,428	.....	50,000	347,967	6,742,868
Local elevators	9,734,475	14,435	122,889	.....	171,118	10,042,917
			Canadian total			152,131,049

Carried by:			Bushels	
Canadian vessels to Canadian ports	662	cargoes carried	145,110,250	
Canadian vessels to American ports	125	cargoes carried	27,669,927	
				172,780,177
American vessels to Canadian ports	25	cargoes carried	7,214,621	
American vessels to American ports	468	cargoes carried	141,735,153	
				148,949,774
				321,729,951

In cargo deliveries to Canadian ports Goderich stood third, exceeded only by Port Colborne and Montreal.

In cargo deliveries to lake Huron and Georgian Bay ports Goderich stood first.

Mr. ELLIOTT: By whom was this article written, and what is the date?

Mr. SPOTTON: It is dated April 2.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This year?

Mr. SPOTTON: This year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Whose statement is it?

Mr. SPOTTON: I will not give the name of the man who sent it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a statement read in that way should include the name of the party signing it.

Mr. SPOTTON: I have a very good reason for not giving that name; I will read it as my own statement and take the responsibility for it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: You have not done that.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): I am afraid the hon. gentleman is completely out of order, and I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that the whole discussion is out of order. We are discussing vote No. 70, roads and bridges.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was understood that when the item of harbours and rivers generally was brought before the committee again any item of that nature could be discussed. While we are not discussing harbours and rivers at the present moment, I would like every latitude to be given to the hon. member.

Mr. SPOTTON: The minister was courteous enough to permit that, and I wish to thank him.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was an understanding which I entered into. I think the committee should have the name of the author of that article in order to know just what weight should be attached to it; that is quite clearly a rule of the house.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Eugene Fiset): I would call the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that the hon. member has stated that it was some notes he was reading.

[Mr. Spotton.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the fact.

Mr. SPOTTON: The Toronto Telegram said quite recently that they did not care who read the speeches, what they were interested in was who wrote them; the minister seems to have taken the same attitude. This is the first time I have ever read anything in the house, and I think I should be given the privilege of placing on Hansard this article which was sent to me by a gentlemen who I think knows more about the harbour of Goderich than any other person in Canada. I have a very good reason for not wanting to divulge his name, but if the Minister of Public Works presses me I will give that reason to the house.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was not pressing the hon. member, I was simply raising a point of order. If the hon. member will father the article himself, that will render it as innocuous as possible.

Mr. SPOTTON: The development of Goderich harbour is not a speculation; once that harbour is once dredged it will remain dredged, because there is no river or backwash to deposit silt, gravel or other sediment. I do not know to what extent the minister is carrying on the work there at the present time, but I do hope that it is being proceeded with as speedily as possible. I notice in a Liberal paper that the minister stated to the delegation which visited him that the proposed expenditures were as follows:

> The minister informed the delegation, that the federal government intends to do all it can, within reason, to make Goderich the port it should be. He said every effort would be made to initiate the work early in the season, if parliament approves the departmental estimates at an early date.
>
> The minister gave the delegation details of the proposed expenditure this coming summer, as follows: Completion Forest dredging contract, $70,000; completion Jackson Construction Company, contract on north pier, $22,000 and $43,000 on moving wharf; completion Vance Construction Company contract on south pier, $9,500; Killmer and Barber, dredging contract,

$5,000; improved dockage accommodation, $5,000, and a start on $143,000 contract for partial removal of ship island for improving turning basin in the inner harbor, $50,000.

I would direct the attention of the minister to the fact that this is Ship island and not Indian island, and when I send a communication to the Minister of Public Works with regard to Indian island I refuse to be misrepresented to the present occupant of Ship island as having designs upon his island. I am not making any attack upon the minister as to the amount of his estimates; I believe the amount is quite fair and I do not think the minister should get peeved when, at the request of Goderich citizens, I ask him that as much as possible of the money be spent this year and not less than fifty per cent of the amount as was the case last year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to follow my hon. friend through all his discussions, but I would just say that I am in the judgment of the people of Goderich and of the people of that county as to whether or not they are being treated fairly. They visited the department a short time ago, accompanied by my hon. friend, and they expressed their appreciation of what was being done by this government. The hon. member has his own views with regard to Goderich harbour; perhaps they are better known in that particular district than they are down here, and I do not intend to quarrel with him in any way. I do not know whether my hon. friend keeps closely enough in touch with Goderich to know that the dredging is proceeding at the present time and that contracts were let last year amounting to $205,000, and therefore the difficulty which he has anticipated as to this work being held up until these estimates are passed does not apply. I have been given to understand by the people of Goderich that the work is proceeding satisfactorily to them.

The hon. member is quite within his rights in making any statement or offering any criticisms with regard to the manner in which the work is proceeding at Goderich, but nothing he can say will divert this government from the fixed policy which it has announced of doing what it considers to be ample justice to the port of Goderich. I would direct the attention of the hon. member to a fact which he omitted to tell the house, that since the year 1922 the amount of $662,070 has been expended by this government upon the harbour at Goderich. I have a report of the engineer of that district, dated December 17, 1928, in which he says that when navigation officially closed for the season on the great lakes Goderich had a winter fleet of 22 steamers, the greatest in tonnage and value ever assembled there. I do not intend to proceed any further, Mr. Chairman, as I do not think I need to offer any argument to convince the people of Goderich that they are receiving fair treatment at the hands of this government.

Mr. SPOTTON: I just desire to repel the covert threat conveyed by the minister's remarks, which is quite in accord with his attitude on a former occasion. The minister is simply coming back to the point which I tried to stress when I quoted his remarks from Hansard; when I urged upon the member for Victoria to see that the government spent this amount of money $46,000, the member for Victoria replied, "They always do, do they not?" and I said, "No, they do not." It is not a habit but a gift with the present minister to put large-sounding, advertising amounts in the estimates and then spend only a percentage of them.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What does the hon. member say to the fact that we have entered into binding contracts?

Mr. SPOTTON: The full amount was not spent last year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The contractors did all they could.

Mr. SPOTTON: The minister is quoted in Hansard as saying, "That is a suggestion for North Huron," and there are other remarks which do not appear in Hansard. He says now that notwithstanding anything that the representative for that riding might say and in spite of the way they are represented, it would not divert this government from their fixed policy of procedure. I am glad he is going to carry on so manfully, and I wish to congratulate him on that policy. But he must not forget that there have been other governments and there was a government bearing the heat and burden of the day, a war government, that put an item of $200,000 in the estimates in 1915. Some day another government may be in power, and if I have the honour to have a seat in the house—if the minister will not carry out his threats to bring about my retirement—I shall stress still more forcibly to the new government that this work should be carried on. My whole point with the minister is this: I am requested to say that the citizens of Goderich are satisfied with the amount in the estimates, but they will not be satisfied if that amount is not spent. We do not believe in getting $205,000 and having only $100,000 of it spent.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I want to make an appeal to the minister in connection with a portion of estimate No. 142 in regard to the interprovincial bridge over the Ottawa river at Hawkesbury, for which bridge an item of $40,000 has been in the estimates for a good many years. The proposal of the government is to build this bridge, provided the Quebec and Ontario governments will each contribute one-third of the cost. The difficulty of the position is that three governments are interested in this matter, and someone has to take the initiative. In all courtesy to the Minister of Public Works, I say that in his position he is the natural person to take this matter up with the other governments. I want to urge upon him that he ask the representatives of the other governments to meet him, talk the matter over and see if there is not some way whereby this very important and necessary work may be built. I want to ask him as a personal favour to take the matter up with the other governments and see if some solution cannot be found. Perhaps the minister does not know the location. The bridge is very urgently required, because there is no bridge over the Ottawa river between Ottawa and Ste. Annes, a distance of 110 miles or thereabouts. I know that at or near Hawkesbury and Grenville many lives have been lost in the last twenty years owing to the fact that people had to cross the river in the fall or spring of the year when the ice was bad and perhaps unwisely took the chance of crossing on bad ice. For humanitarian reasons, therefore, this bridge is very much needed and we have been agitating for it for a long time. With the present development of motor traffic there is a great necessity from the commercial point of view for the building of this bridge, because, if motorists coming from the United States were able to cross at Hawkesbury they would get into the north country via the shortest possible route instead of having to go to Montreal and taking a roundabout route. In the north country back of Grenville there are many lakes and wonderful scenery to attract people from the United States, and if this bridge were built it would be greatly used by motorists who desire to visit that section.

When the Borden government was in power, at my request it was decided to build the bridge and in 1914 tenders were called for the purpose. Unfortunately they came in just about the time war was declared, and on account of the war it was considered impossible to go on with any public works that were not absolutely necessary, so that no tender was accepted. As a matter of fact if the war had not intervened, this bridge would have been commenced in 1914 and completed many years ago. At that time it was the intention of the Dominion government to pay one-half the cost of the bridge, and on that basis arrangements were made with the provincial governments each to pay one-quarter. The minister tells me that the policy of the present government is to pay only one-third of the cost of bridges such as this, and he absolutely refuses to alter that decision. There should be a conference between the authorities of the Dominion and the two provinces on this particular point and with regard to this very necessary work. The counties on either side, one of which I have the honour to represent and the other being the county of Prescott in Ontario, have very little money spent in them. We are satisfied to have our friends from the great lakes and other parts of Canada receive the greater part of the public money that is being spent by the minister's department. We do however demand that this small expenditure be made, and surely in all fairness the people of those two counties ought to be helped to have this bridge built which is so very necessary for the preservation of life and also for the use of tourists who bring so much money into the country. Therefore I appeal to the minister to take a personal interest in the matter and to try to get the representatives of the provinces together to find a solution so that this bridge may be built in the near future.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a matter that has been before the government for some time and in regard to which the attitude of the government, as my hon. friend said, is quite well known. It is true that in the earlier years, as I am able to read the history of interprovincial bridges, it was clearly intended at the time of the passing of the British North America Act that bridges between provinces other than military bridges should be constructed by the two adjoining provinces. Practically the same rule applies as between counties. I am able to speak of the province of Ontario especially, and that rule applies as between two counties. Between townships, the two townships would build it, and between a township and a village the cost would be borne half by each. That has been the practice. Following out that, you would naturally expect that bridges that were not originally military bridges would be built by two adjoining provinces on an equal basis. However, the system has grown up under which the Dominion has contributed different proportions of the cost of bridges at different times, but for the last fifteen years the policy has been consistent.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Not for so long as fifteen years, I think.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Since the interprovincial bridge over the Chaudiere was built, and I am informed that that was fifteen years ago. Where two provinces have decided upon the necessity of a bridge, I think the Dominion government has since that time agreed in every case to contribute one-third of the cost, each of the two provinces contributing one-third. I quite agree with what my hon. friend has said with regard to the right of a county like either of the two he has mentioned. They do not require much expenditure in the way of wharves, breakwaters and that sort of thing, and they should receive some reasonable consideration by way of assistance, so far as it is legitimate for this government to assist in transportation facilities. I was under the impression after a conference I had with my hon. friend some time ago that he was going to be good enough to see one or two or both of the representatives of the provinces with regard to taking the initiative. I question the wisdom of the Dominion, as a general rule, taking the initiative in regard to an expenditure of which the two provinces really have to be the judges to a large extent, and in relation to which their outlay between them is twice as much as that of the Dominion. But I do agree with my hon. friend as to the necessity of a bridge at this point, and as far as I am concerned I am not going to stand on any formalities if I can be of assistance in getting all the parties together and getting an arrangement completed. I know that my hon. friend will be glad to join with me in offering his good offices in getting all the parties together and having this much required bridge got under way at the earliest possible moment. I shall be glad to have a conference with my hon. friend and anything that can be done in the matter I shall be glad to do.

Mr. MAYBEE: I would direct the attention of the minister to the revote of $41,000 for Cobourg harbour. I assume this is to complete the dredging in that place. I would ask the minister just how the matter of the repair of the esplanade stands between the department and the town of Cobourg.

Mr. ELLIOTT: As my hon. friend will know, the title to the site on which the work will be done is in the town of Cobourg. Some time ago they agreed to transfer that to the Dominion government, but for one reason or another—I do not wish to attach any criticism to the town in connection with it—through no fault of this department the town was unable to complete that transfer until a couple of weeks ago. It is the intention to proceed with the dredging right away.

Mr. MAYBEE: I understand from the minister that the town have completed their part of the arrangement satisfactorily.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, within the last two weeks.

Mr. MAYBEE: Then there is no disagreement between the department and the town as to the department going ahead and repairing the esplanade, and there will be no delay in making the repairs.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is only fair for me to say to my hon. friend—he probably knows something about this—that now that we are committed to what is know as the esplanade proposition a more ambitious program, a larger scheme, is proposed by the town. They are urging that at the present time, and I might say that it is under consideration. But just to what extent we can vary the arrangement we made last year I cannot say.

Mr. MAYBEE: Is the minister aware that the esplanade has slid into the harbour since the high water that came with the last storm? At the present time the harbour is not in use for shipping as previously; shipping is being diverted from the harbour of Cobourg to other ports, and the town of Cobourg is thereby losing considerable harbour fees. I would also call the minister's attention to the shipping that has been done at this port. The waterborne tonnage for the port of Cobourg for the year ending April 1, 1929, amounted to 345,600 tons of coal and 115,201 tons of merchandise, or a total of 460,801 tons. The outward tonnage amounted to 194,223, or a total tonnage of 655,024. That means 92 tons for every man, woman and child in the town of Cobourg, which is the highest record, I believe, for any town in the Dominion.

I would also direct the minister's attention to the fact that the town is still under considerable obligation for the cost of the harbour, having debentures that do not mature until 1934. They are therefore very desirous of having the revenues from the harbour maintained so that this obligation can be taken care of.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would say to my hon. friend that I am quite aware of the revenue. Before we decided to proceed with any scheme of improvement there the possible business to be done was considered very carefully. He is aware of the fact that the proposal known as the esplanade scheme involved abou

$40,000. Since that time recommendations and requests have been made, very urgently, to take out the rock necessary to give them a 22 foot depth and build there a harbour that would give them a 22 foot depth right up to the esplanade wharf. That would cost about $140,000, involving a good deal of blasting. I should be very glad if my hon. friend, who knows the local situation, would give me his views as to the comparative merits of the two propositions; they are not entirely in harmony.

Mr. MAYBEE: That is as to the depth?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, as to whether to go on with the scheme that was considered last year of repairing the esplanade wharf, or the other scheme of building a larger wharf.

Mr. MAYBEE: I would certainly urge that the harbour be made to accommodate the vessels drawing the greater depth.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They do now up to the esplanade; this would be an addition.

Mr. MAYBEE: Not over 15 foot draft, I understand, and I believe that considerable shipping that would have come into the harbour last year was lost owing to lack of a greater depth of water. I certainly would urge upon the minister that they make their program to fit the greater depth for the harbour.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is not a question of depth; it is a question whether the harbour should be extended to the larger size.

Mr. MAYBEE: I think the shipping of the harbour justifies that expenditure.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The present shipping does not. It depends to a large extent upon the relative merits of Port Hope and Cobourg with regard to certain shipments of coal and ore that are liable to go to the one place or the other. When this was started a year ago it looked as though those were going to go to Cobourg. It looks now as if the parties most directly interested have some notion of using Port Hope.

Mr. MAYBEE: I think that that traffic is temporarily diverted due to the present condition of Cobourg harbour. That is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Either harbour is available for use at the present time.

Mr. MAYBEE: Not for unloading coal from the esplanade, as it has all slid into the harbour as well as some of the railway track.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: They cannot do it at Port Hope either.

Mr. MAYBEE: I understand that some of the shipments of the coal company go to Port Hope in preference to Cobourg.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Did my hon. friend say that he understood that they were going to Port Hope in preference to Cobourg?

Mr. MAYBEE: I did.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, that is the information we have.

Mr. MAYBEE: It is due to the esplanade at Cobourg being unavailable.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Oh, no, because there is no accommodation at Port Hope now.

Mr. MAYBEE: Certainly they cannot land and unload at Cobourg. That is the fact. I would like to ask the minister if he will have placed in the supplementary estimates an amount at least necessary for the work on the esplanade. Has the minister had an engineer on the ground and been advised as to the present condition of the esplanade?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Our engineers have been going as rapidly as they can all over the flooded areas where the washouts have been particularly heavy this spring. I do not know that there is a very recent report in regard to Cobourg, but we know pretty well the condition there through various reports that have reached the department. My hon. friend asks if it is our intention to put in the supplementary estimates an amount to provide for harbour improvements at the esplanade. I would call his attention to the fact that the item already in the estimates at page 41 is an item for Cobourg harbour improvements, $75,000. That is for the esplanade and dredging in the harbour.

Mr. MAYBEE: I understand from the estimates that that is only a revote of the $75,000 that was voted last year, and that that was being expended upon dredging and some repairs to a pier.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of that amount $34,000 is a new vote entirely; $41,000 is a revote.

Mr. MAYBEE: My understanding is that it will require that or more for dredging.

Mr. CLARK: The minister stated that some fifteen years ago the principle was recognized of giving grants toward the construction of interprovincial bridges. Sixteen years ago the principle was recognized of giving grants to bridges, within municipalities, that crossed public harbours. An act was passed by this

parliament in 1913—I cannot at this moment give the name of the act, but it was a subsidy act for the purpose of assisting in the construction of a bridge over the public harbour of Vancouver. Unfortunately the war intervened and the bridge was not constructed within the period of time laid down in the act. After the war the demand for a bridge in that particular part of the harbour was so urgent that the municipalities surrounding, the city of Vancouver and the province of British Columbia, constructed the bridge. This government declined—well, I would not say they declined to give a contribution at that time, but the contribution was made through the harbour board of the city of Vancouver. In that particular instance it was very natural that the contribution should be made in that way, because the bridge was a toll bridge and the harbour board of the city of Vancouver will be able to liquidate the advance through the return on the investment, because it is a paying proposition and eventually they will receive back dollar for dollar that has been advanced. For some years past the city of Vancouver has suffered greatly owing to the lack of a bridge across another portion of the public harbour from the foot of Burrard street over False creek. I want to draw to the attention of the minister the fact that in this instance all the international traffic that comes into the city of Vancouver must necessarily cross that public harbour at one or other of two or three points on False creek. There is great congestion of traffic. It has been almost unanimously recognized that another bridge must be provided. With that in view, the province of British Columbia has agreed to contribute a very substantial sum of money towards that bridge. The Canadian Pacific Railway has agreed to contribute a very substantial sum of money towards that bridge. The city of Vancouver was quite prepared to contribute the major portion required for its erection, but it did request the Dominion government to make a contribution inasmuch as the bridge crosses a public harbour. Now the principle has been recognized of contributions towards interprovincial bridges; the principle was recognized by statute sixteen years ago of contributions towards bridges crossing public harbours, and the principle is recognized of contributions towards international bridges. And I would point out that an enormous amount of international traffic crosses the bridges over Vancouver harbour. Recently, and after this government's refusal to make a contribution, a by-law was submitted to the electors of Vancouver for the construction of this bridge, involving payment by the city of Vancouver of the total cost with the exception of the contributions by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the provincial government. But although the people voted on that by-law and indicated that a tremendous majority was in favour of the bridge, the by-law was unfortunately defeated by a few votes because it required a two thirds majority. Since the defeat of the by-law I have received numerous letters on this subject from public bodies and others, which indicate to me the certainty that the bridge must be built, for the city is suffering in the meantime to a great extent through want of it. In view of these facts is the minister prepared to do what he has done—and I am not criticising him for having done it—in connection with the interprovincial bridge at Hawkesbury? In this case, apparently, the government is prepared to take the initiative; but I would point out that in the matter of the bridge which I am discussing the initiative has been taken by the province of British Columbia and the city of Vancouver. There is an urgent demand for that bridge. In view of these circumstances will the minister not consider placing in the supplementary estimates a vote as an offer to the city of Vancouver and the province of British Columbia that if they wish to proceed with the construction of the bridge this government will contribute a sum sufficient to take care of the extra cost entailed, by the fact that the bridge crosses a public harbour belonging to this country and a harbour which must be protected.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The matter my hon. friend has brought up has received a good deal of attention by the department. He knows, of course, that this is not an interprovincial bridge but a bridge within a harbour in the province and within the city. It does not come within the category of the interprovincial bridges.

Mr. CLARK: I said so.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Inasmuch as the bridge is within the harbour, the department has decided that it comes under the harbour commission, which is really controlled by the Department of Marine. The minister in charge of that department was good enough to consider the matter with me and we gave it the best attention we could, and so far as this department was concerned I had little difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the matter was outside our jurisdiction.

Mr. CLARK: Does it differ from the bridge over the second narrows for which this parliament passed a bill sixteen years ago, offering a subsidy of $350,000? How does it differ in principle from that?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That was a railway subsidy.

Mr. CLARK: No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my information is correct, it was in the act with regard to railway subsidies.

Mr. CLARK: I do not think so; I think it was a special act.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Then my information is entirely erroneous.

Mr. CLARK: My recollection is that it was a special act, although I have not seen it for years.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend will find that these are the facts.

Mr. CLARK: In that case I will look it up and have the information here at eight o'clock. At the moment I am quite satisfied that it was a special act relating to this particular bridge, although the subsidy may have been granted because of the railway. May I point out that three railways will use this bridge. The Canadian Pacific Railway already have a bridge which crosses the harbour and which is used by the Canadian Pacific and the British Columbia Electric Railway, and it is the only means of access for the Canadian National Railways to that side of the harbour. If this new bridge is constructed it will give access to that part of the harbour to the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian Pacific and the British Columbia Electric Railway. And that reminds me I think that the British Columbia Electric Railway is also contributing; it may be doing so in the name of the Canadian Pacific Railway but the fact is that there is a railway contribution. And if it is to be of benefit to the Canadian National Railways I suggest that the government should take the matter again into consideration. Apart from the position of the railways, the fact that extra cost is entailed by reason of the bridge crossing a public harbour should warrant the government in contributing to that enhanced cost. The work is for the protection of one of the most important harbours in the country.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I desire to table now, if I may do so, reference No. 97, asked for by the hon. member for Fort William, containing all correspondence entered into by the government in connection with the dredging contract for the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William during the year 1928. I do not see my hon. friend in the house at the moment, but I promised to lay the correspondence on the table at the earliest possible moment.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not customary, and in fact I think it is not permissible, to table papers in committee. The clerk must enter them on his scroll.

Mr. CLARK: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were discussing the question of a bridge over the harbour at Vancouver and I undertook to advise the minister of the statute which authorized the subsidy. I find that the subsidy was originally authorized by the Railway Subsidies Act, as the minister suggested, but it is authorized by an earlier act than I had thought at the time; the act was passed in 1908 and renewed in 1912 and 1913. So the principle of granting subsidies for these bridges has been recognized for twenty-one years. In view of the fact that this subsidy was authorized for one bridge over a portion of Vancouver harbour but was never used; in view of the fact that the bridge which was then contemplated has been built; in view of the fact that every cent which may be advanced by the Vancouver harbour commission will be repaid with interest out of the earnings of the bridge; in view of the further fact that the bridge which is now contemplated and for which this grant was asked is a rail bridge in addition to being a bridge for general purposes over the public harbour, I consider there is very much more merit to this request than to any of the requests I have heard for bridges over rivers or between provinces, and I would like to ask the minister again to take this matter under consideration and recommend this grant to the government.

The city of Vancouver is only asking that the government pay whatever extra cost may be entailed by reason of the fact that we must protect the public harbour when constructing the bridge. What could be more just than that the country should pay the extra cost so entailed? It will be necessary, if the bridge is constructed, to have either a swing bridge or a lift, and I believe if the country pays that extra cost the people of Vancouver will be satisfied. I submit that the principle of granting such subsidies has been recognized; we are not asking for anything unreasonable but merely the actual cost entailed by reason of the fact that we are

crossing property belonging to the country. In addition to that there is the fact that the country has already recognized the claim of Vancouver for the bridge over this harbour, although that grant never was used. I do plead with the minister that in all fairness this matter should be reconsidered by the government and very much better reasons given than those so far advanced if the government insist upon refusing this request. Before I sit down I should like to ask the minister if he will table the papers relating to this request and to the refusal on the part of the government.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. First of all, I think perhaps my hon. friend is under some misapprehension as to the manner in which this grant was made previously. If he will look at the estimates for 1925-26 he will find that the vote was not under this department at all, although for his purposes I quite agree that it does not make any difference what department it comes under.

Mr. CLARK: I did not think there was a vote in 1925.

Mr. ELLIOTT: At page 59 of the estimates for 1925-26 my hon. friend will find that in the miscellaneous items presented by the Minister of Finance there is included the following item:

Grant to the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company towards construction of bridge over the second narrows of Burrard inlet, B.C., being revote of portion of subsidy authorized by statute, chapter 46, section 3, 1913. Revote, $100,000.

The total amount provided was $270,000, while the act provided for $350,000.

Mr. CLARK: I think the minister is under a misapprehension. Was that money not voted to the Vancouver harbour commission and in turn loaned by the harbour commission to the bridge company?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, it was voted exactly in the terms I have mentioned. My hon. friend is correct in saying that chapter 46 of the statutes of 1913 authorized a grant of $350,000, but I understand that the entire amount voted in 1925, $270,000, was spent.

Mr. CLARK: And was it not charged to the Vancouver harbour commission, who are under obligation to repay it to this government with interest?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think the harbour commission was in existence at that time.

Mr. CLARK: My impression was that every cent of money advanced by the country in connection with that bridge was charged to the Vancouver harbour commission with the obligation of repayment with interest. I should like to have confirmation of that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not intend to argue with my hon. friend about that, but if there was such an arrangement it must have been a subsequent one; it could not have been done under this vote if the terms of the vote were carried out. I realize that the matter is one of importance and already we have given it a good deal of consideration. As the situation now is, I think this matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Marine and Fisheries department and not the Public Works department, but from the standpoint of the people who need the bridge I do not suppose that that makes any real difference.

Mr. CLARK: The minister says that he has actually consulted with his colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We heard the deputation together, and we have had numerous consultations in regard to it. I shall be very glad to see if there is anything further which can be done.

Mr. CLARK: What has the minister to say about the fact that this bridge will carry a line for the Canadian Pacific Railway and will provide a means of access to the Canadian National Railway for that portion of the harbour which lies south of False creek?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think that is correct.

Mr. CLARK: What has the minister to say with regard to that feature of it? Are we not justified in asking the government for a grant upon the basis of the principle, already recognized by parliament on numerous occasions under the Railway Subsidies Act? During the past years many subsidies have been authorized under that act for bridges for one or the other of these railway companies, while it is refused in this instance.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I understand that that act is not resorted to at the present time to the extent that it formerly was. Such matters naturally come within the jurisdiction of the Department of Railways and Canals, and not of the Public Works department, and this particular matter, because it involves a harbour, comes under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I shall be very glad to take this matter up again with the different de-

partments involved and see if there is any possibility of bringing about a change in the viewpoint which was taken when this matter was considered before.

Mr. CLARK: In addition to the viewpoint to be taken of the grant as such, will the minister canvass the situation and advise the city as to what other possible course there may be? For instance, after the situation is canvassed it may appear to the minister that we would be perfectly justified in asking for a subsidy under the provisions of the Railway Subsidies Act. It may appear that we are justified in asking for a grant in the estimates because of the extra cost entailed by the fact that the bridge crosses a public harbour and it has been found necessary to provide a draw and go to the expense of special construction. Then again, it may appear that this is a proper subject for action by the Vancouver harbour commission. I cannot overestimate the importance of this matter to the city of Vancouver. The bridges over that harbour carry practically all the international motor vehicle traffic which comes into the city. I ask the minister not only to consider this matter, but to advise the city of the course which would be the most advantageous for them to pursue in this connection.

I do not know whether it comes under this item or not, but I should like to have some information in regard to the New Edinburgh mill property, as to how much has been spent on that building since its purchase.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That would come under the heading of public buildings, not harbours and rivers. There is no item in the present estimates for the New Edinburgh mill property, but I would refer my hon. friend to the particulars of expenditures which were tabled in the house.

Mr. CLARK: Under what heading?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was the return which was made relating to the expenditures in connection with the New Edinburgh mill.

Mr. CLARK: Would that be up to date?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think it is; if not, I shall be very glad to furnish my hon. friend with the details up to date.

Mr. CLARK: Has anything been done to utilize the water-power?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Not so far.

Mr. CLARK: Is it lying idle now?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. CLARK: A year ago the minister estimated that it would yield an annual return of $26,400, and that estimate has not materialized.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It will, when we start to utilize it. Up to the present time the demands have not been sufficient to justify the expenditure necessary to utilize these powers.

Mr. CLARK: Has the minister attempted to sell this water-power?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. CLARK: Has the minister attempted to lease it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. CLARK: In the meantime we are losing the interest on the minister's estimate of the value of $200,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know my hon. friend wants to be fair about this matter.

Mr. CLARK: At page 4105 of Hansard of 1928 the minister made the following statement:

> It is obvious, therefore, than an average of 1,100 horsepower could be obtained and if this power was disposed of as rated, it would yield an annual return of $26,400 for 1,100 horsepower at $2 per month.

I would like to have some information as to what has been done in that connection.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend is quite correct regarding the statement which was made. That statement was made in accordance with the valuations of expert valuators which we had before us at the time, and I believe it is still correct. It is expected that the whole of that power will be required for the purposes of government services in connection with the research buildings when they are in operation. The government considered that it was not wise to go to any extra expense in order to develop the power and distribute it for the one building which we are occupying at the present time. I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend a comparative statement showing what it costs to buy the power under our present rates and the cost of developing this water-power. This statement should be considered in the light of the fact that in the near future we expect to utilize all this power. It was not considered advisable to develop it at the present time and enter into contracts which could be made only for a short period of time.

Mr. CLARK: The purchase price, as I recall it, was $525,000. Can the minister tell us what portion of the total investment is being utilized in the public service? We know $200,000 of it is not being utilized, and we are losing, it is estimated an income of $26,400.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We are, at the present time, utilizing from the standpoint of strict operation practically nothing but the building that is used for the Bureau of Statistics. Engineers and architects have been working out a plan for the research buildings and for some other buildings that, it is expected, will be built upon the site. Of course the main part of it is site for public buildings yet to be erected, and none of that is being utilized.

Mr. CLARK: Are some of the existing buildings going to be torn down?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I fancy so, though I think we may be able to utilize for research purposes the big building at the other large mill, and probably utilize in one way or another most of the buildings that are there.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister has touched a very important item, that of research. Will he be good enough to tell us what they are doing in that regard?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not want to limit the discussion, but I respectfully suggest that we would make better headway if we tried to confine ourselves at least to the item with which we are dealing. We are now dealing with item No. 142, which does not at all touch what my hon. friend has suggested. What my hon. friend refers to was passed under item No. 117 some time ago, and in view of that perhaps I might endeavour now, as far as I can, to answer, without the details before me, any questions that my hon. friend cares to ask in regard to that. Under 117, there is an appropriation of $750,000 for National Research Council laboratories. The operation of the buildings, of course, comes under the department of my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I shall be glad to furnish my hon. friend with any information that is available in my department.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister himself brought the matter up, and that, I think, is my justification.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I brought it up in answer to a question of an hon. member with regard to the power.

Mr. McGIBBON: This is one of the most important things that the government has taken up. In fact, the government has been rather slow to act, and, if I might express an opinion, it has allowed the government of Ontario probably to steal a march on it in this regard. Would the minister tell us what they are doing and what they propose to do with regard to research?

Mr. ELLIOTT: From the standpoint of this department I might say that nearly a year ago Messrs. Sproatt and Rolph, architects of Toronto, were engaged to act in conjunction with members of the research council in devising what would seem to be the best and most up-to-date buildings that could be provided for the purposes of the researches that it is proposed to carry on. The class of buildings and laboratories required involves buildings that will be used for purposes of a very technical nature and we have been from time to time impressing upon the architects the anxiety of the department to be able to let a contract at an early date in connection with these buildings. It is hoped that before long we shall be able to do that. I do not think my hon. friend will have any reason to complain that the Department of Trade and Commerce have not been diligently devoting attention to equipping themselves with the best facilities that can be provided for carrying on the researches necessary.

Mr. BOYS: Is there any definite scheme for the utilization of either the power or these buildings? There evidently was something of that sort very definitely in the minister's mind when he addressed the house on June 9 last, when he stated:

> We are going to use them for lighting, heating and various other services.

The minister then elaborated upon the subject, pointing out the available horsepower and so forth, showing that the matter had been receiving attention. He stated that the country would receive some $26,000 as a result of the proposition. What, if anything, has been done in furtherance of the proposal he then presented to the house?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Was my hon. friend in the chamber a few moments ago when I answered the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard in regard to that very question?

Mr. BOYS: If the minister answered the question, I did not hear it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I did, but I have no objection to answering it again.

Mr. BOYS: I do not want the minister to repeat, but I will put this very definite question to him: Is there at present any definite scheme under way for the utilization of these buildings? If so, are there plans that we can examine?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend, I take it, is referring to the buildings?

Mr. BOYS: Both power and buildings.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have answered with regard to power that it is expected to be utilized entirely.

Mr. BOYS: But up to the present nothing has been done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No. With regard to the buildings, one of the main buildings is now being utilized. The other is in process of being fitted up for temporary purposes of research until the research buildings are completed. Quite substantial progress has been made along that line.

Mr. BOYS: I wanted to find out whether there was any definite scheme. The minister said that the architects were now preparing plans. Is that what the minister referred to as being for temporary purposes?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No; that is for permanent buildings. The work of fitting for temporary purposes the large mill that is not now being utilized is under way and the other building has been occupied, as my hon. friend knows, for nine months.

Mr. BOYS: I ask this because with two or three others I went to look the buildings over, and as I looked at them—stables, factory buildings and so on—from a layman's point of view I could not see how they could be utilized as they were for government purposes; it seemed to me that it would be necessary to pull them all down and erect new buildings. I was wondering if any scheme was in contemplation. If so, the committee should know what the scheme is and whether the expenditure is justified. The minister says that so far nothing has been done with regard to power, and it is a question whether a further expenditure of money for the utilization of power would be justified.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps I misunderstood my hon. friend's question; because I could not understand how a member of the house as diligent as we all know he is would not know that the Bureau of Statistics has been housed in one of these buildings for nine months or thereabouts. We are thereby escaping a rental of about $64,000 per year. We have our statistics now housed in a building that is absolutely fireproof, and if my hon. friend looks it over I think he will agree that it is a building exceptionally well suited for the requirements of that branch.

Mr. BOYS: What expenditure is involved in connection with fitting that building for the purpose for which it is being used?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Around $75,000, a little over one year's rent. The other building is in process of being equipped for the purpose of research until the new buildings are complete. The office that is on the corner of Stanley and Sussex streets has turned out to be exceptionally well fitted for the purposes of the research council and has been in use by them for some months.

Mr. BOYS: I would like to know whether there is any scheme of a comprehensive nature under way for the permanent use of these buildings beyond the use to which the minister has referred, which is of a permanent character, and the temporary use to which he referred a moment ago.

Mr. ELLIOTT: So far as the statistics branch is concerned in all probability that work will be carried on in that building for a number of years. So far as the other building is concerned it is expected that even after the new buildings are erected, as there is certain work that requires a building in the nature of a factory, it will be utilized as well as some of the other buildings; in fact I think that there will be none that will not be utilized.

Mr. BOYS: That is in contemplation, but there is nothing definite yet?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Quite so.

Mr. BOYS: Would the minister mind my interjecting something here which I realize is utterly out of place? The opportunity may not again present itself to me; I refer to the Barrie post office. I would ask the minister to make a note of what I am going to say. I understand that it is impossible to carry on operations inside the Barrie post office, if there is a serious rainstorm, without the use of umbrellas. It might be well if some attention was given to this matter and the roof made watertight. These repairs are absolutely required for the comfort of the officials of the post office and for the preservation of the building.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am very glad indeed to have this or any other matter that is of importance to my department brought up, whether it properly comes under the item we are discussing or not, because I think we are all anxious to do the things that are absolutely necessary. I have some information with regard to the Barrie post office. I know that repairs are necessary, but I am not able to say

offhand whether they are of such magnitude as to require a special vote. I rather think they are not so great that they cannot be done out of the general vote. It is the intention of the department to make some repairs there either out of the general vote for buildings or out of a vote in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BOYS: Before even venturing to say what I did I took the precaution to ascertain whether or not the situation had been brought to the attention of the district engineer and of the department, and I was given to understand that it had been, and on more than one occasion. I really feel, therefore, that I was justified in bringing the matter up to-night.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I regret that I am not able to say at the moment just what the decision was, except that some repairs were necessary at that place, which we shall make either out of the general vote or out of a special vote.

Mr. CLARK: In connection with the New Edinburgh mills water-power, is there sufficient water-power there to operate continuously the year round?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My recollection is that there is about 1,100 horse-power available there the whole year.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. BOYS: The minister said 800 last year.

Mr. ELLIOTT: From 800 to 1,100, but I think you will find it is nearer 1,100.

Mr. CLARK: Are there some portions of the year when there is not sufficient water to operate at all?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the low water season there is not as much water available as during the period of high water.

Mr. CLARK: What is available during the low water period?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have just said that my best recollection is from 800 to 1,100 horse-power, and I think it is nearer 1,100, according to the best information I can get.

Item agreed to.

Telegraph and telephone lines—Alberta—Saskatchewan—Alberta and Saskatchewan telegraph and telephone lines—general repairs and improvements, $21,000.
Island Hill—Ile à la Crosse telegraph line—clearing right-of-way, $11,500.
Peace river—building for telegraph service, $5,000.
Reconstruction of Grouard—Peace river telegraph line, $3,800.
Telegraph line from Peace river to Fort Vermilion, $75,000.

Mr. McRAE: I want to take this opportunity to compliment the hon. minister on this vote of $75,000 for a telegraph line from Peace River crossing to Fort Vermilion. It is not in my constituency, but I happen to be very familiar with the situation, and I must say that this is a very much needed improvement and will bring into touch with the world several communities one of which at the present time is about two hundred miles from transportation facilities. I hope the minister will see to it that the usual telephone facilities which are granted on the government telegraph lines will be extended to this line, at all events in Battle River, Keg river and several smaller places where a telegraph operator would hardly be justified, but where I think a telephone would perhaps serve these smaller communities equally well.

While I am on my feet, I want to say that these government telegraph lines which serve such a large area in the northwest as well as in British Columbia are among the most accommodating and best run of all our services, from the superintendent down. I want to speak a word for these men who are responsible for this service throughout that far-flung country. They give, with the assistance of their families, practically a twenty-four hour service. You can reach them and send a message at any time during the day or night, and I hope that when salaries are being readjusted, the work done by the employees of the government telegraph lines, and particularly the men out along the line, will not be overlooked.

Item agreed to.

Telegraph and telephone lines—British—Columbia—British Columbia Northern District—general repairs and improvements, $17,450.
British Columbia Vancouver Island District—general repairs and improvements, $14,000.
Mainland telegraph and telephone lines—general repairs and improvements, $8,000.
Telephone line from Dawson Creek to Sunset Prairie, $2,650.
Telephone line from Rolla to Rolla Landing, $2,500.
Yukon telegraph system—general repairs and improvements, $18,870.
Extension of telephone line on Galiano Island, $2,025.—Total, $258,945.

Mr. BENNETT: Explain.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What is it that is wanted?

Mr. BENNETT: Just where the lines are.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would say to my hon. friend that they are within the British Columbia mainland system, on which we had a total expenditure last year of $68,337. Then there is the Vancouver island system, on which we had a total expenditure last year of $156,509. I can give my hon. friend more detail if he wishes it.

Mr. FRASER: What do you mean by the northern district; what does that include?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The requirements are:

1. General repairs—Queen Charlotte Islands line, $2,414.00.
2. General repairs—Alice Arm to Stewart, B.C., $1,331.25.
3. Purchase of rowboat for use in line repair work between Alice Arm and Stewart, B.C., $60.00.
4. Ashcroft—Highland valley line, $750.00.
5. Ashcroft—Forestry line, $450.00.
6. 100 Mile House—Canim lake line, $3,200.00.
7. Quesnel—Barkerville line, $1,260.00.
8. Clinton—Gang Ranch line, $250.00.
9. Lillooet—Lytton, $6,500.00.
10. Ashcroft—Savona line, $750.00.
11. Repairs to Barkerville buildings, $500.00.

That is how the $17,000 is made up.

Mr. CLARK: What about Vancouver island? Where are the improvements there?

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to extend my thanks to the minister for including in that vote $500 for repairs to the Barkerville building. Some of the other items there are also very necessary, but that was particularly brought to my attention last fall, and I examined the building and my conclusion was that unless you repaired it this year it would be falling down next year. I must, therefore, compliment the minister for giving us the $500 for the repairs to that building.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister give us the detail of the Vancouver island repairs?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This $14,000 is required for the improvement to the Vancouver island district lines, and is made up as follows:

Estevan section, $135.
Nootka section, $75.
Sidney inlet section, $175.
Vargas island, $240.
Tofino section, $100.
Kakawis branch, $50.
Ucluelet section, $130.
Uchucklesit section, $200.
Bamfield section, $175.
Pachena section, $150.
Clo-oose section, $100.
Carmanah section, $150.
Camp Bay section, $175.
Port Renfrew, section, $175.
Jordan River section, $175.
Shusartie to San Josef bay, $225.
Sea Otter cove to Holberg, $225.
Quatsino section, $250.
Alert Bay section, $300.
Rock Bay section, $275.
Campbell river section, $190.
Union Bay section, $150.
Parksville section, $200.
Port Alberni section, $150.
Sooke section, $150.
Victoria section, $100.
Bowen island section, $150.
Whytecliff section, $250.
Squamish-Cheakamous section, $100.
Seaside park section, $100.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. CLARK: Some of the places the minister is now reading are on the mainland, not on Vancouver island at all.

Mr. FRASER: In that connection I would like to ask the minister a question. He mentioned a moment ago the Squamish-Cheakamous section. Have you a telegraph service there?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I see there is $100 for general repairs and improvements, as requested by the general superintendent of government telegraph service in a memo dated December 17, 1928.

Mr. FRASER: Have you any record of the requisition then for the extension of that service?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would not have that here. I have here only the detail relating to the items that we have placed in these estimates.

Mr. CLARK: In view of the fact that many of the places the minister has referred to as being included in this Vancouver island district are on the mainland, will the minister give us a statement of the constituencies in which these votes are allotted, with the amounts?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not here the information by constituencies. I shall be glad to furnish my friend with a statement of it, but I am not sufficiently familiar with the constituencies to be able to say just from glancing at the places. But these are the requisitions made.

Mr. CLARK: How does it happen that there are so many mainland points included in Vancouver island?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The superintendency is on the island, and all that comes under it, I take it, is included in the Vancouver island district. It is served by a superintendent at Vancouver.

Item agreed to.

Mr. FRASER: I should like to have the same information in regard to the mainland telegraph and telephone lines as in regard to the others.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount of $8,000 is required for general repairs and improvements to the mainland telegraph and telephone lines throughout the province of British Columbia, as follows:

1. Kamloops section, $793.50.
2. Barriere section, $331.75.
3. Chase-Revelstoke section, $1,437.50.
4. Golden-Invermere section, $5,361.55.—Total, $7,924.30 say $8,000.

Mr. FRASER: A year ago the department sold the Merritt-Vernon section to the British Columbia Telephone Company. Are any negotiations being carried on at the present time for the disposal of these lines to the same company?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would not say to the same company. There are two companies who would be reasonably in the market for the purchase of whatever lines we have to sell in that district, and we contemplate advertising for tenders in two or three weeks' time for these lines.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous

Accounts branch—salaries of agents, clerks, travelling and contingent expenses of outside service, $25,000.

Architectural branch—salaries of architects, clerks of works, inspectors, draftsmen, clerks, messengers of outside service, $83,000.

Engineering branch—salaries of engineers, inspectors, superintendents, draftsmen, clerks and messengers of outside service, $495,000.

For operation and maintenance of inspection boats, $20,000.

Maintenance and operation of water storage dams on Ottawa river and tributaries, surveys in connection therewith, and settlement of land damages, $50,000.

National Gallery of Canada, $130,000.

National monument on Connaught place, $75,000.

River gauging and metering, $30,000.

Surveys and inspections, $120,000.

Balance of expenditure for works already authorized for which the appropriations may be insufficient provided the amount for any one does not exceed $200, $5,000.

Compassionate allowance to Alphonsine Thibault, widow of the late Paul Thibault, foreman at Bic, P.Q., who was fatally injured by an accident while on duty, $3,355.—Total, $1,036,355.

Mr. FRASER: There is an item here of $130,000 for the national gallery. What is that for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount of $130,000 was requested by the board of trustees to provide for the operation and maintenance, workshop supplies, upkeep of premises, purchase of works of art, management of exhibitions and the usual travelling scholarship of the National Gallery of Canada.

It is proposed to expend the 1928-29 appropriation as follows:—

To continue necessary work on Canadian war memorials if new storage provided, $10,000.

Salaries and wages, $10,000.

General maintenance, etc., $25,000.

For additions to the National Gallery collection, $85,000.—Total, $130,000.

Mr. CAHILL: I may be out of order in what I wish to represent now, but as this item is miscellaneous I would suggest to the minister that if possible, if not out of this vote then out of some other this year, he provide silencers for the typewriters in the stenographers' rooms. These people work under most difficult conditions. They are doing arduous work and the rooms are not as well fitted for the purpose as they might be if the machines were supplied with silencers. If this were done it would add very much to the comfort and possibly to the health of the stenographers in this building. I may add that neither the officials in that room nor any of the employees there have mentioned this to me, so that I am not pleading for anyone in particular. I do think, however, that it would add to the efficiency of the work and make for the health of those in the government service in that department.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to direct the matter to the attention of the Speaker, under whose jurisdiction it comes.

Mr. CAHILL: It would be a good thing if the minister would visit the room.

Mr. IRVINE: Now that the minister has promised to call the attention of the Speaker to the necessity for supplying the machines in the stenographers' rooms with silencers, I wish he would direct His Honour's attention to the fact that we have no gymnasium in this parliament, nor a shower bath. It might be good for the health of the entire assembly if we had something of that sort in the basement.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is a good deal to be said in favour of the suggestion.

Mr. SHORT: With reference to the condition in some of the rooms under the Public Works department, I wonder whether the minister ever visited the offices of the pensions board. The condition there is a disgrace to this government. It is a discredit to them that they should ask the officers of so important a department as that to carry on their work in the present offices. The ceiling is tumbling down and the whole room seems to be badly out of repair; besides, it is barely furnished and is totally inadequate for the purposes for which it was intended.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am glad to have information in regard to that building, which comes under this department. It does not belong to the department but is one of the numerous buildings which we rent.

Mr. MALONEY: Does not the government own the Daly building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Daly building now almost belongs to the government, most of the payments having been made. I am not going to enter into a discussion as to the wisdom of the purchase of that building, but we shall try to keep it in reasonable repair. I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. MALONEY: The minister will not discuss the wisdom of that purchase, but what can he have to say with regard of the Edwards sawmill at Rockcliffe? That is the most ridiculous transaction in the history of the Public Works department. If the minister will go to the sawmill he will see the conditions under which many fine young ladies and gentlemen have to work, and I am sure he will agree that by comparison the Daly building is a palace.

Mr. CLARK: I am sure the purchase of the Daly building will readily bear comparison with the most recent purchase by this government of the New Edinburgh mills. Nothing would be productive of more good than to have the taxpayers of the country view these two purchases and make the comparison for themselves. That comparison certainly would be a reflection upon the business ability of this government and particularly that of the Minister of Public Works. The minister has just admitted that of the total of $525,000, $200,000, from which he estimated just a year ago we would receive an annual revenue of $26,000, will not produce one dollar in revenue. There is no chance that we will ever obtain any revenue from that money, and the minister as well as every hon. member of this house knows that to be the case. The minister also knows that he will never utilize that power except at great extravagance; if he ever utilizes it for the public service of the country he will be wasting money, because we can buy power from the Hydro Electric Power Company for far less than it will cost to generate the power there. If the minister had investigated this matter as he should have done he would know very well and would be able to tell the committee that he cannot generate power there the year round. His statement in that respect will be found to be just as inaccurate as the statement that this sum would bring in annual revenue of $26,000 to the country.

I did not intend to make any comment upon this situation until I had reviewed this return, which relates more particularly to it, but quite apart from the return I do think this house is entitled to a very frank statement from the minister showing every dollar that has been spent on that property since it was purchased a year ago, together with a complete estimate of what it is expected will be spent during succeeding years, also giving the proposed development of the property and the cost of such development. I would like to know also if the minister has had this power question investigated by an expert and a report made as to its value. All we have at present are some very general and irresponsible statements which have been made to this committee with regard to the value of this water-power. What could be more irresponsible than the statement made by the minister a year ago that this power was worth $200,000 and could be operated so as to bring a revenue of $26,000 annually to this country? I think we are entitled to a detailed and very frank statement of just what has been spent in the development of the property, what is expected to be spent, what the minister proposes to do with the water-power, and so on. I think we are entitled to know how he justifies that expenditure, and we should know if any engineers in Canada will certify that the water-power is capable of economical development.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend all the information starting with the return he has already received and bringing it right up to date, showing every dollar that has been expended on that property since it was purchased. I cannot add anything to what I have already said in regard to the manner and time in which the power generated there is to be utilized. Neither can I make any definite statement with regard to what is to be done in the future, because that is more or less problematical, but I shall be very glad to explain what is to be done with each vote as it comes along. Of course my hon. friend is entitled to detailed information in each case, and I shall be pleased to furnish it.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: In connection with this item for the national gallery I would like to know under what system these purchases of pictures and other works of art are made. Are they purchased by the board of directors?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, it would be much better if we could get some order; I cannot hear what the hon. gentleman is asking.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Power): Order.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was asking the minister under what system these paintings and other works of art are purchased, and on whose advice.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The purchases are made by the trustees of the national gallery. There is an amount of $85,000 in the estimates which, as my hon. friend knows, is part of the general vote for the national gallery, and with that sum of mony the trustees purchase these works of art. I do not know whether or not my hon. friend wants the personnel of that board.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am not particularly concerned with that, but I should like to know whether the members of the board are competent to judge of the merits of the works of art or if they have technical advisers who assist them.

Mr. ELLIOTT: They are gentlemen who are supposed to be competent to judge in these matters, and that is the reason they are appointed. I may say that these gentlemen are sufficiently interested in art to give their services entirely free; only their actual disbursements are paid by the government. One member of the board is a gentleman living in Regina who has a very fine gallery of his own; he is quite an authority on matters of that kind. Another member resides in Ottawa and he also is supposed to be one of the best authorities in Canada. Another member of the board is a very eminent, well known gentleman, whose name I will not mention since I have mentioned no others. There are five members altogether.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is quite satisfactory as far as it goes; the members of the board are to be highly commended for their work and we owe them a debt of gratitude for giving their services in this way. However, I had a reason for asking these questions, and it is this: It has been drawn to my attention from time to time and from different parts of the country by artists and sculptors—and I may say at once that I do not consider myself a judge of these matters—that the purchases are not made on a nation-wide basis, but that there are one or two definite schools of art and a certain number of individual artists and sculptors from whom practically all the purchases are made. As to that of course I cannot speak from my own knowledge, but this suggestion has been made by gentlemen who are themselves artists and who feel that the system under which the purchases are made is not impartial and nation-wide but is confined to certain classes of art and certain small, select cliques of men. If that be the case I do not think the gallery is serving its purpose, which I understand is to present for our view and examination and for the benefit of those from other countries a fairly typical and representative collection of the various phases of art in this country in order to show just how we are advancing in these cultural ideas. I should like very much to have some comment by the minister with regard to this matter, because these gentlemen at least were very serious, and if their allegations are true, as I have said, I would not consider that the gallery is fulfilling its purpose.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In reply to the hon. member for Red Deer, I would say that three or four years ago there seemed to be some difference of opinion which developed rather acutely with regard to whether or not the various schools of art were receiving the same amount of attention from the trustees. I think that matter has adjusted itself quite satisfactorily because I do not think there has been a single complaint from any of the schools during the past two years. I do not make that statement positively, but I do know that there has not been any trouble of any account and everything seems to be going along quite harmoniously. I agree with the hon. member when he says that the object of the gallery would not be served unless the different types of art were being equitably dealt with. I doubt very much if it is possible to get a body of men together who will give as much time and care to this work as do the present body of trustees.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The representations which have been made to me by different individuals were made within the last eight months. In order to satisfy myself and others who are interested, I had purposed asking for a list of the purchases and the names of the artists in order to ascertain whether or not there was any ground for the criticisms which had been made.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The list of purchases is not a very long one and I shall be very glad to furnish the hon. member with a copy of it.

Mr. GEARY: It would appear in the Auditor General's report.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Perhaps this matter is not looked upon as being very important.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Oh yes, it is.

Mr. McGIBBON: Apparently most of us on this side of the house have got to the point

where we have to take the crumbs from the rich man's table. The member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) asked a very specific question of the Minister of Public Works and we would like to have an answer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have answered the question.

Mr. McGIBBON: I beg the minister's pardon?

Mr. ELLIOTT: What was the question?

Mr. CLARK: I thought the minister heard the question. What the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) is referring to is the fact that the answer was not complete. The minister stated that he would be very glad to bring down a return showing the expenditures made upon the New Edinburgh mill up to date. I think the hon. member desires a statement as to the plans for the utilization of the water-powers and the plans for the utilization of the buildings which are now on the property but which are unoccupied, and a statement as to the construction of new buildings.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know whether the hon. member for Muskoka was in the house when I made my answer, but I shall be very glad to make it again.

Mr. McGIBBON: I heard all that the minister said.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is all I have to say.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Mr. Chairman, although the item is passed and I may be out of order to a certain extent—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Power): Now that the hon. member calls my attention to the fact that he is out of order I might mention that I was waiting for some hon. member to do so. Under the circumstances I must rule that the hon. member is out of order, although he may proceed with the consent of the committee.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The item under discussion concerns the National Gallery of Canada, and I was going to ask the Minister of Public Works if it was his intention to put in that gallery the picture which I hold in my hand. It is really a scientific work and he should have this picture of the New Edinburgh mills framed and put in the National Gallery of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: Put it in the archives.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): This picture might be inserted in the National Gallery of Canada—

Mr. DUNNING: "Inserted" is a good word.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It certainly would not be out of place, although it is rather hard to find the water-powers estimated to be worth about $200,000. If the minister would mark that particular item on this picture before it is framed it would give the people of Canada some idea of its value. A picture of the Plaza building, which the minister evidently prizes so much, might be put in the gallery also.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the hon. member's question is a fair one, and I can assure him it will receive the most careful consideration. There are many different schools of art in this country to-day and I will submit his picture to the trusteees of the national gallery and tell them that the recommendation has come from a gentleman for whose recommendations I have the highest possible regard.

Mr. McGIBBON: As the minister has made such a brilliant suggestion—I notice that the brilliancy has come almost entirely from this side of the house—will he tell us what he has to offer from his own side?

Mr. HEAPS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask with regard to the gallery—

An hon. MEMBER: Which gallery?

Mr. HEAPS: The national gallery. There is a splendid selection of works in that gallery, but I think it should be made possible for the people to have entrance at fairly reasonable hours. At present the gallery is closed at five o'clock in the afternoon and during the daytime hardly a person enters the building. Anyone coming to the city, or anyone residing in the city has no opportunity of getting into the gallery before it closes, and I suggest to the minister that it be allowed to remain open until eight or nine o'clock in the evening. I hope he will pass this suggestion on to the proper authorities.

Mr. MALONEY: Will the minister—

Mr. HEAPS: Could I have an answer from the minister?

Mr. MALONEY: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ELLIOTT: If the hon. member will permit me, perhaps I should answer the other question first. At the present time the national gallery is open every day from nine to five, including Saturdays, except legal holidays. In order to allow freedom for putting up exhibits, necessary cleaning and so forth, local visitors, who can visit the gallery practically at any time without much inconvenience are not usually admitted before

ten o'clock, but this rule is always relaxed in the case of out-of-town visitors who may be unable to attend at the regular hours. The national gallery is also open on every holiday in the year except Christmas Day from ten to five p.m. The point my hon. friend raises was brought up, I do not know whether by himself or some other hon. member, a year or two years ago. There has been very little complaint that the gallery is not open long enough during the day. As the hon. member will understand, the total amount allowed for salaries, for running the gallery, is somewhat limited, and it is felt that the present hours fairly meet the requirements of the case. You have to be reasonable with the people in charge of the gallery, and at the same time try to place at the disposal of the visiting public at reasonable hours what is to be seen there. I think the matter is working out fairly well.

Mr. HEAPS: I do not think it is working out fairly well, because on one or two visits I have made to the gallery, the only people I saw there were the attendants and policemen. There was hardly anyone else there because the hours are unsuitable for the average person who wants to visit an institution of that character. Unless the people visit the gallery it loses the purpose for which it was created, and consequently I think, without any hardship, the minister might try new hours. I do not think the average person wants to visit the gallery at nine or ten o'clock in the morning. The most suitable time is in the evening, and if there is no particular difficulty in the way of employing a few additional people in order that the gallery may be open longer hours, I would like to have the hours run from twelve noon until eight o'clock in the evening. The minister might try that anyway and see whether more people will visit the gallery than is the case at the present time. I do not see the good of having all these beautiful works of art there in such numbers and the place almost deserted. The money is more or less wasted unless the place is patronized by a large number of people, either from Ottawa or from the Dominion generally.

Mr. MALONEY: Does the destruction of the city hall come within the scope of the capital city beautification scheme launched by the government? If so, when does the minister propose to commence the destruction of that building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think it has been explained here before that that is part of the general scheme. It does not come under this department.

Mr. SPENCER: Under whose department does it come?

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend knows the bill that was passed a year or two ago appointed the federal district commission which has charge of the arrangement.

Mr. SPENCER: But who answers in the house for the federal district commission?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think it is the Minister of Finance. I think he is responsible for the grant.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the Minister of Public Works be good enough to tell the committee the qualifications for a picture being placed in the national gallery, and whether the picture of the present Minister of Public Works and his confreres will be placed there?

Mr. CLARK: Some years ago there were in the national gallery very fine portraits, I think by Orpen, of General Lord Byng, General Sir Arthur Currie, Major General Lipsett, former commander of the Third Canadian Division, who was killed in action in the service of his country, and others, that were ornaments in that gallery. Have they been removed with the other war pictures that formerly hung in the gallery?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not in a position to give my hon. friend an answer to that question.

Mr. CLARK: Is any member of this government on the national gallery committee?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. CLARK: The hon. member for Argenteuil has quite frequently drawn to the attention of the Prime Minister the question of the disposition of the war pictures. I am satisfied from the answers given by the Prime Minister that the portraits of Lord Byng, former commander of the Canadian corps, former commander of the Third Army, and former Governor General of Canada; of Sir Arthur Currie, the last commander of the Canadian corps, and of Major General Lipsett, who, as I say, died fighting in the service of his country, now rest in some basement of this city. Before this vote is passed, I should like to know whether or not I am correct in my assumption.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Did my hon. friend say that they were at one time in the national gallery?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, and I have searched since on several occasions to see whether they were still hanging there, I could not find them, and I assume, as the Prime Minister said, that they have been buried in some basement in the city.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the pictures to which the Prime Minister referred were the war memorial pictures. I do not think they include portraits of these gentlemen. It is of no use my attempting to tell my hon. friend something that I cannot tell him, but I am not aware of any portraits of that kind having been removed from the national gallery. I shall be glad to make inquiries.

Mr. CLARK: I would suggest that this particular item stand until the minister secures that information. I consider it of vital importance to this particular vote. I should like to know what we are voting the money for. If pictures of that kind cannot find a place in the national gallery, I am opposed to this vote and I should like to have an opportunity of discussing it in the light of that information.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I know my hon. friend wants to be fair and I tell him that I will obtain the information and give it to him. If he is disposed to hold up the item until that information is given, I cannot prevent him from doing so, but I think that ought to meet the requirements of the case. I will make inquiries and furnish my hon. friend with the information.

Mr. CLARK: In justice to the minister himself, the vote should stand, because the suggestion that I have made is, in my opinion, a very serious reflection upon the government, and if my assumption is incorrect, I certainly do not want to make that reflection. I feel, however, that I am justified in making that assumption from the remarks that have been made by the Prime Minister himself on several occasions. I have noted them every time they were made, and I have thought of these pictures. I have gone to the gallery and made a search to see whether I could find them. I have asked the attendants if they are there and they tell me they are not. I may have missed them, and I want to be sure. If I am correct in my assumption, I seriously wish to debate this item before it is passed.

Mr. McGIBBON: I do not think we can allow the present minister, like the others, to sit quietly in a kind of philosophical way and let these items go through. In the last few days we had before us the Minister of Immigration who knew practically nothing about his department. The Minister of Pensions and National Health knew practically nothing about his department, and to-night the Minister of Public Works, as item after item is called, practically says that he can give us no information. I for one, therefore, protest against any item going through on which we cannot get any information. Like the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard I have been in the national gallery three or four times in the last few weeks, and I say that these pictures are not there, and we can hold the government responsible for their not being there. I can conceive that this government has not any particular warmth of imagination for the war heroes of this country. Look over the ranks of the cabinet ministers and their followers and you can see that, but we on this side have a little different conception of what our duties are and what they should be.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am not like the publicans and sinners on the other side, said the Pharisee.

Mr. McGIBBON: These portraits should be given a proper place in the national life of this country, and I for one purpose to see that done. If the minister has no information to give us, then so far as I am concerned this item will stand until we get the information.

Mr. ELLIOTT: With regard to a portion of the remarks of my hon. friend I do not propose to attempt to reply.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is your duty to reply.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is no more my duty to reply, I submit, Mr. Chairman. than it was his duty or his privilege to make the remarks that he did. He did not know what he was talking about or he would not have done so. As far as the items in this vote are concerned, I think I have all the details than can be provided. If there are any details in connection with these items which hon. gentlemen want, and which we have not here, I shall be glad to furnish them. If my hon. friends feel that the time of the house can be better spent in discussing these items further, I have no objection.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): This matter may not be of interest to more than half a dozen or so of us, but there are some of us who are interested in this question. If we let this item pass without getting the information we have

no good reason later for discussing this question of the disposal of the portraits painted by a distinguished English artist named Orpen. For that reason I do not think it is unfair to ask that the item stand over until the information is given, and when the information is given the item will pass at once. I for one would be pleased if the minister would let this item stand, and between now and to-morrow he could ascertain where these portraits are. If they are in the building, then all discussion is ended.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I want to meet my hon. friend because while he may think that I think he is unreasonable, I do not. I have known him a long time and I have never found him unreasonable. I want to meet his wishes. We will have supplementary estimates to consider later, and there will be abundant opportunity at that time to discuss this matter on any item that my hon. friend chooses, and in the meantime I shall be very glad to furnish him with the information. I hope that that will meet his views.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would like to accept that but I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that some hon. members who are interested in a particular question cannot always be in the house when that question comes up. There were one or two items that I wanted to discuss but they went through to-day and I had no opportunity to discuss them. I am sure that there will be no delay if this item stands; I believe it will save time. Will the minister say that when the item is called again he will see that those interested in it will be in their places to discuss it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will undertake to hold some item until my hon. friend and his friends are in.

Mr. McGIBBON: That may suit my hon. friend from Kingston City, but not me. This item is going to stand until we get the information or the minister will have to force it through the house with the majority behind him.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. McGIBBON: I move, Mr. Chairman, that this item be struck out.

Mr. CLARK: Included in this vote is a number of other items, one for a national monument on Connaught Place, in regard to which I would like to ask some questions. I think I am correct in saying that the minister stated to me quite clearly that this item for the national gallery might stand. I accepted his word and stopped all further observations I had to make on the subject. If this item is allowed to stand we can go on to the next one.

Mr. CAHILL: And hunt up the pictures in the meantime.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion of the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario is not in order. He cannot move to strike out an item, but only to reduce it.

Mr. CLARK: We want to debate this particular item, not some other item. If I am justified in drawing the conclusions I have drawn, I want to vote against this item, but if I am wrong I will hold up both hands for it. Therefore I think I am justified in asking that the item stand. The minister was perfectly clear in his statement when he said that the item might stand until he secured the information so that we might have a vote on it. Here is a vote of $130,000. We desire certain information which can be furnished by the minister. Some of us at least may want to vote against this item. I certainly want to vote against it, but if I am wrong in the inference I have drawn from the remarks of the Prime Minister I want to vote for the item. There are several other members of the committee in exactly the same position. We are entitled as members of parliament to the privilege of not only expressing ourselves but of standing up and voting on any money item that may appear in the estimates. We cannot pass an intelligent vote on this item unless the minister furnishes us with the information.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CLARK: As far as I am concerned I want that information before voting on the item.

Mr. McGIBBON: There is no possible chance of carrying this item to-night. The minister sits there and practically ignores this side of the house. He cannot do that; he cannot conduct himself in that way. When we ask him for information we expect a reply.

The CHAIRMAN: When the debate ceases it is the duty of the Chair to put the question.

Mr. McGIBBON: The debate has not ceased yet.

Mr. CLARK: We are asking the minister for a statement.

Mr. BENNETT: Would it not be advisable to let this item stand until the minister can give the information?

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my hon. friend will say that he thinks the attitude of his friends is reasonable I will be perfectly willing to let it stand.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I object to that. My leader is not going to say whether my attitude is reasonable or not. I am going to be the judge of my own attitude; I am responsible for my conduct in this house. If the minister is not prepared to answer the question we will go on to another item and return to this later. There are two items before this on which I would like to get information. The first is "operation and maintenance of inspection boats". What does that refer to?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required for the maintenance and operation of the following inspection boats:

Wauketa (Toronto) part season, $3,000.
Walrondo (Victoria) part season, $5,850.
Marion (Nelson) new hull, $6,000.
D.W.P. (Charlottetown), $2,000.
Sachem (Fort William), $2,500.
Contingencies, $650.—Total, $20,000.

These boats are used by the district engineers in inspecting works in the different districts, and are a necessity for the proper investigation and examination of the various engineering works throughout the country.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Are any of these boats on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Would it not be wise if you had one there instead of paying $75 a day for an inspection boat, which is really just a small botor boat? I am speaking of the one used last summer on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend will find, if he looks into the cost of maintaining a boat and the cost of hiring one for temporary work, that in the long run, for the work which has to be done on the St. Lawrence, it is cheaper to hire.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Seventy-five dollars a day would soon eat up this estimate.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, if you had days enough.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The next item is "maintenance and operation of water storage dams on Ottawa river and tributaries, surveys in connection therewith, and settlement of land damages". What are these storage dams?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Timiskaming dam and Quinze dam.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What is the purpose of these storage dams?

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: The object of these dams and sluiceways on the Ottawa river and its tributaries is to store the spring floods and augment the low water flow, thus equalizing the runoff of the Ottawa valley throughout the year.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister tell us what the object of that is?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have just given my friend the object.

Mr. McGIBBON: I beg your pardon. The minister has not given me the object. I think, Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am sorry if my hon. friend did not hear me. I stated that the object is to store the spring floods and augment the low water flow thus equalizing the run-off of the Ottawa valley throughout the year.

Mr. McGIBBON: That is not an answer to my question. I asked the minister what that was for. I hope he comprehends the question now. I am entitled to an answer to that question.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I do not think the minister should turn this matter into something of a farce. What is the purpose of equalizing the flow? That is the question, and it is very plain. The minister says that is was done to equalize the flow. Who is benefiting by it? Why is it sought to equalize the flow?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The object of equalizing the flow as my friend, I would have thought, would consider, is to have it higher at low water and lower at high water.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I think I am entitled to know why it is better to have it higher at low water and lower at high water. Who benefits from it? Any of your friends?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, this is a system that has not originated in recent years, as my hon. friend will probably understand. For instance, it is used for various purposes—in the floating of logs at low water. It is sometimes very difficult, if the flow is not controlled, to have water enough for the floating of the logs.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is that a Dominion obligation?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, it has been assumed.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister knows that it is not.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My friend knows more about it than the minister.

Mr. McGIBBON: I think I do.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not going to get into an argument with my hon. friend.

Mr. McGIBBON: I think we are entitled to an answer to this question. Equalizing the flow means one of two things. The minister has mentioned one of them, that is, getting enough water for the floating of logs, and the other is electrical power. Who is going to benefit by it? That is what we want to know.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Of course my hon. friend will know with regard to the logs that the man who is floating the logs will benefit.

Mr. McGIBBON: Who is he?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The lumbermen further up the river.

Mr. McGIBBON: Who are they, friends of the government?

Mr. ELLIOTT: A number of them are not as good friends as I would like to have them, but I am in hopes that they are getting more friendly all the time.

Mr. McGIBBON: What electrical power is there behind it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not able to say to my hon. friend.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is the same old story. Minister after minister in the government knows nothing about his department. We have had the Minister of Immigration, the Minister of Health and Pensions, and now the Minister of Public Works. Later on we will have the Minister of Agriculture, and probably some more, and when we ask for information they can tell us nothing about their own departments. I make this statement without fear of successful contradiction: this is done for one of two reasons, either to help lumbermen who have logs to float down this river, or help to develop electrical power. What right has this government to do that? That is what I want the minister to answer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am sorry my hon. friend does not think I am trying to give him information.

Mr. McGIBBON: You are not trying.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am doing the very best I can.

Mr. McGIBBON: Well, it is a mighty poor effort.

Mr. ELLIOTT: But of course I have a difficult subject. My hon. friend surely realizes that the man who is floating logs down is aided, when the water is very low, by having that water dammed, if it is too low.

Mr. McGIBBON: Is it your business to dam it?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Perhaps my hon. friend will subside for a moment, because he is not adding very much to the discussion.

Mr. McGIBBON: Neither are you.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Take it in regard to power, the very thing my hon. friend was speaking of a few moments ago—power at the mills. If your flow were uniform the whole year round you would be able to utilize it to the full extent. I should have thought that was an elementary proposition.

Mr. FRASER: I am very much interested in the remarks of the minister in regard to lumbermen floating logs down the river and the government providing a sum, which I presume is annual, for the maintenance of these dams. But I would ask this question: Do the lumbermen pay for that service? Is there a charge for the use of the water which is provided and for which we pay $20,000 a year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is one of the aids to navigation; I know of no concern that pays for it. It is a matter of the control of navigable waters.

Mr. FRASER: There is no charge?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No. If my hon. friend is really interested I can give some examples of just what was done, and explain why it was done. Take the condition at North Bay, where the Nipissing enters into French River. At one time it was complained by some of the lumbermen who were operating along the Nipissing that at very low water they were unable to float their logs by reason of the insufficiency of flow. What is called a sluiceway was made at the point where the Nipissing enters the French river, and that was intended to serve two purposes. First of all, by putting in these stop logs, they raised the height of the water in low water and provided enough water for floating the logs, and when the stop logs were taken out the effect was to widen the point which before was narrow, and that gave greater scope for the water to get away. That is one example of the control of dams.

Mr. FRASER: I am very much obliged for the explanation, but my trouble is an entirely different one. On behalf of some

lumbermen on the Fraser river I applied this winter for them to be allowed to put up, at their own expense, certain works on the Fraser river to catch their logs, and that permission was absolutely refused them. Now I find that the man on the Ottawa rriver not only has the privilege of doing that but you pay for it. What is the reason for this difference in treatment as between the lumbermen of Ontario and those of British Columbia? That is my point. Those lumbermen were absolutely refused permission to do what they wanted. All they wanted was leave to erect these works, and to erect them at their own expense, and that was denied them by the department. And it has been denied them for the last three or four years. I submitted the matter to the department in detail this year and was denied that permission. What is the explanation?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not know the case to which my hon. friend refers particularly.

Mr. FRASER: I can give it to you.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The control of navigation is to a certain extent vested in this department under the Navigable Waters Act, and if the engineers report that the work proposed is likely to interfere with navigation then permission is refused.

Mr. FRASER: The minister cannot get away with that; there is absolutely no navigation on the river. I grant you it is a navigable river and has been navigated, but at the present time and for the last ten years there have been no boats operating on the river nor are there likely to be any.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What was the purpose of the permit?

Mr. FRASER: For catching their logs.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Does not my hon. friend know that a river on which logs are floated is navigable?

Mr. FRASER: I do not know the legal definition of a navigable river, but I do know that this river has been navigated. As a matter of fact I have navigated it myself and I know that it can be navigated again. But I should be glad to know why there has been this difference between the treatment meted out to the lumbermen in British Columbia and that which has been given the lumbermen in Ontario. The lumbermen in British Columbia are merely asking for permission to erect certain works. It does not seem fair to me.

[Mr. Fraser.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: Our treatment is the same to everyone; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. FRASER: Well I can inform the minister that he has never spent one dollar for the lumbermen in British Columbia, while evidently he is spending it in Ontario and making it an annual charge on the people of the Dominion.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will my hon. friend say that this government has not spent millions in the Fraser river to allow the lumbermen to get their lumber out? I think the Fraser river is an unfortunate example.

Mr. FRASER: The Fraser river, it is true, is 1,200 miles long, but I am talking about the stretch from Prince George up to mile 53. That is the part to which I have reference, and at the present time we have in that locality 25 operating saw-mills, all in the same difficulty. They canont get permission from the government to erect the necessary works to hold their logs properly.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would call the minister's attention to the fact that the lumbermen of Muskoka have to erect their own dams for floating their own logs. Why should they have to do this when the government of Canada gives assistance to lumbermen in the Ottawa river and pays the expenses? Why this discrimination?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. McGIBBON: It will not be carried until the minister has the decency to answer the question.

Mr. DUNNING: Withdraw.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I hope my hon. friend will not persist in that sort of language.

Mr. McGIBBON: I hope the minister will not persist in his attitude towards questions from this side of the house.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Something depends, of course, on the question. I should say that the people of Muskoka are getting exactly the same treatment as the people in the rest of the country—

Mr. McGIBBON: Getting nothing.

Mr. ELLIOTT: —with regard to these dams.

Mr. McGIBBON: They are getting nothing at all, but here you have a vote for the lumbermen on the Ottawa river. What does the minister mean by saying they are all getting the same treatment?

Mr. RYCKMAN: Any question I put to the minister is quite sincere, and I expect a plain answer. Apparently none of this money was spent last year. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, $26,552 was spent to March 31.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Then why is there a revote of $50,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is a practice which was more in vogue years ago than is the case at present. We are cutting it down from $100,000 to $50,000 this year in view of the fact that we spent only $26,552 last year.

Mr. RYCKMAN: When I asked the minister why this service was given he said it was to equalize the water flow; when I asked for what purpose that was done he said it was to help the lumbermen operating on the Ottawa river which, of course, is a navigable stream. The minister knows very well that in Ontario we have the Rivers and Streams Act, and none of the lumbermen of whom I know are leaning on the federal government. I think a short statement should be made by the minister explaining why the government is spending this money on the Ottawa river for the benefit of those who float logs on that river. That is a reasonable question, and I think we should have an answer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is for the control of the river for the floating of logs, for power control and for general navigation; it is not limited to any one thing. If I give the details of just what it is intended to include under this vote perhaps my hon. friend will get the point I am trying to make clear. For instance, in connection with the Timiskaming dam the sum of $8,800 is set apart; of that amount $4,968 is for maintenance and $3,834 for operation. For the Quinze dam $9,000 is set aside, $7,000 for maintenance and $2,000 for operation. These dams are operated by labourers who are required to work the various sluices and gates which are necessary.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am not interested in those details, since I know what the item covers, but I would like to know from the minister if any service of this kind is rendered by the Dominion government to a private interest in any other place in Canada, and if so where that service is rendered.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is the case I have already given, the control dam at the outlet of the Nipissing into the French river.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Is that under this item?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, it is under the collection of revenue item.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The Nipissing development is for hydro-electric purposes. Will the minister be good enough to tell the committee if any service similar to this on the Ottawa river is rendered in any part of Canada?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are storage dams on the St. Maurice in the province of Quebec. I can only refer to those we have noted here.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The vote for the St. Maurice is not under this item, surely?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is no vote in these estimates in regard to the St. Maurice development.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Then will the minister say it is fair to state that in no other part of Canada is a similar service rendered under vote 149?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have already given the case of the French river; I cannot recall any others, and with that one exception I think my hon. friend's statement is quite accurate.

Mr. FRASER: In view of that statement I would ask the minister to look very carefully into the situation I mentioned a short time ago. I know these people in British Columbia are subjected to a good deal of annoyance, and I also know that is a large, important proposition.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will my hon. friend give me the name of the stream?

Mr. FRASER: The Fraser river.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That covers a lot of territory.

Mr. FRASER: I will give the name of one of the mills which has been very insistent in submitting the matter to me. I refer to the Sinclair Spruce Mills, whose post office address is Sinclair Mills, British Columbia.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to look into the question.

Mr. FRASER: That is only one of the mills affected; there are half a dozen others. The Sinclair Mills have studied the situation thoroughly; they have a large file in that connection which I have perused and they can explain the situation to the minister much more clearly than any of the other companies.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I began with a very serious question, and perhaps all this would not have been necessary if the minister had been a little more generous with his information and had told us that this is a very old vote and that it is intended that it shall be gradually decreased. However, I want the minister to consider whether or not the expenditure on these storage dams is not being made for other purposes than simply the floating of logs. The minister knows very well that water-powers are being developed now both above and below this point, and that this expenditure may be of benefit to the power development higher up. Has the minister any information in that connection? I also think the minister will find that the situation now is somewhat different from what it has been in the past; in some cases this storage development is interfering with those who are interested in the upper waters. Has the minister any data as to whether this work is of benefit to others than the lumbermen?

Mr. ELLIOTT: These dams were built many years ago and are fairly permanent structures. I do not think there is any prospect in the reasonably near future of abandoning these projects.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is this storage of water of any benefit to the power companies?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It benefits all the power companies who are interested in a steady flow of water.

Mr. McGIBBON: Now we are beginning to get a little more light. We discover that the Dominion treasury is paying out money to help the lumber and power companies, presumably friends of the government. What lumber companies float logs down this river?

An hon. MEMBER: The J. R. Booth Company.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The E. B. Eddy Company, the Booth Company, the International Paper Company and the Gordon Company.

An hon. MEMBER: Senator Gordon.

Mr. ELLIOTT: For my hon. friend's information, I would advise him that the work was done about 1914.

Mr. McGIBBON: As the government has been so generous in this instance, will it extend that generosity to the people and the lumber companies in my riding? They are building their own dams and running their own lumber mills, and I was wondering whether these other companies are in the preferred class.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If the circumstances are similar to those under which this grant was made, they will reecive consideration from the department.

Mr. McGIBBON: On what grounds does the minister give assistance to these private companies?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Every case has to be settled on its own merits. I went over the file in connection with the Gordon Company not so long ago. They complained that during the low water periods they could not operate their mill. If there are any companies in the hon. member's territory which would come within this category, they will be treated in the same way.

Mr. McGIBBON: I would hate to think that the minister is as simple as his explanation would lead one to believe he is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister dispenses money from the public treasury in order to aid private companies, and I have asked him his authority for doing that; I am not concerned with his excuses.

Sir EUGENE FISET: It is done through money voted in the estimates.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. McGIBBON: I can talk just as long as the minister can, and he will not get this item through before eleven o'clock if he is going to take this attitude. I am asking upon what grounds he takes money out of the public treasury in order to help private interests. I am not concerned with the requests which these private companies make to him; I am asking him what justification he has for spending the money of the taxpayers of Canada in order to help private companies.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It comes largely under the heading of navigation, and the various phases of it are merely incidental. These things were started by my hon. friend's friends years ago, and are being continued by the present government.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Can the minister tell us what settlement has been made as to land damages?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Would the hon. member be good enough to speak a little louder? I cannot hear him.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What settlement has been made as to land damages; what is the amount?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is impossible to tell in advance what the damages are going to be; that would include any land damage caused by the works erected by the government, through flooding or otherwise.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What has been paid in the past?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are no claims under consideration at the present time, but an amount must be provided to take care of any claims which may arise.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The land in this neighbourhood will be land belonging to these companies; I do not see how there can be much damage done in doing that work.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The item of $4,000 is being set aside to pay damages which may arise through the flooding of lands by the storage dams. At the present time there are no claims under consideration. However, claims may arise during the year and it is to provide for that contingency that the sum of $4,000 is required. In 1928-29 one claim of $100 was paid to Odilon Champoux. That is the only claim which was paid during 1928-29.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister be good enough to answer the question I asked a while ago? I am going to keep on asking it until I receive an answer.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Which question?

Mr. McGIBBON: I asked the minister what justification he had for spending money from the public treasury of Canada in order to help private companies.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Navigation.

Mr. McGIBBON: That is not my question.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is my answer.

Mr. McGIBBON: Navigation does not concern private interests. I am asking the minister on what grounds he justifies the expenditure of the money of the taxpayers for the benefit of private interests.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I regret that I have not made it clear to my hon. friend. It is done for the purpose of assisting not only public but private interests. All the people who use the waters are assisted by anything which is done to assist navigation.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister has changed his attitude; when I asked the question he said it was done for the purpose of floating logs.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is one phase of navigation.

Mr. McGIBBON: Are these streams navigable?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is getting into the legal question as to what is a navigable stream. I think the best ruling on the subject is that any stream which will float logs is a navigable stream.

Mr. McGIBBON: Are there any boats plying up and down these streams?

Mr. ELLIOTT: There are tug boats and some passenger boats on the Ottawa river.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the minister give us the names?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, I cannot do that.

Mr. McGIBBON: I submit that we are entitled to the information. The minister is asking parliament to grant him a certain sum of money and we have a right to know what he wants it for.

Mr. DUNNING: Just as a matter of mercy to the rest of us, as it is extremely hot, would the hon. member say whether he was really serious in stating that he did not intend to allow the item to pass to-night? Because, if so, there is no use in the rest of us staying here. A quorum would be sufficient.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister should ask the Minister of Public Works whether the matter is serious or not.

Mr. MANION: Let us adjourn. It has been a long, hot day.

Mr. CLARK: If the Minister of Railways wants an answer to his question, may I say that I do not think the item will pass to-night. The matter is very serious. We asked as politely as I think any minister could be asked, that one particular item be allowed to stand for what are, I am sure, most excellent reasons. I understood the Minister of Public Works to tell me that the item would stand. I consider this is a vital appropriation and I think the reasons I advanced were quite sufficient to justify the Minister of Public Works in saying: Yes, this particular item may stand; I shall be glad to let it stand and we can discuss it further in the light of the information I shall bring down. The minister apparently thought he could bulldoze the members on this side and push the item through. That is the in-

ference I have drawn. I certainly have made up my mind in regard to the matter, although so far I have not had very much to say. Others have had plenty to say, and consequently I have not found it necessary to say much; but I can assure the Minister of Railways that I have enough to say to keep this item under discussion until eleven o'clock unless the Minister of Public Works will grant what, I think, is a very fair request. I do not think we were trying to take any advantage of the Minister of Public Works. I will outline the matter again if the Minister of Railways was not present.

Mr. DUNNING: I heard what the hon. member said. I have been here all the time waiting for some business to be done.

Mr. CLARK: Does the Minister of Railways not think it is a matter of interest to the Canadian people to know what disposition has been made of the portraits of two former commanders of the Canadian army, a former governor general and a former commander of a Canadian division who was killed in action in defence of his country? If he does not think that is of interest to the house and to the people of Canada, I am of an entirely different opinion.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend knows perfectly well that I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. CLARK: No, but what am I to infer from the minister's statement that he was waiting for some business to be done? I am waiting just as patiently as he is. I do not think the Minister of Railways will say that I am an obstructionist. I am not attempting to obstruct the business of the country, but I can assure the minister whose estimates are now under discussion, that I am not going to be bulldozed. I am asking for information which is perfectly legitimate. I am asking for the whereabouts of three pictures that are of vital interest to the people, pictures which, if they belong to this country, should be given a place in the national gallery. All I want to know is where they are now and why they are there. In the light of that information I should like to discuss further this particular item relating to the national gallery. If it be found that those pictures do not belong to the national gallery, do not belong to the Dominion of Canada, the matter is settled so far as I am concerned. If they belong to the country and will be put in the national gallery, it is also settled. But I think we are entitled to the information as to where they are and what disposition is proposed to be made of them. It is a very simple matter to allow this particular item to stand over for a day. The minister does not have all his estimates through; he admits that he will have supplementaries, and this item can stand and be discussed with the supplementaries. At that time it will not take two minutes if he will just give us the information.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I made the suggestion which, I thought, was a reasonable one, namely, that my hon. friend or any other hon. member should have the fullest opportunity of discussing the matter under the supplementary estimates which will be brought down very shortly. I had hoped he would see his way clear to agree to that proposal. I do not want to appear to be—well, I am not going to say as obstinate as some of us think some of our—

Mr. CHAPLIN: Opponents are.

Mr. ELLIOTT: —opponents are.

Mr. CLARK: It is the minister who is obstinate.

Mr. McGIBBON: The minister is not helping himself by a remark of that kind.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my suggestion is reasonable.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I pointed out to the minister that the question of these portraits was perhaps in a different position from that of any other item; that it was an item which affected us a little more than some others that we could discuss under some other subject, that, therefore, we did not care to bring up under a general item a discussion in regard to the portraits of our former commanders; that we preferred to have it under this item. The minister tried to bluff us on that. I went immediately to another question that is of interest to me as one born and brought up along the Ottawa river and knowing almost every foot of it. I know the reasons for these expenditures and I know there are now arising on the Ottawa river conditions which were not there a few years ago. The government of the day is proposing other matters in the way of power development, having arranged just lately for the Chats falls development. I felt that the time had come when, perhaps, the Department of Public Works would consider whether this work which we were doing in the way of benefiting the lumbering industry was not now going to the benefit of one or two other industries, and whether it was not time to consider the question of distribution of the expense. I know these facts. I have travelled the Ottawa river

and I know the upper waters as well as the lower. I pointed out one or two things that are occurring and any question I asked was put with a special object, with the interest of the people of Canada at heart and not with the intention of blocking. I stopped when the minister said that he could not see our point of view, namely, that we did not care to discuss on the general item, the question of the portraits of our former commanding officers, and I went on to deal with the other matter. There was no attempt on my part to block the estimates.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I feel it necessary to say a word, because I have asked half a dozen or more questions. The minister has referred to the reasonableness of his suggestion and to the attitude taken with regard to the national gallery item. What has happened? These three paintings, the work of a most distinguished artist, who has painted a portrait of His Majesty the King, were hanging in the national gallery. They have been removed. The information was—and I was in the house and heard it—that they were in a cellar. The minister is asking for an appropriation of $130,000 for the national gallery. He could not get these three portraits for $30,000 of the $130,000. These portraits by a most distinguished artist are in a cellar, and yet the minister is asking us to-night to vote $130,000 to buy more pictures that cannot compare with the ones that were in the gallery and that have been removed. Who has the reasonable side of this? There is no doubt about it. We want to know where those pictures are. We take a pride in the portraits and in the artist, and we are not going to vote $130,000 without knowing where these valuable paintings are, and why they cannot be put in the gallery or some other suitable place. If there is anything unreasonable in that, then I am unreasonable, but I submit that I am not.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend was present when the explanation was made by the right hon. the Prime Minister as to the location of the pictures that are known as the war memorial pictures. I am not in a position to say whether the three that have been mentioned here to-night come within that category, but I shall be glad to obtain the information. I do not think hon. gentlemen who want to be reasonable will expect me to say offhand just what pictures are included in the national gallery and what in the war memorial collection. There is no question about it, we have not the accommodation at the present time for all the pictures the very fine group known as the war memorial collection, and they cannot be put on exhibition until accommodation has been provided by way of a new national gallery, which the government has not up to the present time seen fit to provide an appropriation for.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Why could not these three paintings be placed back in the national gallery? Why spend money to the large amount of $130,000 annually—and that is a large amount to some people—when here are three paintings by a distinguished artist that would grace that gallery and yet are not hung there.

Mr. MANION: We have been discussing this question all evening and I think it is a very reasonable request that the information should be given. The minister must see that we are not making any advance at all. It is twenty-five minutes to eleven; we will surely adjourn at eleven and we shall not have made any more progress on this vote by that time. It has been a long hot day and I still adhere to my opinion that the ventilation in this building is abominable. I suggest that the minister would be doing a favour to the whole house if he reported progress, to be followed by the adjournment of the house.

Mr. ROBB: I quite agree with my hon. friend that we will not make any progress on this item, but we will stay and listen to the discussion. We can stay here until eleven o'clock.

Mr. MANION: I am just as young as the Minister of Finance and I can stay here if he can.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): May I ask the Minister of Public Works why a different situation should prevail on the Ottawa river from that prevailing in any other part of Canada?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would say that under the same circumstances there is no different situation prevailing elsewhere. It is the same policy for every part.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is that altogether true? Is it not a fact that there are improvements on the French river, placed there by the Department of Public Works, which are at the present time said to be causing immense damage to the land and houses along lake Nipissing. It is also true that the government proposes to expend $25,000 to build a sluiceway in connection with a dam maintained by the Public Works department, and the prov-

ince is being asked to put up a like amount for a dam owned and operated by this government.

Items stands.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Railways—Canadian Government Railways—to provide for additional car ferry and facilities for car ferry service between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, $3,500,000.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister explain this item?

Mr. DUNNING: It will be remembered that one of the features of the report of the Duncan commission related to the necessity for improved ferry accommodation for Prince Edward Island. I need not go into the reasons therefor, because they have been discussed in the house on many occasions. Last year an amount was appropriated to start the work. In the meantime a careful investigation has been made with respect to the matter, so far as time and facilities would permit, by the Canadian National authorities on behalf of the department. There was a suggestion many years ago that money might be saved and better facilities afforded at lower annual charges if a tunnel were constructed between the mainland and the island. I thought it desirable to have the old reports in that connection looked up and checked by the engineers in the light of present conditions in order to see, facing as we were a considerable expenditure in any event, what were the economics of the tunnel suggestion. Another suggestion was that a causeway might be built across to the island from the mainland.

Mr. MANION: What is the distance?

Mr. DUNNING: The shortest distance across is nine miles. The result of the investigation during the year reveals that a tunnel would cost to-day in the neighbourhood of $40,000,000. Hon. gentlemen will understand that that is not a detailed estimate, because considerable engineering work would be necessary to determine the subaqueous conditions.

Mr. BENNETT: That is a Montreal terminal estimate.

Mr. DUNNING: No, it is not nearly as great as that. With respect to the causeway, idea, which is held as sound by a great many people—

Mr. BENNETT: What is the difference between that and the tunnel?

Mr. DUNNING: The estimated difference is $6,000,000—$46,000,000 for the causeway and $40,000,000 for the tunnel—but no engineer will take the responsibility of stating that a causeway, when completed, would stand up and be an effective means of transportation between the island and the mainland.

Mr. BENNETT: What is meant by a causeway in this connection?

Mr. DUNNING: A breakwater structure with a road on top and adequate facilities here and there for the passage of boats to and fro. I do not think that we can regard that as a practical solution of the difficulty. I think the island members on both sides of the house will agree with me that at present we cannot contemplate either a tunnel or a causeway as a solution of the problem. At the same time the trade of the island has been growing very rapidly; it is becoming increasingly apparent that the present ferry accommodation is not sufficient, and if anything happens to the existing ferry then real difficulties of communication will present themselves. We have also investigated during the past year the type of equipment which would be most desirable and economical from the ferry standpoint, having regard not only to the vessel itself and what it will carry but the nature of the terminals now existing, and the changes which would have to be made in those terminals to accommodate the new ferry services.

Naturally, the people of the island desire the best and most dependable ferry service that can under all conditions be provided. It so happens that the existing ferry was not designed to take care of automobile traffic and automobiles crossing to the island at the present time must be loaded on flat cars and run on to the ferry and carried across in that manner—a very cumbersome method, and one which prevents the complete utilization of the ferry in the carriage of the ordinary commerce of the country. The result of the investigation has led us to the conclusion that it would be advisable to build a steam ferry larger than the present one, the dimensions being: length 310 feet, beam 59 feet, with 19 feet 6 inches of a draft. The cost of such a vessel would approximate two million dollars. Improvements to the existing pier at Tormentine, an auto roadway leading on to the ferry ramp, dredging, and so forth, is estimated to cost about $811,000. Improvements to existing pier at Port Borden on the island, auto roadway, ramp and dredging, approximately $592,000. A lay-up wharf, that is, an improvement to the existing lay-up wharf at Borden, and dredging, $192,000. It is proposed—and the members from the

island agreed last year that it was desirable—that the new ferry should be an oil-burner because of the greater dependability and greater flexibility in ice conditions of oil-burning vessels. Oil storage pipe lines and equipment generally for oil storage at Port Borden would cost about $172,000. It is therefore estimated that the total cost of providing the new ferry and the necessary facilities at both terminals would be slightly less than $3,800,000.

Consideration was also given to the provision of a larger vessel of broader beam which would permit a type of design more effective under ice conditions, but the cost of such a vessel would be very much greater, as much more extensive alterations would require to be made at the terminals in order to accommodate a vessel of broader beam. And in addition the services by the larger vessel could not be provided for the island in the same length of time. The proposal now before the house involves the building of a 59 foot beam boat, 310 feet in length and the works that I have just described.

In conclusion I wish to say that a careful review of what it is possible to spend this year indicates that it will not be possible to spend the amount of the estimate now before the house, $3,500,000, and I would ask my colleague, the Minister of Finance to move that the item be reduced by one million dollars. The naval designer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries has been loaned to us for the preparation of preliminary plans of the boat. We expect to be able to call for tenders before very long, and have reasonable expectation of delivery within fifteen months thereafter. During that time we hope to have the necessary terminal works completed, and by accepting a 59 foot beam boat we hope to be able to provide the accommodation one or two years in advance of the time that would be required for the larger boat.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the width of the present boat?

Mr. DUNNING: The width of the present boat is seven feet less than the width now proposed.

Mr. MANION: I did not get the reason why the minister is reducing the item by one million dollars.

Mr. DUNNING: We will not spend it this year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): How does the length of the new boat compare with that of the present one?

Mr. DUNNING: The present boat is 285 feet long, so that the new one would be 25 feet longer and 7 feet wider.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to criticize the item as it stands. In fact I think I am but voicing the sentiment of the people of Prince Edward Island when I express appreciation of the minister's act in making the provision which is now proposed. The only criticism one can offer is the delay which has occurred in the matter. It is more than a year since $1,000,000 was placed in the estimates for this purpose, and yet even now the plans are not completed. I can quite understand the minister's explanation of that to be that many representations were made by local bodies in Prince Edward Island asking for changes; yet I should like to impress upon him the great importance of putting forth every effort to get the boat delivered as early as possible in the year 1930. The heavy traffic in the fall, chiefly the movement of potatoes, commences in the latter part of September and is very heavy by the middle of October. The present boat has been driven to the extreme limit in attempting to take care of the traffic and has not been able to handle it adequately. There is the further feature which is of great importance, the danger of something happening to the present boat. Last winter a slight accident took place, and there was consternation all over the island when it was reported that one of the propellers of the boat had been broken off and that she would have to go to Halifax for repairs in the middle of the winter. An embargo was placed on all freight at a time when it was very important and desirable to move it, especially potatoes, and it is indeed lucky that in the fourteen or fifteen years that boat has been operating a more serious accident has not occurred.

The minister's explanation in regard to the whole matter has been very clear and explicit. With respect to the proposals for a tunnel or causeway, I am of the opinion, as the minister is, that under the existing conditions a car ferry service is as much as we can ask for, especially in view of the enormous amount of money which either a tunnel or a causeway would involve. It is very gratifying that all arrangements have been undertaken to provide particularly for automobile traffic, because, as the minister said, when the present boat was built there was a prohibition against automobiles on the island, and such a thing as carrying automobiles was not contemplated. My only reason for speaking at all of the present con-

dition is to urge that all possible haste be made in the carrying out of the proposals, and that the boat be provided and put into service at the earliest possible date.

Mr. ROBB: I move that vote No. 93 be reduced by $1,000,000.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MANION: Will the minister tell me where the tenders are being called? Are they public tenders—I mean both Canadian and British? Where will the boat be built, in Canada or in Britain?

Mr. DUNNING: We have scarcely reached that point yet, but if there is a Canadian firm that has the facilities I should like to give it an opportunity.

Mr. MANION: Surely there must be some.

Mr. DUNNING: It is a very special type of construction. The existing boat was built in the old country, at Newcastle on Tyne, I believe. Certainly there will be public tenders, or at least tenders addressed to any concerns which might reasonably be expected to be able to supply the type desired.

Mr. MANION: Is it the intention when this boat is built to have the two kept on the service?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. MANION: What revenue has been derived from the ferry as it has been running?

Mr. DUNNING: It cannot be segregated inasmuch as it is a part of the railway service. I can give information regarding trips of the ferry, if that will help. The trips per month in 1928 reached a higher average than for many years; I believe it was the highest average in the history of the ferry. There were 160 round trips per month in 1928. The number of passengers per annum is also increasing; in 1928 it was 73,000. The automobiles are increasing; the number reached the total, higher than ever before, of 7,416 in 1928.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is recommended in the Duncan report that a separate accounting be made of the ferry service, as distinct from the accounting for the Island railways. Has the minister considered that?

Mr. DUNNING: I do not remember a recommendation with respect to a separate accounting for the Island railways, but I do remember something of that sort in connection with the operation of the ferry. I suggest, however, that it would be very cumbersome and difficult. We are really meeting the intention by providing this ferry, not to be charged to the Canadian National Railways, but to the funds of the Dominion of Canada directly.

Mr. BENNETT: But not the operation.

Mr. DUNNING: No; its operation forms a part of the operation of the eastern lines and meets the intention of the Duncan report rather better than an elaborate accounting which would have very wide ramifications. For instance, I mentioned 73,000 passengers: a separate accounting would involve the separation of that portion of each passenger's fare which could be properly allocated to the ferry. And the same with freight, which is a through movement. Separate accounting would be unnecessarily cumbersome and would not be of advantage, whereas this method involves the assumption by the Dominion of the constitutional responsibility which belongs to the Dominion in providing the capital expenditure involved.

Mr. FRASER: Has the minister any idea whether the boat when completed will pay capital charge and operating expenses?

Mr. DUNNING: The annual cost of operation, including interest and depreciation on the scheme we are now proposing, would be $804,800. I cannot give accurate figures with regard to the revenue but am reasonably sure we cannot hope that the revenue would meet the cost of providing the service which is the carrying out of an obligation of confederation.

Mr. MANION: What is the fare across?

Mr. DUNNING: There is no separate fare; it is included in the railway fare.

Mr. FRASER: It is a free service?

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I understand that the fare for a single crossing is 75 cents and the charge for automobiles $4. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. MacLaren) is of considerable importance. The cost of operation certainly cannot be taken care of by passenger traffic, and under present methods of operating it increases the deficit on the railway line there. That, in turn, is charged to the eastern lines, and when railway matters are discussed the charge is always made—and it is a fact—that there is a loss on these lines. The loss would be minimized to a considerable extent if this ferry, which is a direct obligation of the Dominion and is not part of the railway service, could be taken out of the Railway department altogether in the matter of expenditures. In regard to

the work done last year, I gathered from the statement made that about $220,000 was expended out of the $1,000,000 voted. Can the minister give us an idea as to what was done?

Mr. DUNNING: That does not appear to be on my file. If I can supply the information privately to my hon. friend I shall be glad to let him have the details.

Mr. MANION: One hon. member told me that he wanted certain details and I should be glad if the minister would report progress. It is eleven o'clock anyhow.

Mr. BENNETT: Is any part of the depreciation and fixed charges upon the investment which the minister mentioned a moment ago taken into consideration in determining the deficit in the operation of the eastern line?

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, May 31, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Thirteenth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Parent.

INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford) presented the third report of the select standing commitee on industrial and international relations, as follows:

The select standing committee on industrial and international relations beg leave to present the following as its third report.

Your committee has had under consideration a resolution which was adopted by the House of Commons on February 13, 1929, as follows:—

That the question of granting family allowances should be studied, taking into consideration the respective jurisdiction of both federal and provincial parliaments in the matter. and that the said question should be referred to the Committee on Industrial and International Relations, with instructions to inquire into and make report.

The following witnesses appeared before your committee to give evidence:—

Rev. Father Leon Lebel, S.J., teacher of philosophy, L'Immaculee Conception, Montreal, P.Q.

Mr. Gerald E. Brown, Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, Ottawa, Ont.;

Mr. Joseph Daoust, shoe manufacturer, Montreal, P.Q.; and

Miss Charlotte Whitton, of Ottawa;

Mrs. Mildred Densit, of Montreal; and

Mr. Robert E. Mills, of Toronto; representing the Social Service Council of Canada.

Your committee begs to submit the evidence of these witnesses on the subject matter of investigation, and recommends that (a) as this proposal is new in Canada, and requires more careful consideration, no immediate action shall be taken; and

(b) that before the next session of parliament the question of jurisdiction in matters of this nature as between the Dominion and the provinces be considered by the government;

(c) that 500 copies in English and 500 copies in French of this report and evidence be printed in blue book form, and that standing order No. 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Antigonish-Guysborough) presented the second, third and fourth reports of the select standing committee on marine and fisheries, as follows:

The select standing committee on marine and fisheries beg leave to present the following as their second report:

Your committee, to whom was referred for their consideration, the convention for the protection, preservation and extension of the sockeye salmon fisheries in the Fraser river system, which was signed at Washington on the 27th day of March, 1929, on behalf of His Majesty for the Dominion of Canada, by the plenipotentiary named therein, have taken the said convention under consideration and beg leave to recommend that the house do approve of the same.

The select standing committee on marine and fisheries beg leave to present the following as their third report:

Your committee have had under consideration Bill No. 26, an Act to amend the Fisheries Act, and have agreed to report the said bill with amendments.

Your committee has ordered that the said bill be reprinted as amended.

The select standing committee on marine and fisheries beg leave to present the following as their fourth report:

Following the consideration of Bill No. 26, an Act to amend the Fisheries Act, and in view of amendments made by your committee to said bill, your committee beg leave to recommend the adoption of the following departmental regulations in respect to the lobster and smelt fishing seasons:

That the lobster fishing seasons as now established by order in council be as follows:

1. Charlotte county, N.B., November 15-June 8.

2. St. John county, N.B. November 15- May 23.

3. Remainder of Bay of Fundy to Burns Point Digby country January 15-June 29.

4. Burns Point to Herring Point, Lunenburg county, March 1-May 31.

4. (a) Herring Point to Cole Harbour, Halifax county, December 1-December 30; March 1-May 15.

5. Cole Harbour to Red Point, Richmond county, including strait of Canso, May 1-June 30.

6. Red Point to Cape St. Lawrence, Inverness county, May 16-July 15.

7. Cape St. Lawrence to south side river St. Lawrence, except Magdalen islands, and a portion of Northumberland strait, May 1-June 30

8. Portion of Northumberland strait from river Philip, Nova Scotia to Chockfish river, New Brunswick, and Victoria harbour to Westpoint, Prince Edward Island, August 16 to October 15.

9. Magdalen islands, May 10-July 20.

10. North shore, Gulf of St. Lawrence, May 20-July 31.

That the smelt fishing seasons as now established by order in council be as follows:

In Nova Scotia;

For gill nets, October 15 to the last day of February following, except in a portion of Richmond county, where it is October 1 to January 31.

For bags nets, November 25 to the last day of February following, except in Northport and Tidnish rivers, where it is November 1-January 15.

In Prince Edward Island;

For gill nets, October 15-February 15.

For bag nets, November 25-February 15.

In New Brunswick:

For gill nets, October 15-February 15.

For bag nets, November 25-February 15, except in Baie Verte and Port Elgin rivers, it is November 1-January 15.

In Quebec:

For gill nets, September 1-February 15.

For bag nets, November 25-February 15.

For drag seines, September 1 to close of navigation.

Your committee also recommend the adoption of the recommendations of the sub committee appointed to report on clause 5 of Bill No. 26, as amended:

That, in place of section 5 of the said bill, which was stricken out as amended in committee, the minister be asked to regulate the number and use of trawlers under chapter 73, clause 46, R.S.C., by issuing to said beam trawlers a license to operate, and that regulations may be made by the Governor in Council prescribing the form of license, the evidence to be furnished on the application for the license, the number of licenses at any one time, the conditions under which same will be issued, and any other provision respecting same;

That all said trawlers so licensed be owned and registered in Canada;

That no beam or otter trawler be permitted to fish within twelve miles of the headlands of the Canadian coast; and

That the department use every effort to encourage line fishermen, both inshore and offshore, to increase the production of fish to meet any increased demand.

THE LATE MR. ROCH LANCTOT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, hon. members of this house learned yesterday afternoon, I am sure with sorrow, of the death at his home at St. Constant, Quebec, of Mr. Roch Lanctôt, member for Laprairie-Napierville. Mr. Lanctôt had been in ill health for some time past; indeed, he was unable to be present at all during this session of parliament and was absent during the latter part of the last session. His death therefore, was not unexpected. At the same time, I am sure it will bring a feeling of sadness to the hearts of all present to realize that we shall not again see within this chamber or about the corridors of parliament, his familiar figure.

Mr. Lanctôt was in his sixty-fourth year. In years of representation in parliament he was one of the oldest members. He came into the House of Commons after the general elections of 1904 and was again returned in the elections of 1908, 1911, 1917, 1921, 1925 and 1926, a continuous service, as a member of parliament, of some twenty-five years. During the whole of that time Mr. Lanctôt was very faithful in the discharge of his duties as a member, in attendance upon the sittings and work of the house and in representing in parliament the interests of his constituents and, in particular, the interests of the agricultural classes with which he was specially identified. It was characteristic of his concern for the people and their welfare that, in addition to being a member of parliament he should have continued to interest himself in municipal affairs. He was, at the time of his death, mayor of the parish in which he lived.

Mr. Lanctôt was a true son of the soil. He was born in the country; he came to Ottawa for his early education, but thereafter returned to the farm and devoted himself to rural pursuits. He was not only a son of the soil but a lover of the soil and was true to the soil. Had he lived in France he would have been spoken of as a peasant proprietor; had he lived in Great Britain he would have been referred to as one of the yeomen of the country, the class of men who in both these lands are the backbone of the nation, and who are known throughout the world as the salt of the earth. In Canada he brought to the rural life of our country what was best in the rural life of these older countries, with which through blood or birth he was associated. A true representation of the type of man of which Mr. Lanctôt was an outstanding example is given, it seems to me, by Gray, in his Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard:

> Some village Hampden, that, with dauntless breast,
> The little tyrant of his fields withstood,
> Some mute inglorious Milton here may rest,
> Some Cromwell guiltless of his country's blood.

Mr. Lanctôt had many of the characteristics of a Hampden. He was a man of sturdy independence and of sterling integrity; one who would not submit to arbitrary measures; who was fearless and courageous; prepared to stand alone for a principle in which he believed. He had many of the qualities of a Milton. He possessed a deep religious conviction, a strong faith. He was a lover of nature and there was about him, in his love of the simple and beautiful things of life, in his broad human sympathies and great friendliness of heart, not a little of the poet and the philosopher. He had, too, many of the attributes of a Cromwell. He was one who had a hatred of caste and of class; he was a great believer in the commonwealth, the commonweal, and at all times and on all occasions he stood for the rights of the people. This is the man who has passed away from our midst.

Speaking more particularly of the party to which he belonged, may I say that we had in him one of the firmest of upholders of Liberal principles. He was an intimate friend and strong supporter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier during the time that Sir Wilfrid was the leader of the Liberal party. In the ten years that it has been my privilege to be in the leadership of the party, he accorded to me a like friendship and an equally loyal support. Personally I feel his death very deeply. I am sure that feeling is shared in equal measure by all who sit on this side of the house, and I believe it is felt in great measure by all members of parliament, irrespective of party.

May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to convey to his widow the sympathy of this house in her great bereavement. The house I am sure will feel sympathy for the constituency as well, the constituency which has lost a member who has represented it continuously and faithfully for so long a period of time. Perhaps nothing more worthy could be expressed of his name and his fame than to say he was as much respected and beloved by members in this house of parliament as he was honoured by the constituency which over a quarter of a century gave him an unbroken confidence.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I, on behalf of those who are associated with me to your left as well as on my own, express my great sympathy with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his party in the loss they have sustained by the death of a beloved colleague? Mr. Lanctôt possessed those qualities that endeared him greatly to those with whom he was associated, and I can readily understand the reason for the moving sentences with which the Prime Minister expressed the sense of the loss sustained by him and his party in the passing of Mr. Lanctôt. It was my privilege to know Mr. Lanctôt for many years. I did not know him nearly so intimately as the Prime Minister and his colleagues did, but I knew enough of him to realize something of his sturdy character, sterling qualities and the devotion he gave to the service of his country. It may well be said that he was desirous at all times of adding to his store of knowledge. Perhaps some members of the house will recall a speech that he made on one occasion in which he indicated that he came here a young man desirous of learning and that he had learned much by his experience in this house.

He was a very devout man and a son of his church in the true sense. I think from a brief conversation I had with him that he would describe himself as a Canadian with all that it involves—a son of the soil who loved his native province with a devotion that was sometimes touching, one who loved the soil as only perhaps a Canadian can who is proud of his country, proud of its achievements, and looks forward to its future with great hope.

He was a man of real integrity of character, and his views were not easily disturbed once he had arrived at a conclusion. While my hon. friend the Prime Minister described him as a very strong supporter of his party, I am bound to say that in the discussions that I have had with him, not less than in some of his public utterances, there was a strong indication that while his views were generally in accord with those of the Prime Minister, he held very conservative principles and I think most of those who knew him well will agree that that was so.

I am glad to associate myself with the Prime Minister in the sympathy that he has expressed for Mr. Lanctôt's family, who have lost a loving and devoted husband and a father whose memory will be cherished with pride and satisfaction. He has rendered service to his country. His character and his achievements will serve as an example to those who come after him in the community in which he lived. His love of his country was manifested in every possible way in which it could be done within the sphere of his influence. The quotation which the Prime Minister has made from the poet Gray I would supplement with this other stanza:

> No farther seek his merits to disclose,
> Or draw his frailties from their dread abode,
> (There they alike in trembling hope repose,)
> The bosom of his Father and his God.

Mr. ROBERT GARDINER (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that we heard of the death of Mr. Lanctôt late yesterday afternoon. Mr. Lanctôt was for many years a very very faithful member of this house and I am sure that he served his constituency well. We in this corner of the house desire to associate ourselves with the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) in paying tribute to the memory of the late Mr. Lanctôt, and we also wish to express our sympathy to his widow and his family.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): May I be allowed to voice my deep appreciation of the work of Mr. Lanctôt, of his very attractive qualities and of his sterling worth? He had a charming personality. He had two things in common. He had a deep love of the people who live on the land and till the soil, and he was extremely interested in the peace of the world. With me he believed that if we continued to train our boys and girls in military methods, we would continue to use military methods. For all of these reasons I want personally to associate myself with the three members who have spoken in appreciation of the work which Mr. Lanctôt did for the coming generations in this country.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

KING'S BIRTHDAY—SATURDAY SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The motion on the order paper with respect to Saturday sittings in order to be moved at this time will require the unanimous consent of the house. Before asking for that, may I say that in now presenting the motion I am doing so with a view to hearing hon. members express their views and feelings on the wisdom of sitting to-morrow. I recognize that we have had a pretty hot week so far as the temperature is concerned, and a good many I imagine are feeling its fatigue and exhaustion, none more so than the members of the administration. However, we are quite prepared to sit to-morrow and continue with the work of the house with a view to hastening the termination of the session if such appears to be the wish of hon. members.

May I say in regard to sitting on Monday that last year, as I recollect it, the house sat on the King's birthday but adjourned during the afternoon in order that hon. members might attend the garden party given by Their Excellencies in honour of His Majesty's birthday. We had thought of following a similar procedure this year but again, if Mr. Speaker would permit it, I would like to have an expression of the views of the house and the government will seek to be guided in its final decision in the matter by what appears to be the general view.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the motion. It is moved by the Prime Minister:

That on Saturday, the first day of June, 1929, and every Saturday thereafter until the end of the session, the house shall meet at eleven o'clock in the forenoon and the order of business and procedure shall be the same as on Fridays.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): It is undoubted, Mr. Speaker, that the notice of motion now given by the Prime Minister has only become necessary because it was found that the first motion was not sufficiently broad to cover the matter, for it was originally intended to deal with to-morrow as well as every succeeding Saturday until the house prorogued.

I think we are all desirous of doing our best to expedite the business of parliament. We certainly should not sit for three sittings to-morrow. Whether or not we should sit until six o'clock to-morrow is a matter in respect to which those who sit to the left of the Speaker are entirely in the hands of the majority of the house. If the majority of the house so desire, we certainly are willing to expedite business by sitting.

With respect to Monday, I think the course suggested by the Prime Minister is one that might well be followed. We can have a sitting in the morning, adjourn for the afternoon, and sit in the evening from eight until eleven. I see no reason why that should not be done, and those associated with me are quite willing to assist in carrying out that idea.

Mr. ROBERT GARDINER (Acadia): So far as the sittings on Monday are concerned, it is agreeable to us to sit in the morning and in the evening, as the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition suggest, leaving the afternoon free for those who desire to attend the garden party. But to sitting on Saturdays we have very strong objection. We have been having three sittings every day all week, and we have other business in our offices that we must attend to, and with three sittings a day we have not very much opportunity to take care of that business that our constituents expect us to take care of. Saturday is the only day we have left in which to do that business.

I want to draw the attention of the house to a very important point. The members from the maritimes and we from the west

have to sit here week in and week out. We cannot go home on Friday night and come back on Monday night like most of the members from Ontario and Quebec. It is the practice of this house not to transact important business on Friday or Monday; no important votes are ever taken on a Friday or a Monday. The consequence is that we who have to sit here all week can only mill around, if I may use that expression, until the other members come back. We get tired of this kind of business. We do not think it is fair. Then when we come to the end of the session there is a great rush, against which we have always protested. As far as we are concerned we will not consent to sitting on any Saturday during the rest of this session. I understand that this motion is not in order, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it was not placed on the order paper in time. Therefore I raise objection against the passing of the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: If objection is raised, I must declare that it is valid, because the motion is out of order unless there is unanimous consent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is understood then that the house will sit on Monday morning and adjourn on Monday afternoon. I therefore move that this motion be withdrawn with the consent of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: Resuming again at eight o'clock on Monday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is understood then that I adjourn the house tonight at eleven o'clock until Monday morning as usual.

Motion agreed to.

MIXING OF WHEAT FOR EXPORT

CORRECTION OF INACCURATE STATEMENT BY CORRESPONDENT OF LONDON NEWSPAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the ministry, and especially the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) to a most mischievous and inaccurate statement which appears in the morning newspapers. This mischievous and inaccurate statement is the report of some publication in London, England. The diplomatic correspondent of the London Morning Post is reported by Mr. Lukin Johnston of the Southam Press as having said:

> One aspect of American activity in Canada requires close attention and that is in the mixing of low grade American wheat with Canadian, and exporting it as Canadian. This must affect, in a measure, the Canadian market abroad.

As that statement, Mr. Speaker, is inaccurate, is mischievous and calculated to do irreparable harm to our wheat industry overseas, I ask that the Minister of Trade and Commerce take the necessary steps to correct it.

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank my hon. friend the member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), for calling the attention of parliament to this statement which, as he says, is entirely inaccurate. Neither from Montreal, Halifax, St. John or Vancouver is a Canadian western certificate issued on anything but all-Canadian wheat, and how the impression has gone abroad as to the mixing of Canadian and American spring wheats in Montreal I do not know. But I think at this time it might just as well be stated clearly to the house that there is an admixture of Canadian and American durum wheat, but that wheat does not go out under a Canadian western certificate. The wheat that is mixed at Montreal is what is known as macaroni wheat or durum wheat. Those wheats of both Canadian and American origin are sold out of American seaboard ports and out of Canadian ports on what is known as an open or seaboard certificate, which does not give the country of origin, either passing through an American port or a Canadian port. The statement that they are low-grades or high-grades as of either country is incorrect. Durum wheats are used in the macaroni trade in Europe, and the buyers know exactly what they are getting. In many instances the admixture may consist of a high-grade American durum and a low-grade Canadian durum. In other instances it may be that the grade of Canadian durum is higher than the grade of American durum, and I think it is with regard to this admixture which is sold on an open or seaboard certificate in both countries that the impression mentioned has been created. But may I repeat again, that all wheat passing through Canadian ports on Canadian certificates is entirely of Canadian origin, and that the statement referred to by my hon. friend, and contained in The Citizen this morning, is incorrect.

Mr. T. E. KAISER (Ontario): May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he can explain the origin of the word "durum"?

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot give my hon. friend the origin

of the word "durum" as applied to this particular variety of wheat. I mentioned in my previous remarks that it was descriptive of a certain flinty wheat which was used in the macaroni trade.

FISH TRAPS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA WATERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a request of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin). I have a telegram from Ucluelet, a small fishing place on the west coast of Vancouver island, saying that they are forwarding a petition with a thousand names on it against salmon traps, and that further largely signed petitions will follow. I asked a question about this some weeks ago but did not get any reply. I presume I will be within my rights in debating the matter on the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and in order that we may do so intelligently I would ask if the minister will be kind enough to lay on the table the report of Commissioner Ellis who was appointed to investigate. The sittings concluded about six weeks ago, so the report should certainly be available now.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I shall do the best I can to meet the request of my hon. friend.

POST OFFICE SIGNS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether or not there is any accuracy in the report that the enamelled post office signs that were formerly printed in blue on a white ground have been withdrawn, and signs with red letters on a white ground substituted therefor. I was asked to bring the matter to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General for the purpose of having him reply to that inquiry, and also to ascertain whether or not there is a contract pending for the purchase of the enamelled signs, and if so whether the Postmaster General will bring it down. I do not expect him to be able to give an answer at the moment, but I have had a communication asking me to bring the matter to his attention.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): I am not in a position at the moment to give a reply. I will have the matter looked into, but I really think that it belongs to the Department of Public Works.

CANADIAN FLAG

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS DONNELLY (Willow Bunch): I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to an article appearing in the Regina Leader of May 25, in which it is stated that at a meeting there our Canadian flag was in danger, and that the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King had appointed—

The SPEAKER: The article should be sent to the clerk and read to the house.

Mr. DONNELLY: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if a committee has been appointed, as stated, consisting of six or seven Roman Catholic priests to provide a new flag for Canada.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): If I understand rightly, the hon. gentleman asks the question as to whether it is true that a committee of six priests has been appointed to devise a new flag for Canada. I cannot imagine a statement more remote from the truth, or more absurd.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONTREAL TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the third reading of Bill No. 254, respecting the construction by the Canadian National Railway Company of certain terminal facilities, with grade separation and other works at and in the vicinity of the city of Montreal.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I had an amendment which I had prepared but left upstairs. Perhaps by consent this can stand till the afternoon.

Motion stands.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT

The house resumed from May 30 consideration in committee of Bill No. 313, to amend the Dominion Elections Act—Hon. Mr. Cannon—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. POWER: Section 27 was allowed to stand in order that members might express an opinion as to whether or not in certain constituencies the period between nomination day and election day should be two weeks. I have now a list of such constituencies and I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke), that section 27 be replaced by the following:

Schedule 3 of the said act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

Schedule 3: List of electoral districts in which an interval of two weeks between nomination and the polling day is to be allowed:

Province of Ontario: Algoma East; Algoma West; Fort William; Frontenac-Addington; Grey Southeast; Hastings-Peterborough; Kenora; Rainy River; Muskoka-Ontario; Parry Sound; Port Arthur-Thunder Bay; Renfrew North; Renfrew South; Temiskaming North; Temiskaming South; Victoria.

Province of Quebec: Charlevoix-Saguenay; Gaspe; Pontiac.

Province of Manitoba: Brandon; Dauphin; Lisgar; Macdonald; Marquette; Neepawa; Nelson; Portage la Prairie; Provencher; Selkirk; Souris; Springfield.

Province of British Columbia: Cariboo; Comox-Alberni; Kootenay East; Skeena; Vancouver North; West Kootenay; Yale.

Province of Saskatchewan: Assiniboia; Kindersley; Humboldt; Last Mountain; Long Lake; Mackenzie; Maple Creek; Melfort; Melville; Moose Jaw; North Battleford; Prince Albert; Qu'Appelle; Rosetown; Saskatoon; South Battleford; Swift Current; Weyburn; Willow Bunch; Yorkton.

Province of Alberta: Acadia; Athabaska; Battle River; Bow River; Camrose; Lethbridge; Macleod; Medicine Hat; Peace River; Red Deer; Vegreville; Wetaskiwin.

Yukon: Yukon Territory.

Miss MACPHAIL: Why is Southeast Grey given two weeks between nomination and election day when many other Ontario ridings have only one?

Mr. POWER: In quite a number of constituencies in Ontario at the present time there is a period of two weeks between nomination day and polling day. The former chief electoral officer, Colonel Biggar, prepared a list of constituencies which in his opinion should come within this category by reason of administrative difficulty, a difficulty which he felt could be met if the period were thus extended. Amongst these was Southeast Grey. If the hon. member would prefer it otherwise the list can be amended accordingly.

Miss MACPHAIL: I just wondered why it was included. I have no objection.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I believe Moose Jaw was put in amongst those in which two weeks are allowed. The only reason for having two weeks is that it makes it easier for the returning officer to arrange for the polling subdivisions and for the ballot officers going out. In the constituency of Moose Jaw, which is half city and half country, not covering a very great area, I do not think there is any necessity for two weeks. I would rather have one week.

Mr. POWER: I move that the constituency of Moose Jaw be omitted.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. CAHAN: I would move that section 26 of the bill be called and approved. I notice by Hansard that my contention was correct, that this section had not been read and passed. I think it is necessary that it should be called and I move accordingly.

Mr. DUNNING: I wish to associate myself with the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) in asking that section 26 be called. I was responsible for the statement yesterday that I had heard it called. I was under the impression that I had, but Hansard does not indicate this to have been the fact.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 26 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Section 26 agreed to.

On section 15—Preparation of lists.

Mr. POWER: With regard to section 15, the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George thought that schedule (a) could be made more clear. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, that section 15, schedule (a), rule 20, be amended as follows:

> Any person, whose name appears in the list of voters for any polling division in the electoral district, may make oath before a registrar giving particulars of the list upon which his name appears, stating that he is qualified to vote in the electoral district and alleging the death, disqualification, or real residence and appearance on another list, of any person on the list for any of the polling divisions in the registration district for which such registration has been appointed,

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 16—Polling day.

Mr. POWER: I would ask the committee to revert to section 16, which is not quite clear. This section amends section 40 of the act. Subsection 1 reads:

> The governor in council shall fix the day upon which the poll shall be held at any election, and such day shall be named in the writ of election; at the general election the writs for all the electoral districts shall be dated on the same day.

I would add the words "and shall name the same day for the poll."

Mr. BENNETT: That is very desirable.

Mr. KAISER: I direct the attention of the committee to the answer given by the chairman of the special committee (Mr. Power) and by the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) yesterday, which answer is correct, namely, that no record is kept of those who

take oaths. They are permitted to vote on taking the oath as in form 25. Provision should be made in this bill for a record of the various oaths that are being taken by voters so that we may have access to them for future use in amendments to the Elections Act. I asked the electoral officer if he could give me information as to the number of votes polled under this section by virtue of the oath and he gave me the same answer as the hon. members gave me yesterday, that no record was kept. When you are appointing a permanent electoral officer or permanent returning and deputy returning officers, these experts should surely be able to give an intelligent account of the proceedings on election day. I think provision should be made somewhere in this bill whereby more information would be provided in regard to what takes place in the various polling booths on election day than is ascertainable at present.

Mr. CANNON: I do not know if it would be possible to devise a practical method of securing the further information which my hon. friend wishes to have, but I might suggest to him that in view of the fact that the committee has considered other amendments than those included in the present bill, with the idea of having the further amendments adopted at the next session of parliament, my hon. friend might take up this question with the committee so that it might be considered when the legislation is being prepared next year.

The CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment before the committee. Mr. Power has moved that subsection 1 of section 16 be amended by adding the words "and shall name the same day for the poll."

Mr. CANNON: The hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) drew the attention of the committee yesterday to the fact that on Mondays there are at times certain religious feasts observed by those of the Hebrew faith and that it might cause some inconvenience to those people if an election were held on a Monday on which one of those religious feasts was being observed. In answer to my hon. friend I may say that I have absolutely no doubt that if the attention of the government were drawn to such a situation the governor in council would see to it that no such Monday would be chosen as election day, so any inconvenience such as that indicated by my hon. friend certainly would be overcome.

[Mr. Kaiser.]

Mr. JACOBS: I might point out that these fasts and feasts may occur on Mondays or Tuesdays; they are not definitely fixed.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Polling day to be half holiday.

Mr. HEAPS: Yesterday I asked that this section stand in order to consider the question of the half holiday which, under the present bill, would be observed all over Canada. As I pointed out then, under the old bill employees were given two hours off with pay, but under this bill they would not be paid for this half holiday. In other words, they are to be denied certain rights they previously enjoyed, and I did feel that this was a retrograde step. I would be very much in favour of a half holiday, of course, if the employees received pay for that time off, but not otherwise. I do not think it was the intention of the committee to penalize employees in this way if they desired to exercise their franchise.

Yesterday I was under the impression that just before the one o'clock adjournment an amendment had been moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Thorson), but on looking up Hansard I find that such was not the case. However, I see that the chairman of the committee accepted the suggestion on behalf of the government, for which I am very grateful.

Mr. POWER: No.

Mr. HEAPS: My hon. friend shakes his head; I will quote what he said:

> I understand that the government have no objection to accepting this amendment—

Such being the case, I do not see now why the chairman of that committee should shake his head and object to the statement I am making. I think most members of the house will remember that just before one o'clock yesterday the hon. member did make the statement as reported in Hansard.

Mr. POWER: If I may just interrupt, I may have made the statement but I have no recollection of doing so. I really did not intend to say that.

Mr. HEAPS: I will attribute it to the heat, but I presume that the Hansard reporter took down exactly what the hon. member said, even though he does not remember making the statement.

Mr. POWER: I did not mean to say it; I think my hon. friend will permit me to

make that correction. I am quite clear in my own mind that I did not mean to attempt to bind the government, over which I have no power or influence, or even to bind myself, over whom I am presumed to have some influence.

Mr. HEAPS: I must say that the hon. gentleman is very modest. However, Mr. Chairman, I intend to move an amendment to section 4 as follows:

That section 14 of the Dominion Elections Act be substituted for section 4 in the present bill, No. 313, except that the word "three" shall be substituted in the second line for the word "two".

The effect of this amendment, which I hope will receive the support of the government, will be to give men and women who are employed in factories and elsewhere three hours off on election day without any deduction from their pay.

Mr. CAHAN: Why not make the motion in the exact terms in which you wish it adopted?

Mr. HEAPS: I think that is what I have done; I think this covers exactly what I wish. As a matter of fact I thought this amendment had been moved yesterday; only a few moments ago I learned that this was not the case, so I drafted this amendment hurriedly to cover the point. The only change from the old act I am asking is that the word "three" be substituted for the word "two," which would make the section read as follows:

Every employer shall, on polling day, allow every elector in his employ at least three additional hours other than the noon hour—

Mr. CAHAN: I would suggest that in as much as section 4 had been adopted—

Mr. HEAPS: No, it has not been adopted; if that had been the case I could not have made this amendment.

Mr. CAHAN: You are substituting the old section and inserting the word "three" instead of two."

Mr. HEAPS: Yes. It has been stated that this parliament has no power to legislate along these lines. I cannot say as to that, but nevertheless I do know that in past years the large employers of labour in this country have carried out the spirit of the act and have given to their employees the two hours provided for in the old elections act, which we are now amending. I know what has happened in the large shops out west; on election day they closed down at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, so the employees were given two hours off with pay. I believe the same practice has been followed by other companies employing large numbers of men and women. Under this bill now before us a half holiday is declared on election day; that is something I would like to see carried out, and I believe the wording of my amendment is in accordance with the intentions of the committee. The large employers of labour usually keep open from 8 to 12, and then from 1 o'clock in the afternoon. They would probably work from 8 o'clock in the morning until 1 o'clock in the afternoon under this arrangement, and I think every large employer of labour in the Dominion would follow that practice. I am not so much concerned with the question of the powers which we have under the British North America Act, because it strikes me most forcibly that whenever anything comes up which concerns the working people of this country the British North America Act is always brought forward to their disadvantage. Under the old act the employees were given two hours and when we try to extend that by one hour we are told that we have not the power to do so. It was done in the past, the employers of labour carried out the spirit of the enactment of parliament and I feel quite satisfied that if this amendment is adopted they will carry out the spirit of the amendment in the same way as they carried out the provisions of the Dominion Election Act.

Mr. POWER: I have a copy of Hansard before me and I find that the hon. member is quite correct; I did intimate that the government seemed to be willing to accept that suggestion, but I said also that as chairman of the committee I wished to dissociate myself from it. May I repeat briefly my reason for taking that stand; it is quite true that there are provisions in the act whereby an employee may, for a period of two hours, absent himself from his work for the purpose of voting, and the act states definitely that the employee shall not forfeit his pay for that time. That provision has been in the act for some time, and there has been no protest about it. As a matter of fact, as the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) has said, the employers all over the country have entered into the spirit of the act and have not contested the validity or the legality of that provision. The point I wish to make is this; it is of doubtful validity. In saying that I am not giving my own opinion only, because in the legal sense I do not think it would be considered as worth very much, but those who know something of our laws have

declared as of doubtful validity an enactment by which the parliament of Canada seeks to bind an employer to pay an employee for something, which is only a matter of contract and therefore falls within the jurisdiction of the provinces. In a matter of at least doubtful validity, when we stretch that period to three hours, the employers of labour might say, "We were willing, without going to the trouble of appearing before the courts, to allow our employees two hours' time, but three hours would be of considerable consequence to us." An employer of labour employing three, four or five thousand hands, might find that the cost would be somewhat excessive. I am under the impression that it is quite likely that some employers might not be willing to comply with the spirit of the act, and might decide to test its validity. In my opinion, and in the opinion of many whom I have consulted, if that is done it will be found to be invalid and the labourer will be in the position where he will not receive any holiday or any pay.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: He would not receive any pay if it were a half holiday?

Mr. POWER: None at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then he would be no worse off than he would be under the proposed change.

Mr. POWER: I am not suggesting that the half holiday would be an ideal arrangement, nor that the previous arrangement of allowing two hours is ideal, but I say that I do not wish to associate myself with the proposed change to three hours for these reasons: First of all, I do not believe it is good law, and secondly, I do not believe it is in the interests of the labouring classes. I am not opposed to this principle in any way; if it were possible to grant a half holiday with pay I would be only too willing to do that.

Mr. NEILL: Suppose the act is left as it is, and the day is made a public holiday; could an employer refuse to pay an employee's wages for a period which has been proclaimed to be a public holiday?

Mr. POWER: Undoubtedly.

Mr. NEILL: I question if he could deduct those wages.

Mr. CAHAN: If the contract between the employer and the employee is a monthly one, then the employee must be paid by the month, no matter how many days are declared to be public holidays; the same principle would apply to a weekly contract.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. NEILL: But not where the employee is being paid by the day?

Mr. CAHAN: If he is being paid by the day, and a half day is declared to be a public holiday, he will only receive pay for the half day that he has worked.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, it may seem to many members to be a matter of small consequence as to whether or not payment shall be made for one hour or two hours, but I think the very fact that we have to debate this matter is an indictment of our present wages system. Many of these men have to pare things down to a very fine point, and I take it that the real purpose which we have in view is to enable as many as possible of these men to exercise their franchise. Unless provision is made for a certain period when they can take time off, it is impossible for many of them to do so. A great many of the electors in Winnipeg work in the railway shops at Transcona, and in order to vote they must travel a distance of eight or nine miles to Weston, the western suburb of Winnipeg. Unless they have time off it is impossible for them to do that. They should be allowed several hours off, or given a full half holiday. I recognize the fact that there may be some difficulty, as suggested by the chairman of the committee, but I can hardly conceive that where the employers are willing to give two hours, they would go to the trouble of appealing against this legislation when one hour only is added to the free time. In case the validity of the act is tested, the worker would be in no worse a position then he would be under the proposed arrangement for a half holiday. It seems to me that we might very well take the chance and give the three hours which would actually meet the requirements of the time necessary for voting.

Mr. POWER: The hon. member and myself are in substantial agreement, but it is only a matter of opinion. I give it as my opinion that the employers of labour, when they find they must allow pay for three hours, are not as likely to enter into the spirit of the act, as they have been in the past when they were obliged to allow two hours only. It is my impression that they will test the validity of the act, but that is only my opinion.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the committee in presenting these amendments sought to limit them to proposals on which we were practically unanimous. We sought to avoid bringing before the house at the close of the session any issues which might be disputed.

Inasmuch as this trouble has arisen, I suggest that the Solicitor General give favourable consideration to the withdrawal of section 4 of this bill repealing section 14 of the original act, and allow the original section 14 to stand. I think that would, for the present session, be preferable and would allow further consideration of the proposal made by the hon. member for North Winnipeg, when other matters are brought before the house next year, because a number of controversial issues in respect of the Dominion Elections Act must come before us next session in the bill then to be introduced, I understand, by the government.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If there is any difficulty over validity, is there not a possible difficulty in the Dominion parliament forcing an employer to give a half holiday for election purposes? It seems to me that might readily be construed as interfering with freedom of contract. If objection is taken to the payment of wages for one hour, objection might easily be taken to the cessation of work for half a day.

Mr. POWER: It is for three hours.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Well, for one or two or three, I do not care which it is, the principle is the same. If objection is taken to that, objection might be taken to the forced cessation of work and the tieing up of the entire plant for a half day.

Mr. CAHAN: This parliament has legislative jurisdiction to declare a holiday or a half holiday for the purpose of carrying out any public business over which parliament has exclusive jurisdiction; that is, such business as a general federal election.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But in practice that penalizes the worker.

Mr. CAHAN: That may be so, but in this case, in order to avoid penalizing the worker any more than he is at present penalized, I would suggest that for the time being we should revert to the terms of the original section 14 of the act, because I think a good deal is to be said in support of the suggestions made by the chairman of the committee which has for some months been considering the bill amending the Dominion Elections Act. That is, if you impose too much upon the employer, you will find that he will contest the matter, whereas at the present time the giving of two hours as a holiday with full pay has become a general standard and accepted. But there is a very strong body of opposition against extending the time, and as we wish now to reach amendments which are generally acceptable I would suggest that we might drop clause 4 of the bill and allow for the present the original section 14 to stand.

Mr. THORSON: When I suggested this change to the committee when it was last in session on clause 4 of the bill, I had in mind a situation which became very evident in Winnipeg at the last election. Many of the workers who live in South Winnipeg, St. James, Weston and other western suburbs of the city of Winnipeg, work in the Transcona shops which are from ten to twelve miles distant from their homes and from the polling subdivisions where they cast their votes. They leave their work at Transcona at three o'clock; it takes them half an hour to an hour to get home; they wash and change, and then they pile into the polling booths in the last hour or so of polling day.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The polls close at six o'clock.

Mr. THORSON: Yes. The result was that a great number of these men were not able to vote. That was one of the reasons I had in mind for suggesting that the word "two" before the word "hours" in the original section 14 should be struck out and the word "three" substituted therefor. I am not prepared to admit the constitutional invalidity of section 14 of the present act. I think the Dominion parliament, having jurisdiction to legislate with regard to the subject of Dominion elections, may set forth the conditions and circumstances under which the elections shall take place.

Mr. CAHAN: There are various contentions both ways, but we cannot decide the matter.

Mr. THORSON: I am not prepared to admit that section 14 of the present act is ultra vires of this parliament. I think the argument can be made just as strongly for its validity as for its invalidity; in fact, I think the argument for its validity is stronger than that for its invalidity. Rather than see clause 4 of the present bill stand, I would prefer the old section 14 of the present act. If it is the sense of the house, I would prefer, for the reasons I have stated, to have three hours instead of two given to the employees.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Why not extend the hours of voting?

Mr. THORSON: That might be one method of meeting the particular difficulty I had in mind, for instance, by extending the

polling hours to seven in the evening. I do not know whether the committee has that in mind or not in any subsequent report that it may bring down.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There is no doubt that the old act gave a special privilege to one particular class. No argument is being advanced to give a farmer two or three hours' pay for going to the polls. No argument is being used to give a fisherman so much extra time to get to the polls. In my judgment, we have stretched our authority in giving the two hours. Let us be content with that. Do not let us exaggerate the thing and ask for so much that we may regret it later. This is a tax upon the employer of labour. If it is proper to give two hours and if it is within the law, as my hon. friend who has just spoken, says, to give three hours, why not half a day, and, if half a day, why not a whole day? Do not make an absurdity of the thing. We have gone far enough. No manufacturer or employer of labour has made a great deal of fuss about the matter. We are giving a good deal; do not let us carry it to an absurdity.

Mr. CANNON: When this clause was under consideration yesterday, I stated on behalf of the government that, if it were the desire of the house, I saw no objection to the withdrawal of the clause from the bill and to our reverting to the old law. When I made that suggestion, the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) who now moves his amendment, stated that he was not in a position to decide whether this would be acceptable or not, and the section was allowed to stand, I reiterate that the government has no set opinion; that we are introducing in this case legislation along the lines of the recommendations of the committee. It seems as if this half holiday without pay might not be as satisfactory as the two hours with pay as provided for under the old act.

I am not going to prolong the debate by discussing the question whether we were within our constitutional right in legislating as we did in the past. There is one side that has been expounded, that is, that salaries and wages are matters of contract and civil rights and, generally speaking, those matters are within the purview of the provinces and not of the Dominion government. But there is also another side that might be urged, and that is that this question of declaring that wages are to be paid during those two hours might be considered as a matter ancillary to the general scheme of legislation regarding elections. These are two viewpoints, one which would indicate that we are not within our jurisdiction, and the other which might indicate that we are perfectly within our province when we have legislated as we have done in the past. I repeat, I am entirely in the hands of the committee and we will stand by the opinion of the committee as it is expressed.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): I am in favour of this amendment for various reasons. In the first place I do not think any deduction will be made for the half holiday from the pay of monthly employees such as clerks. With regard to other employees, it is not necessary for any of them to take the half holiday. If a man is employed in the steel works, for instance, and his work is necessary, he can stay at work, and if he works he will get extra time for holidays. I think this should go through as we arranged it in the committee.

With regard to the eight-hour day, I do not see how a man who is working only eight hours a day can take three hours off in the afternoon because that leaves him only one hour to go back and work, and that is hardly worth while. I think the sensible thing to do is to make it a half holiday.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HEAPS: We now have the situation where we either have to accept the half holiday without pay or the provision of the existing Dominion Elections Act, and if I have to choose between the two I prefer the existing act to the provisions of the bill now before us.

There is one point that I would like to bring to the attention of the chairman of the special committee. It is rather an important point which he raised. I do not understand much of the law on this question—

Mr. POWER: Neither does the chairman.

Mr. HEAPS: The hon. member (Mr. Power) made the statement here to-day that the validity of the existing act could be challenged and that under the act the worker would not be entitled to two hours with pay. This would raise a very important question. Assume that at some future time some employer or someone interested challenges the act, and that it turns out as the chairman of the committee thought it would turn out. It would mean that hundreds of thousands of electors would have no opportunity on election day of going to the polls and casting their votes. I do not say that anything of that kind will happen, but if it does then it means that we would have to recast completely the

provisions of this act. That danger occurred, to my mind, when the chairman of the special committee gave that opinion, either as a lawyer or as the chairman of the committee, I do not know which.

Mr. POWER: As a very poor lawyer I gave that opinion.

Mr. CAHAN: I do not think, since I have been in this house, that a special committee of the house has ever sat with a more sincere desire to obtain amendments that would be satisfactory to all concerned and that would be fair and impartial to all interests. On this section there were differences of opinion. They arose in this way. All the large corporations employing men and women have a rule almost universal in this country that if employees are brought back on a holiday to work they are paid double pay for the time in which they are engaged in such work. Large corporations such as the steel and coal industries cannot shut down for a half day conveniently, and therefore when there is a half holiday they arrange to bring back a certain number of men to keep their works in operation, and they pay them double time. So if we declare this a half holiday a large body of the workingmen and workingwomen of this country who desire to work on that half day will receive employment at double pay for the time in which they are employed.

Mr. POWER: Is it not possible that it will have quite the contrary effect to what was intended and that a large number of people will remain at work at double pay rather than go out and vote?

Mr. CAHAN: There is the difficulty. We believe in liberty of opinion and liberty of action within certain limits in this country. I am simply stating how this question appeared to the committee. On the other hand, the ordinary day labourer who is employed in the village factory or in the small store in the smaller urban centres has no difficulty whatever in arranging with his employer for ample time to go out and vote. The relations between employers and employees of that class are so amicable in this country that very little difficulty has arisen in respect to voting. I prefer the half holiday for this reason, that it assures the hundreds of thousands of men who are employed in the larger factories and the great industries a half holiday for them to go to the poll, and if they are brought back to work for the purpose of carrying on the operations of the company it entitles them to double pay.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: A few moments ago the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George was arguing against the amendment of my colleague, and suggesting that it would be wise under the circumstances to leave things as they were, but as soon as the amendment is turned down he suggests that now we adopt the half holiday.

Mr. CAHAN: I beg pardon. That is a mis-representation of my intention. My intention was not to make an argument but to state to the committee the views that influenced us when we were dealing with the matter as a committee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But the effect is as I stated, whereas a few moments ago the hon. gentleman was suggesting that we leave things as they are; he now suggests an amendment. I submit that that is hardly a consistent attitude. There may be some truth in what the hon. member has said in regard to a few people in the large industries, but there is a very large number of shops where men are not brought back to work on a holiday. I should say that the vast majority are not brought back and paid double time for the holiday. The suggested plan would work a substantial injustice in their case. It would seem to me that when we remember the very narrow margin on which a great number of the workers have to operate, it is highly desirable that they should be given the opportunity to vote without being penalized too much for so doing. Further than that, I would point out that whilst the relations between employer and employee may in some instances be amicable in many instances they are not of the most cordial nature. It may be all very well to say that a man is free to go and vote, yet in a great many plants a man is not free unless his employer gives him the opportunity. I myself have had difficulty with large employers in that connection who paid no attention to existing legislation for providing suitable hours in which their men could go and vote. They said they could not arrange to let them all go at the same time, and so on. It is quite true I was representing the interests of the employees, but I would take that position whether a man were voting Liberal, Conservative or Labour.

Mr. CAHAN: Is the hon. gentleman in favour of continuing the original section?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Most decidedly.

An hon. MEMBER: We are all agreed.

Mr. CANNON: I think the committee would be satisfied if we simply dropped the clause, and left the question open; we might attend to it next year. That is section 4, subsection 14.

Mr. BOYS: I agreed with the clause as it appears now. I did not take the trouble to look it up myself, but I was informed—I think the information came from the chief electoral officer who appeared before the committee—that this very question was dealt with in the house in 1925, and that by a vote of 54 to 32 the change was then made, and that merely by oversight it was not incorporated in the act. I feel that that being so it would be very proper now to adopt what was done in 1925. I have no very pronounced views on the matter myself, and if they who feel that they have some right to speak for labour think that it would be better to revert to the previous subsection whereby two hours are given with pay I would have no objection to that. On the other hand, I have no desire to oppose the suggestion of the Solicitor General that the matter be dropped now, and with many other matters to be attended to which will be subsequently referred to in another report of this committee it might well stand to be dealt with at the next session of parliament.

Section withdrawn.

On section 20—Name not on the list.

Mr. NEILL: Might I ask the permission of the committee to refer to another section which came up yesterday in the house when I was attending a rather important committee? It is a small matter but it is rather important. With the consent of the hon. Solicitor General, who I suppose is in charge of the bill, I would like to insert one word in section 20. If you will refer to section 20 of this bill you will find that it deals with the question of allowing, as it is known in popular parlance, a man or woman to swear himself in on election day. I am talking entirely of rural matters. This does not concern the urban electors at all. There is a privilege there where a man can, as I say, go and swear himself in, on complying with certain formalities, and it is a highly-prized right in those country places. It is a safeguard against a lot of things; it is a safeguard against corruption, if such should exist, although it does not in the district that I represent; it is a safeguard against carelessness which might exist, or ignorance of the local deputy returning officer, who has no desire to do an injustice. Under the old act a man went there and he swore, aided by a voter who was on the list, that he had resided in the electoral district the regulation number of days and that he was now a resident in the polling division. Now they have gone further, he has to swear not only that he has been the regulation number of days, and so on, but that so far as he is aware his name does not appear on the list of voters prepared for any other polling division. That is the trouble. Those registrars, as they are called, who put the names of people on the list, are paid so much a head, and sometimes for that reason, and sometimes due to pure carelessness, they just take the last list, or some other list, and they jam on every name that is there, men who have been away for years, or men who have been dead for years. They do not put them on deliberately; they simply take the list and will not be bothered checking up to see whether Bill Jones has left the district, or has gone to heaven or to some other place in the meantime. Then the man comes along on election day and wants to vote in this other polling division where he has been residing for perhaps six months. He knows his name is on the old list, or someone tells him so; he may be aware that he is left on the old list, but—improperly. What is he going to do? He has no remedy; he loses his vote. That is not the intention of this amendment.

Mr. ADSHEAD: He can vote at the polling division where he belongs.

Mr. NEILL: But he does not want to. He cannot afford to take a long trip. His interests are in the polling division where he then resides. We are proposing to make it easy for the workingman, and for everyone, to vote. I would ask the Solicitor General to be permitted to insert this one word. It is not the way I would like to have it, but I know it would open up a lot of discussion to change the whole section. I would ask leave to insert the word "properly" down on the second last line of the section, so that it will read that the man has got to swear that so far as he is aware, his name does not "properly" appear on any other list. There is no opportunity for abuse; he has to have someone who lives there swear to his identity. He has got to swear himself that he has resided in that polling division. It is rather a retrogade step from the old act. If the Solicitor General would allow me to put in that one word "properly" it would, in great part, meet my objection.

Mr. CANNON: I have no objection. I think that would improve the section.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask the chairman of the committee whether the committee gave any consideration to the question of proportional representation which question, I think, was presented to the committee.

Mr. CAHAN: We had a speech on it yesterday before this committee.

Mr. POWER: The committee did give some consideration to the question of proportional representation. We even invited representatives of labour to appear before us to give us their views on it. They did speak briefly. We also heard another witness who told us what he thought of proportional representation, but the committee did not see fit to change our present system.

Mr. CAHAN: Nor to introduce so controversial a question where we were anxious for unanimity.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Vote No. 93—Railways, to provide for additional car ferry and facilities for car ferry service between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, $3,500,000. This vote, on motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) last evening has been reduced by $1,000,000. Shall the item carry?

Mr. MacLAREN: I think this includes the estimate for a new ferry.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: Some reference was made to this matter last evening, and since then I have refreshed my memory with regard to the accounting in connection with the ferry service between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. I wish to quote from page 28 of the report of the royal commission on maritime claims. The particular reference to which I wish to direct the attention of the minister is this:

> We further recommend that, so far as the ferry boat service is concerned, it should not be run as part of the railway operations, but should be run by the railway administration under separate account for the department. We feel that, by reason of its association with railway accounts, this service does not get the attention it should receive.

This bears out substantially what was represented to the minister last night. Now at the present time the operative charges are included in the accounts of the railway lines on the eastern division, and it is recommended otherwise in the Duncan report. Not only that; it is fair and reasonable that the operative charges should not be included in the eastern lines operating account, where it does not properly belong. The reason is obvious: it makes a much larger deficit in these accounts than otherwise would be fairly represented. I do not think the minister has any particular objection except the difficulty of accounting. I believe his attitude is one of preparedness to recognize that, provided the difficulties of accounting are not too great. He says there are very considerable difficulties in the matter of separate accounting.

Mr. DUNNING: There is, of course, no difficulty in separate accounting for expenditures. The only difficulty relates to separate accounting so far as revenues are concerned.

Mr. MacLAREN: I take it there are difficulties at any rate.

Mr. DUNNING: Entirely in relation to revenue.

Mr. MacLAREN: The recommendation of the Duncan report is that the accounting be separate. The minister says that will not be an easy matter. There is nothing more unsatisfactory than the present method.

Mr. DUNNING: Why?

Mr. MacLAREN: Because it heaps up the deficits in the operative expenses on the eastern division of the railways and makes the apparent deficit larger than it actually is. Another reason is contained in the Duncan report; that is, that more attention would be given this important service. I submit that some other method than the present should be adopted; it is absolutely the worst so far as having the true results of operative expenses on the eastern lines is concerned. The minister says there are difficulties, whatever they may be, in the accounting. It seems to me that accountants possess considerable powers of adaptability and resourcefulness, and surely they can arrive at some system whereby the accounts will be kept separate without too much expense and too much labour. If there are difficulties—and on that score I cannot express an opinion—I believe they should be overcome, or at least an attempt should be made to overcome them. I would even go the length of suggesting, if this is the last recourse, that the operative expenses on the car ferry service be arrived at in a fair way by estimate, allowing that amount to be written off the operative expenses of the eastern lines.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not prepared to admit for a moment that the deficit on the eastern lines is largely inflated by the operating loss on the ferry.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is to that extent.

Mr. DUNNING: No one knows to what extent it exists. I think we can get the exact cost of operating the ferry; I believe it is in the neighbourhood of $200,000 a year. That is the cost of operating the ferry, exclusive of interest and depreciation, which, of course, is taken care of by the fact that the ferry is built out of an appropriation by this parliament. No interest is charged to the railway with respect to the cost of this ferry or the cost of the work; it is borne by parliament. Therefore, so far as interest on capital is concerned, that interest does not operate to increase the deficit on the eastern lines; so that the operating cost is the only matter to consider.

Mr. MacLAREN: That is the only point I have raised.

Mr. DUNNING: Well, the operating cost is $200,000 a year. My hon. friend desires that we should endeavour to ascertain the proportion of every ticket issued from any point on the mainland to any point in Prince Edward Island, or vice versa, which should properly be credited to the ferry.

Mr. MacLAREN: I said I would be content with an estimated amount.

Mr. DUNNING: I am afraid if I came here with an estimated amount from year to year my hon. friends would question its accuracy, and with all deference I submit that a statement of revenues should be exact or should not be submitted. An estimate would be open to all sorts of suggestions as to the possibility of manipulation and so on.

Mr. MacLAREN: We would not do that with the minister.

Mr. DUNNING: I thank my hon. friend. Yesterday I gave the number of passengers and the amount of freight; those 73,000 passengers came from many different places and part of their through tickets was passage over this ferry. Accounting machinery would have to be set up to take out of those tickets the proportion properly chargeable or creditable to the ferry. I am not prepared to admit that the ferry at present does not pay the cost of operation; I would doubt very much if there is very much of a deficit, having regard to the fact that the capital cost is borne and is proposed to be borne, under the estimate now before us, by the Dominion government. It becomes part of the public debt and involves no interest charge on capital to be charged against the eastern lines. I think if the amount to which my hon. friend refers could be arrived at it would be found to be rather small.

I will tell my hon. friend what I will do; before this session is over I will endeavour to get some kind of approximation of the revenue which would be properly creditable to the ferry for last year. Of course we can very easily get what it cost to operate the ferry, and in that way we will get some idea as to whether or not it will be worth while to set up an elaborate accounting service to separate these revenues in order to show what would be properly creditable to the ferry.

Mr. MacLAREN: I think the minister has said enough now to justify my remarks. Let us find out about it then, if the minister does not know the actual figure. I think it would be reasonable to let us have that amount first.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not pretending that I can tell my hon. friend the exact amount; that certainly would involve in the first place the checking of 73,000 railway tickets, and in connection with freight it would involve very much greater difficulties. Potatoes are shipped from the island on a through rate basis, which includes transportation on the ferry, and we would have to find some way of allocating to the ferry its fair proportion of the freight rate paid on every carload of potatoes. If my hon. friend understands my proposal as one which involves accuracy I must withdraw it, because I cannot guarantee the accuracy of an estimate. Every word I say emphasises the very great accounting difficulty involved in the separation of such a short journey from a through freight rate or a through passenger fare.

Mr. MacLAREN: At any rate, as a preliminary move I suggest an estimated amount; I think that would be quite all right for now, although I would not accept that as the final word. We must get some idea of how this is working out, and surely it would not be a very difficult thing to arrive at a reasonable and fair estimate of the operating expenses as compared with the income derived.

Mr. BENNETT: We should be able to get that roughly.

Mr. DUNNING: As I pointed out, the expenditures are easily ascertainable, and I will undertake to see if there is any means by which we can get even a reasonable approximation of the revenue.

Mr. BENNETT: On the basis of 75 cents a passenger and $4 a car you could get some general estimate.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member who was speaking at one o'clock is not in his place, but I do not think I can add anything to what I have previously stated regarding the revenues of the ferry. The question raised by the hon. member for St. John Albert (Mr. MacLaren) really had nothing to do with the merits or otherwise of building a new ferry; it had to do rather with the principle of ferry operation.

Item agreed to.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

Hudson Bay railway and terminals—construction and betterments, including E. B. Jost at $2,500, $6,500,000.

Mr. JELLIFF: Could the committee have a statement as to what is being done at Fort Churchill?

Mr. DUNNING: This vote is to cover work on the Hudson Bay railway and terminals. So far as the railway work is concerned, it is for the purpose of paying the Canadian National Railways, who are acting as the agents for the minister in the construction of the road. The work at the port is being done by the forces of the department, under the control and direction of the chief engineer, and the division betwen the two, as estimated for this year, is $4,500,000 for the railway and $2,000,000 for the terminal. The steel reached Fort Churchill in March last, but approximately 100 miles still requires to be graded, as it is merely a skeleton track, This work is being pushed forward by the Canadian National Railways as speedily as possible.

As I explained last year, we expected to use most of last year in getting stores, equipment, machinery and plant into the port and in providing buildings for the accommodation of the men and plant in the expectation of being able to proceed with the dredging work during the summer of 1929. I may say that that expectation was fully realized, and the two dredges which were built last year were towed into Fort Churchill from Montreal and all the equipment necessary to start dredging this summer is now on the ground. In addition, we took in some 15,000 tons of other material and plant, and I think I can say we are now well equipped to commence the actual work of dredging a channel from deep water within the harbour to the site of the dock itself. I think that is the general information desired by the committee. The expenditures on the port itself up to the present time have been very largely for plant and have been made in the proportion I have indicated.

Mr. SPENCER: I am sorry that I was not in the chamber when the minister began his explanation, but would he be good enough to give us a statement with regard to the position which the government has taken as to the townsite; on what terms it was turned over to the Manitoba government and whether or not there are any restrictions as to private speculation.

Mr. DUNNING: I undertook last year to examine into this matter very carefully, and it was determined that it would be better to turn over the control of the town site to the provincial authorities, who under the constitution, are in control of municipal development. A careful survey of the east peninsula was made by the officers of the department and of the Canadian National Railway, in order to determine what area would be required for the purpose of the railway and for the purpose of the port; in other words, what area was required for Dominion government purposes. That area was set out on a plan and the remainder of the eastern peninsula as shown on the same plain has been turned over to the government of Manitoba. No restrictions were placed upon the government of Manitoba in receiving it from the Dominion, but discussion revealed that the government of Manitoba had determined to go carefully into the best method of dealing with a municipality of that particular type. I feel sure that satisfactory plans will be evolved by the local government who, of course, have the legislative jurisdiction in respect to municipalities.

Mr. BENNETT: I want to ask a question in connection with the Beach property. While on a passenger train one day I was spoken to by one of the representatives of the Beach estate, and it would appear—I made a note of the matter—that the original homestead was granted to Beach, I think in 1905, and in 1928, so far as I can remember, the minister expropriated all the privately-owned property on the eastern peninsula at Fort Churchill. I believe that is correct. These people have been paid no money since, so

far as I can ascertain. It is more than a year and a half since the property was expropriated and the principle which the railways have always proceeded on is that when property is taken, the people must be paid for it. At the moment they have not been paid for it, so far as I understand the matter—I am asking for information—and there is no likelihood of their being paid within the immediate future. The minister might state what the situation is.

Mr. DUNNING: I can assure my hon. friend that the delay in settling for the property expropriated is in no sense the fault of the department. We have been ready to go ahead with the exchequer court proceedings. If my memory serves me aright—and I am practically certain it does—application was made for delay by those representing the owners of the property in order that they might have someone go up there and look over it. My understanding is that the case is set down for hearing at the next sitting of the exchequer court in the province of Manitoba, but I am quite sure that the department is proceeding as rapidly as possible in the matter.

Mr. BENNETT: My point is that, as I understand the matter, the government has taken possession of the property.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: The government expropriated the whole area without any restriction or limitation of any kind. The people who owned the property are out of possession of it and they have received no compensation.

Mr. DUNNING: So far.

Mr. BENNETT: I remember the late chairman of the railway commission, Mr. Justice Mabee—

Mr. DUNNING: I think the hon. member stated the date of expropriation wrongly. The date was the fall of 1927.

Mr. BENNETT: I said 1928. I was wrong in my memorandum. It was 1927, apparently, which will be two years ago this fall. I made a note that it was two years ago and I did not know exactly what that meant. I remember Judge Mabee taking the view that if railway companies did business in that way, he would quash the expropriation proceedings entirely. The reason is this: that in fixing compensation, regard is had to the date of expropriation. If you let the matter drag beyond a given time, then you have another set of principles upon which to fix expropriation damages than you otherwise would. I recall that the Railway Act was amended to meet that situation. For two years these people have been out of their property; somebody else is in possession. They have received no money in compensation and they have to go to the exchequer court. The offer in this case was, I think, $10 a lot, because the property had been subdivided. I understand the matter is to be determined by the exchequer court in its sittings, not in Manitoba, but in Moose Jaw this fall. The submission I make to the minister is that if this were a railway company dealing with the matter as an ordinary railway company would, the delay would be such that regard would be had to the conditions at the later date and not as they were when expropriation proceedings commenced in 1927.

Mr. DUNNING: Does my hon. friend mean the added value to the property by reason of these works?

Mr. BENNETT: By reason of the fact that when expropriation took place, the future of the port as to development had not been settled, and if you had to take the piece of property to-day, you would pay more for it than you would two years ago. The Railway Act was amended to provide that if the railway company did not proceed to do something within a given time, the damages had to be assessed as of the date when they came in de novo. This is not an unreasonable view to take.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): With regard to the point brought up by the leader of the opposition, the Beach case is a special one. In the first place, a homestead was given to the elder Beach.

Mr. BENNETT: About twenty years ago.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): This homestead was then traded to the government for the land that now belongs to the Beach estate. Any rights that the government may have had over the homestead lands for railway purposes or expropriation were given up, I think, at the time this land was traded for the homestead. This is a special case and it should be treated specially and as rapidly as possible by the department.

Mr. DUNNING: Both the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Moose Jaw will, I am sure, appreciate the fact that I do not intend to try an exchequer court case in this committee. I was rather dealing with the question which the leader of the opposition raised as to the delay. I have

since made sure of the facts. Every effort was made by the department to arrange with the parties for a hearing this spring just passed, and it is at the request of the other parties that the delay until the fall occurs.

Mr. BENNETT: I assume there was an offer of so much money.

Mr. DUNNING: Under the law there had to be.

Mr. BENNETT: What was it?

Mr. DUNNING: The committee will appreciate that it was a matter of some difficulty to arrive at the value of property situated four miles from where the port of Fort Churchill will be, property which had been left as nature made it since the original shack was built.

Mr. BENNETT: Then how does the minister justify expropriating it?

Mr. DUNNING: I justified my action in the house a couple of years ago, and I think the house generally approved what I then said. Part of it is undoubtedly required for railway purposes. I will not go further into that at the moment unless I am pressed. I am willing to enter into a debate on the general desirability of expropriating property, but I do not desire to delay my estimates more than can be avoided. To arrive at a value to offer for property of that description was a matter of some difficulty. I gather from the legal staff that they arrived at it by taking the value mentioned in the probate of the will of one of the original owners of the property. That is, we took as a basis the only thing in sight which would afford a basis.

Mr. STEVENS: The last legal process to which the minister refers would hardly be fair. This, if I recall aright, was a homestead taken up by a man called Beach about twenty or twenty-five years ago. In those days, to go there was quite a trip for anyone to take. He went there; I think he took his wife with him and they lived on the property for some years. While there necessarily was not very much clearing or farming of the property, because there is not much of that done at Fort Churchill, nevertheless the man lived there and settled on the property, having in mind, as far as I can judge, the fact that some day Fort Churchill was destined to be the site of a city or a town, a point of export. That foresight on his part, his efforts to get there and the time he spent there are worth something. He was, in other words, a typical pioneer. The railway comes along and decides that Fort Churchill is to be the railway terminal. In the meantime Port Nelson had been going on for fifteen years and this man Beach might very well have thought that as far as he was concerned the railway would never come there, but still he stayed with his property. I think his father died later, but Beach held this property. The minister shakes his head. There is no doubt that the property was held under the control of Beach in some form. There was some difficulty about the homestead entry and so forth, but in any case the man was in possession of the property when he died. Then the railway decided to go to Fort Churchill. The minister says that this is three or four miles away from where the actual railway works will be located, and that it is a question whether the property owned by Beach will be required for railway purposes at all. The government decided, perhaps wisely—I am not criticizing them at all for that—that it was better for the government to control the whole townsite, and therefore they decided to take in all the property that was likely to be townsite property and own it. That is not acquiring property for railway purposes. Mark you, I am not complaining because the government took control of the townsite, because I think the minister's objective was to prevent unwise speculation in townsite property in a prospective terminal. I think the government was wise in doing that, but if the government felt that in the public interest it was desirable that they should own the townsite, it was due to this man Beach or to his estate that he should get the full value of his property. Instead of simply taking the property over as an abandoned homestead, it should have been regarded as part of what would be a valuable townsite, because if the government is going to exercise control over that townsite and reap the full benefit which some people think in future years will be very great, these property owners are certainly entitled to a very different basis of valuation than simply as land taken over for railway purposes. That, I think, is the point at issue.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend does not quite appreciate what the situation was. I would be the last to detract from the pioneer spirit and the foresight of William Beach, but facts are facts and the exchequer court will no doubt take into consideration all the facts. That is why, instead of attempting to settle it in any other way, the exchequer court is to deal with the matter. My hon. friend is wrong when he assumes that either William Beach or the estate of William Beach or any of the Beach family

own all of the property in question. The property was subdivided and sold many years ago; not all of it, but much of it.

Mr. STEVENS: Only part of it.

Mr. DUNNING: Parts here and there of that quarter-section were sold to people in the west and elsewhere who believed that Fort Churchill was destined to be a port.

Mr. STEVENS: That is true.

Mr. DUNNING: I have had letters from people who paid as much as $600 for a lot twenty years ago in Fort Churchill. I do not know how much Beach made by the sale of the land to others, or whether he made anything. Very often when a man subdivides his quarter-section everybody but himself makes money out of it, and in all probability real estate operators and manipulators made the money and not Beach. I am not in a position to discuss that but I do know that there are now hundreds of owners, if my memory serves me. We have not got track of them all yet. There are people in the United States owning lots on this quarter-section of Beach's, and there is a very good reason why we cannot get track of them. Many of these people own this property for one reason and one reason only, and that is that there was no means of getting rid of it until the government took it over for the purposes of the Hudson Bay railway. There was no means of getting rid of it even by tax sales because there were no taxes up there and no taxing body. They held the property in spite of themselves.

Mr. STEVENS: Foresight.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend may call it foresight if he wishes. In saying these things I trust I am not to be considered as attempting on behalf of the government to take from the Beaches or any of the other owners that which is justly their due. I take this position: There is a tribunal, the exchequer court of Canada, to decide what is right as between the crown and the subject in a situation such as this, and I have no doubt that the exchequer court will take into account all considerations which could be advanced here in connection with the matter; in fact, I doubt very much whether we are really in order in discussing it at the length we have been doing, having regard to the fact that it is before the exchequer court. If anybody objects to that procedure of taking it before the exchequer court, then it is a proper subject for discussion, because it could be withdrawn from the court and other means of settlement adopted, but frankly I know of no better means.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister perhaps has not taken fully into cognizance the point I was desiring to make. Section 171 of the Railway Act reads:

> In granting any such sanction, or in giving leave under any provision of this act to take lands without the consent of the owner, the board may fix a period
>
> (a) within which the company must acquire the lands or take the necessary steps for such purpose; or
>
> (b) within which the notice hereinafter required to be given, preliminary to proceeding to arbitration to fix compensation or damages, shall be conclusively deemed to have been given.
>
> 2. In the event of the order granting such sanction or leave, whether made before or after the passing of this act, providing no such time limit any owner or person interested in the lands may apply to the board for an order that the company shall acquire such lands or take the necessary steps for such purpose, within such time as the board deems proper, and thereupon the board may make such order in the premises as appears just.
>
> 3. Where no time is fixed by the board as above mentioned, if the company, within one year after any such sanction or leave has been given by the board, or in any case where no such sanction or leave is necessary, if the company within one year after the plan, profile and book of reference have been deposited with the registrar of deeds, does not either acquire the lands covered by such sanction, leave, or plan, profile and book of reference, or give the notice hereinafter required to be given preliminary to proceeding to arbitration to fix compensation or damages in respect thereof, the company's right to take or enter upon, without the consent of the owner, any part of such lands which it has not within the said year either acquired or given such notice in respect of, shall at the expiration of such year absolutely cease and determine, unless the board, after notice to the owner and upon such terms as the board may deem proper, otherwise orders.

The point I am making is this: This man's lands were taken from him compulsorily, without his consent. Secondly, the crown, as distinguished from the railway company, filed expropriation proceedings against the whole of that land regardless of whether it was required for railway purposes or not. I think it is proper to use that word "regardless," because it is not asserted by the railway that these lands were to be used for railway purposes. Had it been a private enterprise taking over these lands without the consent of the owner, then under section 171 of the Railway Act, which was inserted in the Act at the instance of Judge Mabee, then chairman of the railway commission, the notice would have lapsed and they would have had

to start de novo to take the lands, and the principle with regard to compensation would govern as from the date of the filing of the new notice, which, of course, changes the whole situation, as the minister will see. It is because of the long delay in taking the proceedings, which the minister now says was partly attributable to the owners themselves, that I was endeavouring to bring the matter to his attention. I am frank to say that I know very little about it except what was told to me by a gentleman whom I have often met travelling up and down this country for the last twenty-five years. What the minister says about the lots having been sold is true, but multiply the number of cases by five or six hundred and you get into an intolerable situation. The crown when it expropriates, as distinguished from a railway company that expropriates, has been offering compensation that poor unfortunate people have been compelled to take, and which they would not take at all from a railway company where they could take proceedings before the local district court judge and have compensation fixed in the local court. But people who are not in good circumstances naturallly think with much doubt and diffidence of approaching the exchequer court, because they cannot afford to go into litigation against the crown. They have not the facilities. I direct attention to that, because I do not think those people have been treated with the consideration that would be accorded to them were they the owners of property that had been taken from them without their consent by a private railway company.

Mr. DUNNING: What would my hon. friend suggest I might now do?

Mr. BENNETT: I think what might be done is to revise the whole basis upon which compensation has been offered. This is not in the hon. minister's department, but in the Department of National Defence; a situation arose in North Vancouver, and I must say I feel very sorry for the poor old lady who had a lot out there for which she paid several hundred dollars. They appropriated and she lost her property. She said, give me another lot equal to this but, of course, that was not done. I think she got less than $100. This is a case in which the basis of compensation is wholly inadequate.

Mr. MANION: I have seen a good many expropriation proceedings. I am not speaking of this case at all, but one or two things in connection with expropriation proceedings have struck me rather forcibly for a number of years. I notice in practically all expropriation proceedings, and probably there is a good defence for the attitude, that the judges, whoever they may be, whether exchequer or county court judges before whom expropriation proceedings of any kind are taken, invariably hear a good deal of evidence as to the utility value at that moment. Frequently it can be shown before these courts that the actual utility value is very, very little, and as a consequence some man who had the foresight perhaps fifteen or twenty years before to purchase a piece of property with the prophetic idea that it was going to be required by a railway or some other company, has that property taken from him for practically nothing, although not only the original purchase but the carrying charges may have cost him a good deal of money. I have seen not one but many cases where properties were expropriated, and that was the ultimate result to the man concerned. I admit that in many instances a railway or a government may require property for very good and sufficient reasons, and in that case it is right to expropriate. But this is the principle I wish to offer as my suggestion—not in regard to this case but in regard to cases in general: I do not believe that either the government or the railways in this country should expropriate property at any time unless there is absolute need for that property. That, in my opinion, is a principle that should be laid down. I have seen cases of expropriation where the railway, or the person concerned for whom the expropriation took place, did not have actual need of the property in question, and this would appear to be such a case. A large area of land was taken for the purpose of preventing speculation; I remember reading something of it in the press, and I think I am right in that. There probably is a good defence of such a course, but there is also a good defence of speculation. If some man had the foresight to see that some day the land would be valuable, I rather think it a good argument that his foresight should be taken into consideration, a thing which is very rarely done before any of the courts I have seen adjudicating on expropriations.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) spoke a moment ago about the homestead of this man. I want the minister to correct me if I am not right, but I think this is the position in regard to this matter; this land was homesteaded by William Beach,

who figured that at some time in the future there would be a city at Fort Churchill. There was some trouble about getting title to the homestead in the first place, but finally William Beach did get title. After that, when the government had an idea of going into Churchill, or Nelson at one time, as I understand it, a deal was made with William Beach and his property was taken away from him then, and in place of it other property was given to him. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that this is expropriation. I claim that it is reexpropriation, that the land was taken from this man in the first place, and in lieu of that land he was given the land which is now held by the Beach estate. Then the government comes along and takes the land again, and this is a special case different altogether from any of the others that may be there. This man has already given up certain rights to the government on account of the port at Churchill, and the government comes back and asks him to give up rights again. Briefly, that is the case. That man had the foresight to go there, and on account of having given the land away he should be given abundant compensation for it.

Mr. MacLAREN: I wish to give an instance, for the minister's benefit, of how this question of expropriation by the crown works out, an instance in Vancouver not long ago to which attention was drawn; a small lot of land was held by a man who had bought it, from a speculative standpoint, and the land has been expropriated for the purpose of a rifle range near Vancouver. He paid a few hundred dollars for it; he paid taxes for something like ten years. Under the expropriation proceedings this man was awarded $14.75 for his lot, for which he paid a few hundred dollars and several years' taxes. I brought the case to the attention of my leader. The matter is absolutely too small to take proceedings in, and yet the property has been taken on the initiative of the crown. There is no request from the individual. Surely there is some compensation coming to a man whose property is taken away from him against his wishes and without any application from him.

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot confirm what the member for Moose Jaw related, as to the circumstances, because I approached the matter only from the point of view of the situation in which I found it. Standing on that east peninsula myself in 1927 I had to face this situation; that a quarter-section of land four miles from where the dock would most naturally be placed was owned by a number of private parties. The ownership had not changed for a great many years; the land was entirely covered with brush; there never had been any attempt at development of any kind. And, in addition to that, on the original government townsite—the peninsula was surveyed, as I think my hon. friend knows—there were here and there lots—I forget how many, but quite a few—that in some way or other in the past had also passed into the hands of private parties. I had to face the problem of what would result when it was announced that Fort Churchill was to be the terminus of the Hudson Bay railway. I had hoped to get a little support on account of the government having prevented the kind of speculation which undoubtedly would have involved hundreds, if not thousands, of Canadian people in serious loss. Everyone knows what happens in such cases. That quarter-section of land, four miles out, would have been acquired, or some arrangement would have been made, and real estate promoters would have got hold of it; the publicity regarding the project which has developed since the change in port was made would have been used to exploit it; people everywhere would have been encouraged to buy lots at outrageous prices and inevitably would have lost a great deal of money. No one has yet suggested any other means of preventing that sort of thing than the means I have employed on behalf of the government. True, not all of the property is required for strictly railway purposes.

Mr. BENNETT: How much of it? What fraction of it?

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot answer exactly as to the size.

Mr. BENNETT: I am told, practically none.

Mr. DUNNING: A comparatively small amount I agree. But these people are to be compensated. That, of course, was a question I had to face in reaching the decision and I was advised that there was in Canada an exchequer court whose business it was to decide as between the subject and the crown with respect to values in such cases. Later it developed that legally we had to make an offer in order to start the machinery of expropriation, and our people were further concerned as to what offer should be made. I can well imagine the criticism I should have encountered in this house had we made any considerable offer for property so situated—property which was of no use for farming purposes, in fact, of no use for any other

purpose than the possible extension of Fort Churchill to a point four miles beyond the docks. I can imagine the criticism that would have been made, and justifiably, if I had offered any large sum. Finally the legal officers of the department discovered that one of the principal owners had died and it was necessary, in probating his will to declare a value for these lands, which really had no intrinsic value.

Mr. BENNETT: But his death was prior to Churchill being selected.

Mr. DUNNING: Exactly; and will my hon. friend contend for a moment that that decision to go to Churchill should have the effect of giving to the owners of private property there an unearned increment in connection with what was brought about thereby?

Mr. BENNETT: The exchequer court will settle that.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, and that is exactly my point. There is just as much argument, from the point of view of the ordinary citizen, against any unearned increment going to the speculator in such a case as there is on the other side. I am not going to pretend to settle that; I did not pretend to settle it in the first place. I referred the matter to the exchequer court, and in settling the amount which should be offered, our legal officers proposed the amount stated in the probation of the will plus, I think, 15 per cent for forcible taking. At any rate, $11.75 per lot is the offer which was made to start the exchequer court proceedings, and the exchequer court will determine whether or not we should pay more. Of course, we shall have to pay whatever the court awards. But I will put it up to this house: It is not yet too late to surrender to these private parties all the property other than that which is required for the railway purposes, and if this committee of the House of Commons thinks that would be in the best interests of Canada I should like to hear the views of hon. members on the point.

Mr. RYCKMAN: A gentleman who owned one of these lots, or several of them—I do not know whether acquired from the Beach estate or not—saw me with reference to what should be paid. He received this notice of expropriation but he did not receive any offer of $11.75 per lot. On his behalf I wrote to the department—I regret I cannot recall his name—and I received a very courteous reply intimating, as I remember, that the matter will be proceeded with immediately in the exchequer court. But I cannot learn that any sum was at any time offered to him.

Mr. DUNNING: I can explain that.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Is that right?

Mr. DUNNING: It may be in an individual case. We were in this difficulty, that we could not make offers to all, for a large number of them are completely unknown and cannot be found; some are in the United States, and others in England and elsewhere. And so an offer was made to the principal owners, the Beach estate, the largest individual owner. Exchequer court proceedings are being taken in that case in the hope of settling a scale of compensation which can be applied generally in connection with the expropriation.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Is it correct that $11.75 is the largest sum offered?

Mr. DUNNING: It is the only sum.

Mr. CAHILL: Since the minister has raised the question as to the principle of expropriating property to save people from themselves, I want to voice my objection. I am not familiar with the case except as outlined by the minister to-day, but I do think it is a bad policy for the government to expropriate private property if the principal purpose of expropriating that property is to save citizens from themselves in speculating therein. I think it is uncalled for on the part of either the Dominion or the provincial government to take that attitude.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not want to save people from themselves, but I did think it was the duty of the government, in connection with a wholly government enterprise, to endeavour to save people from being exploited unmercifully, not by themselves, but by others, and not in the ordinary speculative sense of market transactions but in connection with something which, judging from my experience in the west, would undoubtedly be the subject of misrepresentation and would undoubtedly be sold at a figure far in excess of actual value.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not think the government can avoid that difficulty arising in any event. At any rate I do think it is bad policy for the government to expropriate property on any pretext other than the necessity of the government for that property. I rise merely to object to the principle involved in that course. If it were left to me, I would simply let the Beach estate retain the property and dispose of it to the best possible

advantage, exercising their own judgment with respect to misrepresentation. No one would be hurt if that were done, whereas under the other procedure it is possible that people may be injured. They will certainly have agreements and it is uncalled for on the part of the government to interfere in the matter at all except for the necessities of the railway, in taking what property is required for railway purposes.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am in accord with the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill). He says he thinks it is unwise; I think it is unlawful. I do not believe the government can do it under the British North America Act. What is the position? I should like the minister to consider this. He says that on behalf of the government a large extent of property is expropriated so that speculation therein may not take place, although the Dominion may not want it for the actual purposes of the railway. Then what happens? This expropriation may not be resisted by the man who could resist it. He allows the government to hold that property and the government builds the railway. There is settlement there and improvements follow; as suggested, a considerable city grows up. Now the government is taking an enhanced value for property which it could never use in connection with the railway and has a lot of property to which it is not entitled and which belongs to the individual.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister asked what suggestions could be made, and later on he inquired whether the committee would have the government abandon the whole project to speculators. I suggest this. Inasmuch as the government is apparently going into a townsite proposition—because that is what it amounts to; the minister cannot escape it, for there is bound to be a townsite at Churchill—in that case there is going to be a large expenditure. Between the $34,000,000 and another $8,000,000 to finish, there is going to be a townsite.

Mr. DUNNING: The government is not going into townsite business. It has turned over to the government of Manitoba all the area which would be used for ordinary townsite purposes.

Mr. STEVENS: The government of Manitoba, then; it makes no difference to me which government it is. What I suggest is this. The property expropriated, which was originally taken by persons whose foresight indicated that at some time there was going to be a port there, should be taken from them on a share basis; that is, whatever value accrues to that property later on should be shared with these people. I think it is an unfair thing to expropriate that property under the aegis of a railway company or a railway development, or under the power of the crown, and prevent these people from reaping some return on the investment they made ten, twenty or thirty years ago. I think this movement started about twenty-five years ago and was carried on for perhaps ten years. There is objection to wild speculation, but there is no doubt that these people went in there, some of them locating on land and others purchasing on a purely speculative basis. However, they paid their money for the land; the minister has said that in some cases $600 was paid for some of the lots. Why should not these people have an opportunity to get back some of that money?

Mr. DUNNING: Then my hon. friend suggests the withdrawal of the expropriation proceedings?

Mr. STEVENS: I do not say that at the moment. I would not encourage wild speculation, but I think the element of vicious speculation which has been described by the minister will be abundantly provided against by the fact that the government itself, or the railway company, will make announcements from time to time as to what the likely business of the port will be. There is not much danger of vicious speculation being carried on if the government does its duty in issuing fair, truthful and accurate reports of this kind. Frankly, I think it is unfair to deprive these people of the opportunity of reaping some return on their investment.

Mr. IRVINE: I have not been able to ascertain what the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this discussion have been objecting to in connection with the townsite at Fort Churchill. So far as I have been able to understand it, their objection has been to some detail in connection with the expropriation.

Mr. BENNETT: No, the objection is to the principle.

Mr. IRVINE: Then I wish to congratulate the minister on standing up for that principle. I do not know whether my agreement with the minister comes about because for once he is right, or whether it is because I am wrong—

Mr. BENNETT: You are both wrong, as usual.

Mr. IRVINE: —but at any rate I am bound to express my opinion on this issue. Anyone who knows anything at all of Canada in particular and of the entire North American continent in general knows that the inflated values of land and especially of townsites has been one of the greatest curses in the development of the west. I do not think there is any doubt about that; I do not think even the hon. gentlemen who are objecting to this principle will take issue with that statement. It is all very well to object to the principle of expropriation in a case of this kind, which I presume has been carried on intelligently by the minister after investigation, but what about the expropriation which takes place after a big boom, when people who have put a little money into land find themselves unable to hold the land because of inflated values, and it goes back either to the original owner or to the city. What about that kind of expropriation? It is not called by that name; it is part of the game, part of the gamble, and we forget about it, but after all I presume that is the thing the minister is trying to prevent. I do not know that this ever has been done before.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not think it has.

Mr. IRVINE: For that very reason I wish to congratulate the minister on having had the courage to make this one experiment. Heaven knows we have had sufficient experiences of the other kind, and I do not believe anyone wishes more of them. There is not a town in the west that is not an object lesson in bad speculation of this kind, and if anything can be done to prevent that sort of thing in the future development of western Canada, it should be carried out; if this is not the way to do it I want to find out how it can be done. Let us have other constructive suggestions.

I have no quarrel with this expropriation; I think the course taken by the minister was the courageous one, which showed initiative and statesmanship on his part. I hope the venture will be a success; I presume now it will be continued by the provincial government, but I hope they will carry out this idea. If the experiment fails we will know enough not to do it again, but after all this is a comparatively small experiment in itself. If it is successful, as I am sure it will be if it is carried on properly, then we shall know how to prevent speculation in land in future, and that will be a fine thing for everyone concerned.

Everyone knows that the increase in land values is not due to any individual but rather to the population at large; it is a social value which should not be monopolized by any individual or any concern. By this course which has been followed by the minister the social values which have been created by the people will be left to the people instead of being taken by a few individuals who happened to get in on the ground floor when the developments began.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to support the position taken by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin. It may be that the family which went in to Churchill to homestead some years ago have certain claims upon the government; as a matter of fact I think they have, and their rights should be safeguarded. Ostensibly they took up homestead land; possibly they had some ulterior motives, but at least the land was granted to them on the ground that it was agricultural land, which is in an entirely different class from a townsite. I do not see why an individual family should reap all the benefits from a townsite when they secured the property in the first place as agricultural land; I cannot see that they are entitled to all the enhanced value. Further, with regard to those people who made early investments, those were distinctly speculative in character. It might be the part of wisdom and of justice to allow some fair return on investments made by those who went there in the early days and perhaps from the very first advocated this scheme, but if we do that I think we are going as far as we should go.

The principle of excess appropriation has been adopted in a great many countries, including Great Britain, and I am inclined to think that some of us, as I suggested on a previous occasion, from now on will be drawing the policies of Great Britain to the attention of the house much more than has been the case in the past. In connection with the construction of one of those great thoroughfares in the city of London I remember that the principle of excess appropriation was adopted; a great deal of land on both sides of the highway was taken over and the enhanced value of the land on each side was sufficient to pay for the entire improvement. The same thing has been done in other countries. I am not discussing the question of whether or not such action comes directly under the Railway Act, but I do not see any objection to the recognition of the principle, and it is the principle involved to which objection has been taken.

As the hon. member for Wetaskiwin has said, the enhanced value of the land is entirely a community created value. The fact

that individuals have been able under our laws to appropriate what really belongs to the community is no reason why we should continue that policy in future, especially in such a case as this where the government has, by its own action, constructed a road which is definitely responsible for the enhanced value of the land. I hope the minister will see his way clear to carry through his policy in that regard.

Mr. DUNNING: I have no desire to avoid this discussion, but, of course, the source of the support makes me rather scratch my head and wonder as to whether or not I have made a mistake.

Mr. BENNETT: I think it must convince the minister that he is wrong.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is convinced that I am wrong?

Mr. BENNETT: Absolutely; I have been convinced from what I have heard.

Mr. DUNNING: That observation by my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, is more or less of a counterweight to the discomfort which I was feeling a few moments ago at receiving support from the far corner. In this country, matters of equity and justice are decided by our courts, and the exchequer court will decide the equitable treatment to be given the owners of property. I can well imagine what would have happened in the house had I not taken this action.

Mr. BENNETT: What nonsense.

Mr. DUNNING: I would have been asked how many friends of the government had lots in Fort Churchill.

Mr. BENNETT: Four miles away from the port?

Mr. DUNNING: That would not matter.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Did not the hon. member see the same thing in Calgary?

Mr. BENNETT: Six miles away.

Mr. DUNNING: I am fairly well satisfied that this will not work out disastrously for any one concerned. I must suggest that the expropriation of a quarter section of land is after all a comparatively small part of the great development of the north country occasioned by the Hudson Bay railway, and I would rather encourage the committee to a discussion of the matter in hand rather than on this one quarter section.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. BOYS: I understand the minister to say that the lands in question had been handed over to the Manitoba government?

Mr. DUNNING: Not this quarter section.

Mr. BOYS: Have any of the lands which are being expropriated been turned over to the Manitoba government?

Mr. DUNNING: As I explained a few moments ago, in the area immediately surrounding that site there were occasional lots which were owned by private parties, and they were expropriated. Some of these may be in the area which has been turned over to the Manitoba government, but the land comprising the Beach homestead is four or five miles away from that point, and it was not thought necessary to turn that land over to the Manitoba government for townsite purposes. In addition, there is the matter of a water supply for the port. This will involve the consideration of the drainage area a few miles out, and it may be considered that the Dominion should retain that particular part of the peninsula, and also of all other crown property. It must be remembered that this quarter section is completely surrounded by property which has never left the ownership of the crown.

Mr. THORSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the passing of this item, but there are certain matters connected with the Hudson Bay railway which are of vital interest to the people of the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba and I think they should be brought to the attention of this committee. The hon. Minister of Railways is to be congratulated upon the energy with which he has pushed forward the completion of the Hudson Bay railway, but he has not yet finished the task which he has undertaken. There are two questions of particular interest to the province of Manitoba and to the city of Winnipeg which have been the subject of a great deal of discussion during the past year. The first has to do with the freight rates which will prevail on the Hudson Bay railway, so far as Manitoba points are concerned, and the second relates to shorter and more direct railway connection between the city of Winnipeg and the Hudson Bay railway itself. These questions have been widely discussed and have been the subject of two resolutions passed by representative bodies in the province of Manitoba. The first of these resolutions was passed at the city of Winnipeg on February 12 of this year by a representative gathering of business men from all points in Manitoba meeting in conference with the Winnipeg Board of Trade.

I think there were 128 delegates at that meeting, representing 51 different boards of trade. They passed unanimously the following resolution:

Be it therefore resolved: That in the opinion of this meeting it is Manitoba's just right that it should be maintained in equally as good relative position in respect to railway facilities and rates for the marketing of its produce, both crops and live stock, as well as its products of the mines, lakes and forests, as it heretofore enjoyed.

And that in any construction of new routes or rearrangement of traffic or rates that this position be provided for either by the construction of such lines of railway as may be necessary to effect that result which the Union of Boards of Trade may endorse or by the equalization of rates as will compensate for any altered position in which the people of Manitoba as a whole may be placed in the shipping of their products by reason of newly constructed lines in adjoining provinces or exchange of commerce between the various parts of the province.

And that for the purpose of insuring such protection that the parliament of Canada and the various ministers thereof as well as the Board of Railway Commissioners be memorialized on behalf of the residents of the province setting forth fully their case in this respect.

On April 9, of this year the second resolution was passed, by the legislature of the province of Manitoba as follows:

1. Whereas there is a need for a more direct railway connection between the agricultural areas and distributing and manufacturing centres of the province of Manitoba upon the one hand and the northern natural resources and the Hudson bay seaports of the said province, upon the other for the purpose of improving and facilitating trade; of participating in the import and export trade through the Hudson bay, and developing the said northern natural resources.

Therefore, be it resolved, that this house hereby approves of the action of the Hon. Charles Dunning, Minister of Railways in the federal government, in authorizing the compilation and coordination of all existing data as to the alternative routes for such more direct railway connection, with a view to ascertaining which route or routes is the most suitable.

2. That this house hereby respectfully urges that such compilation and coordination be carried forward without interruption or delay until completion, and that, as soon as possible thereafter, a decision be reached as to the most suitable route or routes over which to construct the aforesaid direct railway connection, and that the work on such direct railway connection be forthwith commenced and carried forward to completion with all dispatch.

3. That this house is of the opinion that, pending the completion of such direct railway connection, the railway rates between the shipping points on the existing lines of railroad in southern and western parts of the province, upon the one hand, and the shipping points on the Hudson bay and Flin Flon railways, upon the other, should be adjusted, having regard:

Firstly—To the railway rates which would or could prevail, upon a mileage basis as if the projected direct railway connection so decided upon, as aforesaid, were actually completed and in operation.

Secondly—To the actual and potential competition by water haul over Manitoba's great lakes and the Red, Saskatchewan and Nelson rivers.

Thirdly—To the favourable geographical position of southern and western Manitoba, with respect to northern Manitoba and the Hudson bay.

Fourthly—To the fact that northern Manitoba is, or should be, tributary to the province of Manitoba, on at least as favourable terms as any other province, in view of the expenditures, undertakings and administrative responsibilities of the government of Manitoba in the development of northern Manitoba.

And that, in the opinion of this house, eventually by such more direct railway connection, and in the interim by such rate adjustments, effect should be given to Manitoba's just right to be maintained in equally as good a relative position as regards railway facilities and rates upon freight moving into and out of northern Manitoba, as Manitoba has enjoyed until the date hereof.

I think this second resolution may be considered as being the opinion of the people of Manitoba as expressed by their elected representatives. I do not need to argue at any great length the benefits which would accrue to the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba through shorter and more direct railway connection between the city of Winnipeg and the Hudson bay railway. These benefits are obvious. There have been four proposals put forward. The first is that a cut-off be constructed from Mafeking to The Pas; the second is that the present Canadian National Railway line east of lake Manitoba be extended from Gypsumville to the Hudson Bay railway; the third is that a water and rail route should be established from Winnipeg by way of the Red river, lake Winnipeg, the Nelson river, and then by rail from a point on the Nelson river to connect with the Hudson Bay railway; and the fourth is that a railway line be constructed east of lake Winnipeg to connect with the Hudson Bay Railway.

I do not propose to enter into any prolonged discussion as to the relative merits of these various proposals. I realize, of course, that a great deal of study must be undertaken with respect to the various proposals that have been brought forward, but there are certain facts which, I think, should be placed before the committee in order that it may understand clearly the importance of this question of shorter, more direct railway connection between Winnipeg and the Hudson Bay railway. The present distance between Winnipeg and Fort Churchill by rail is approximately 960 miles. The construction of the Mafeking cut-off would reduce that by a comparatively short distance, I think about seventy miles, but the extension of the line from Gypsumville to the

Hudson Bay railway would reduce the railway distance by more than 200 miles, and the establishment of the rail and water route or the construction of the road east of lake Winnipeg would shorten the railway distance by more than 330 miles, or more than one-third of the present distance. I do not wish to delay the passing of this item, but we feel in Manitoba that we are entitled to share to as full a degree as possible the success which, we are confidence, will attend the completion of the Hudson Bay railway, and that we are entitled to be placed upon an equality with our sister province to the west in the enjoyment of the benefits that will follow from the completion of this new outlet to the sea. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways to state to the committee and to the country at large what consideration has been given by the government to the proposals that have been put forward, and what action will be taken with regard to them.

Mr. DUNNING: It is very difficult to review, without going into great detail, the ground that has been traversed by my hon. friend. Broadly speaking, it is a question of adjusting the present railway systems of the west so as to enable the Hudson Bay outlet to be reached most economically by all parts of the area which it might reasonably be expected to serve. I regard this not as a Manitoba question, or a Saskatchewan question, or an Alberta question, but rather as one relating to the railway economics of that part of the country.

As is well known by members of the committee, the Canadian National branch line program of 1927 and also of 1929 gave evidence of the desire of the Canadian National to provide such links as would make possible the fullest utilization of the Hudson Bay railway. But I am free to say that the work of the Canadian National along that line so far has been with regard to the outward-bound shipment of grain and other western produce rather than with regard to what may be termed inbound traffic which, of course, is as yet uncertain in volume. That must be worked out. I have every faith that such traffic will exist, but as to its movement, a great deal depends upon what ocean rates may be established after the port is opened.

With regard to the specific question to which my hon. friend directs attention, that is a more direct route from the city of Winnipeg to the north, it is difficult to give a definite answer as to which would be the more practical solution which should be embarked upon. In fact, I believe I am correct in saying that those in Manitoba who have given the question painstaking and careful study, as indicated by my hon. friend, are not themselves absolutely agreed upon any particular solution of their northern outlet problem. I think the best course to follow in connection with the matter is to investigate carefully the practicability of the various proposals advanced and any others which may develop out of them in order that we may be sure that the expenditures we are proposing to the house are wise. My hon. friend will surely not expect me to say anything regarding the rate aspect of the resolutions which he read. The matter of railway rates is, of course, one for the railway commission to deal with and I shall not, at the moment at any rate, attempt to discuss that phase of the question.

Mr. FORKE: That is the important part.

Mr. THORSON: Will the hon. minister be good enough to undertake on behalf of the government that the department will investigate as fully as it lies within the power of the department to do, the feasibility of the various proposals for shorter and more direct railway connection that have been advanced?

Mr. DUNNING: Some weeks ago, as a result of representations of the character to which my hon. friend refers, I gave instructions to the deputy minister that that should be done. I do not want to be bound to a particular day or hour at which it will be completed because the department has very many enterprises and investigations going on, but I can assure my hon. friend that it is intended to investigate the whole matter of possible northern routes from Winnipeg.

Mr. WARD: This year?

Mr. DUNNING: Please do not ask me to bind myself to completing it this year.

Mr. WARD: No, but will the survey be made this year?

Mr. DUNNING: At least a start will be made this year. The field of investigation is much larger than some people think, but I can assure my hon. friends it will be undertaken as soon as possible. I would prefer not to be bound to a definite promise as to time because that is rather uncertain.

Mr. WARD: But some progress will be made this year?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, I can guarantee that some progress will be made this year.

Mr. BANCROFT: Quite a bit of progress?

Mr. BENNETT: With respect to the Hudson Bay townsite, I find that the privy council dealt with a couple of the clauses that we have discussed, in the Boland case in 1926. When I heard the hon. member for Pontiac make the observation that he did, coupled with the speech of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin, I realized that we were getting into dangerous waters. To assert that a minister of the crown, of his own mere motion, can file an expropriation plan and thereby deprive a citizen of this country of his property, and thereafter fix a price for it based upon any assumption that is thought desirable is at variance with all the principles that govern our law, and when the hon. gentleman cheered so loudly about unearned increment from property, certainly it was not their property that was being taken.

An hon. MEMBER: Both of them have gone out now.

Mr. STEVENS: Having saved the country.

Mr. BENNETT: You may be sure that it is a dangerous principle to lay down that the decision of the minister shall not be called in question except by some person acting for him or for the crown. He can go to work and expropriate property in the name of the crown and fix compensation on the basis of what somebody else fixes for probate purposes. That is all wrong. When you talk of unearned increment, that unearned increment belongs to the provincial government, not to this government. What about the unearned increment of the Chicago man who bought a lot in good faith for $600 many years ago? The minister has said that he himself is the saviour of the country; he is saving it from speculation.

Mr. DUNNING: No, from exploitation.

Mr. BENNETT: All right. He comes down from Fort Churchill and gives an interview to the press of what he has done and makes a hero of himself as the great saviour of his country from exploitation. Is he going to save from exploitation every townsite on this railroad or not? Is he going to save from exploitation every townsite on the Canadian National? If he is going to do that on the Canadian National, is he going to do the same thing in respect to the Canadian Pacific? Is he going to save every community from exploitation? Here was a quarter-section of land four miles from the docks, and the minister, when he is nailed down, says that practically no portion of it is required for railway purposes. He does not take it for the railway; he expropriates it for the crown, and the section says that that proceeding cannot be called in question except by the minister or some person acting for him or for the crown. In the Boland case the railway desired to expropriate a piece of property and the first judge yielded to the contention that they had the same powers that the crown had and so, as the railway wanted the land, it could be taken. The case was appealed to the appellate division in Ontario, and Lord Dunedin, when the case was decided in the privy council, where the judgment was reversed, said:

> It is not a conclusion to be easily reached that they should act in such a manner with all the powers of an autocratic despot.

Those are words that every thoughtful man should ponder. We have now diplomatic relations with the United States. Since this parliament began, the rights of an American citizen were alleged to have been infringed in this country. He makes representations to Washington, and Washington makes representations to our diplomatic representative as to what is to be done. In this case we have a man in Chicago buying in good faith a lot in Fort Churchill for $600. According to the hon. member for Wetaskiwin and the hon. member for Winnipeg, what is wanted is some red-blooded, virile, strong minister who will say, "I will save Canada from exploitation. I will take this man's property and offer him $11.75 for it." Does not that come within the language of Lord Dunedin. I say that you cannot reach a conclusion favourable to the minister except by assuming that the minister is to act with all the powers of an autocratic despot. That is not the function of the Minister of Railways in Canada. There are ministers who think it is, not necessarily the Minister of Railways. When you talk of unearned increment, whom are you taking it away from? A man puts $600 into a lot, and you offer him $11.75 and say that the Dominion can take the difference between the $600, and the interest on it for those years, and $11.75, although there is a commandment that says "Thou shalt not steal."

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend knows how unfair that is.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not unfair.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend said "Thou shalt not steal." He insinuates that the government is stealing this property.

Mr. BENNETT: What else is it? According to Lord Dunedin—

Mr. DUNNING: I do not care what Lord Dunedin or any other lord said in regard to

that. It is not stealing. The government of Canada is taking something which had no value whatever save as the government of Canada gave it value—

Mr. BENNETT: Will the hon. gentleman sit down?

Mr. DUNNING: —and will pay for it whatever the court decides.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman once more must remember that this is not the Saskatchewan legislature.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend—

Mr. BENNETT: I have the floor.

Mr. DUNNING: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the usual cry. What is it now?

Mr. DUNNING: I will state the point of order as soon as my hon. friend takes his seat.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the point of order?

Mr. DUNNING: The point of order is this, Mr. Chairman. My hon. friend has cast reflections on the conduct of another legislative body in this country, as he frequently does.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not a question of order.

Mr. DUNNING: I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule on the point of order, and while I am on my feet I will raise another point of order, as to whether it is in order by inference to accuse the government of Canada of stealing.

Mr. BENNETT. Stealing. The point of order, Mr. Chairman, was that references were made to another legislature. I said, "This is not the Saskatchewan legislature." That is all. The hon. member raised a second point of order. He says: By inference I accuse the government of stealing. I made no such observation. I said that there was a declaration, "Thou shalt not steal" and that still stands. The hon. gentleman says that he cares not what Lord Dunedin or any other lord says. The Lord I had reference to was the Lord of all creation, and I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman's statement as to his freedom in regard even to that.

Mr. DUNNING: This surely cannot be allowed, Mr. Chairman. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement. He stated that I had no regard for the Lord of creation.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. BENNETT: He said that he did not care what Lord Dunedin or any other lord said, and I said that it was the Lord of all creation that made the statement I was referring to.

Mr. POULIOT: Our Lord said: You shall love each other.

The CHAIRMAN: I heard the hon. gentleman's remarks with respect to another legislative body, but I did not take it that there was anything derogatory to that other body in his references. With respect to the other matter, I fail to see that there is a point of order.

Mr. BENNETT: I was observing, Mr. Chairman, that it is not right to say the difference between $11.75 and $600 should be taken by anybody, whether it be the collective power of the state or somebody else. It is not right to say that the crown, unless it requires it for the overwhelming interest of the country, should take that property away and say, we will give you $11.75. We have a certain principle in connection with these matters. The principle is that a man who has the right of possession and of title to a property cannot have it taken away from him lightly unless it is required for the overwhelming interest of the state. And in this instance the crown—not the railway, mark you, but the crown—expropriates this property, and tenders the man who paid $600 for it, $11.75. Then the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) says the minister is to be congratulated because he expropriated another man's property, not for the railway but to prevent exploitation. I submit to this committee and to this country that the minister has undertaken a responsibility which cannot be narrowed down to Fort Churchill; he must make it apply to every part of Canada through which this system carries its ramifications and lines. That is a position which he cannot maintain. If we are to be the guardians of the people of the country with respect to their speculations and their purchases, well and good, let us say so. We have in British law this principle running down for a thousand years, that when a man buys property and pays for it and gets title to it, it cannot be taken away from him by compulsory proceedings unless the interests of the state are paramount to the private interests. We hear about the question of unearned increment. It might be well to remember the legislation passed in Great Britain by the Right Hon. Mr. Lloyd George in connection with that very thing, and yet we lived to see the day when it was quietly repealed.

Mr. DUNNING: I have only a little to say. I sometimes envy the ability that makes it possible to take half a truth and twist it around with most dexterous language into something which is entirely untrue.

Mr. BENNETT: That is strictly out of order.

Mr. DUNNING: If my friend cares to raise a point of order I will argue it.

Mr. BENNETT: Not at all. The great parliamentary experience of the hon. gentleman should be a guide to his conscience.

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend finds the cap fits him I hope he will wear it. I made no reference to my hon. friend, and I am very glad that he confirms what I said. The facts are what count, and the facts are simple. Here was a decision to be made by a government—it could not be made otherwise—as to the change of location of the port and of the terminal of the railway. Here was certain property, the greater part of it owned by the crown, a small part owned by a large number of private individuals, the majority of whom had ceased to have any hope of getting anything out of it.

Mr. STEVENS: But whose judgment was now being vindicated.

Mr. DUNNING: Perhaps that is so.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps it is so.

Mr. DUNNING: As a matter of fact if those people had any complaint it should be directed against the government which changed the port from Churchill to Nelson in the first place, because the judgment of the individuals who acquired that property was exercised before the original contemplation of Churchill as the port, and government action took the port away from Churchill completely, and not action by this government. However, this situation existed, as I said a while ago. It had to be faced; decision had to be made. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition recited the circumstances correctly up to a certain point, and there he stopped. He says the minister autocratically—he uses the language of Lord Dunedin, or some other lord, but I would like to read the whole of the judgment before I would accept that part of it as being the complete expression of Lord Dunedin's opinion; that would only be fair. And then my hon. friend says there is a law, "thou shalt not steal," with the plain inference that the government was stealing this property from those people. That was the clear insinuation of my hon. friend. After all, what is the fact? The government says it was in the best interests of this country, having regard to all the peculiar circumstances surrounding Fort Churchill, for the state to take this land. And there is a statute which my hon. friend read, the Expropriation Act, which enables a minister of the crown to file expropriation plans. Those plans were filed. Then my hon. friend stops and says dramatically, "thou shalt not steal." He knows perfectly well that no stealing is either intended or possible. The Exchequer Court Act was passed by this parliament. Why? To insure that in cases where the government of the day decided in its wisdom, or lack of it, that a certain piece of property was required for governmental purposes, machinery should be available by which the rights of the subject could be protected. My hon. friend says, "thou shall not steal." Does he attach any importance whatever to the fact that there is an exchequer court in Canada, one of the high courts of this country, set up specifically for the purpose of insuring that nothing shall be unjustly taken from the subject by the crown? The minister did not take this property, the government did not take it, without compensation. The government took it subject to the provisions of the Expropriation Act and subject to the decision of the Exchequer Court of Canada as to the value of the property, which, when determined, will be paid to the owners thereof.

In fact most of the discussion this afternoon on this matter, Mr. Chairman, is out of order, because the subject matter of the value of this property is now under adjudication by one of the high courts of this Dominion. Nothing that we say here should affect, at any rate, the judgment to be rendered by that court. I know that the exchequer court will not, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition intimated, steal this property or allow the crown to steal it from the people who own it. If it were possible for the government to steal the property of any individual I should be one of the first to cooperate with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in setting up machinery to prevent it. Neither the crown nor anyone else has the right to steal. But "stealing" is an entirely wrong word to use in connection with a transaction of this kind.

I do not know that we can, with advantage, further discuss the matter. It is before the court. There is one way in which it could be dealt with here, and that is by a motion, on the part of members who feel as strongly as the leader of the opposition does that this policy is a wrong policy, that the proceedings for the expropriation of the privately-owned property on the peninsula at Fort Churchill

should be withdrawn. That will require an expression of opinion from this house as to whether or not the government took the proper course in what it did on that occasion. The house cannot settle the value to be paid for the property; that is a matter for the exchequer court. But this house can pass very easily upon the principle as to whether or not, having regard to the unique circumstances, the proper policy was pursued.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. minister has perhaps overlooked one fact. It was to that fact my criticism was directed. Section 1 of the subsection under which he acts reads as follows:

> In all cases, when any such plan and description purporting to be signed by the deputy of the minister, or by the secretary of the department, or by the superintendent of the public work, or by an engineer of the department, or by a land surveyor duly licensed as aforesaid, is deposited of record as aforesaid, the same shall be deemed and taken to have been deposited by the direction and authority of the minister, and as indicating that in his judgment the land therein described is necessary for the purposes of the public work; and the said plan and description shall not be called in question except by the minister, or by some person for him or for the crown.

That is the section, and I hope the minister gets the point of my criticism, which is also the point of the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) and the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross). It is this: that the right to take the lands required for any public work shall not be called in question, except as herein provided. And the minister distinctly said that he took the land to prevent exploitation. That is my criticism. But let me read the rest of the clause:

> And the said plan and description shall not be called in question except by the minister or by some person acting for him or for the crown.

In other words, the question whether or not this land was required for a public work is a question which the unfortunate persons who bought the land may not litigate, inasmuch as it can be litigated only if the minister calls it in question. That was really the point of my criticism, with respect to which I made the observation I did. I trust the minister realizes what is at issue. It is not a question of exploitation. The minister himself this afternoon distinctly said that most of the land was not required for public work.

Mr. DUNNING: Not for railway purposes.

Mr. BENNETT: But that is the only reason for which he could take it.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. DUNNING: No; I will discuss that.

Mr. BENNETT: And the statute so declares.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend confuses—

Mr. BENNETT: The minister said he wanted to prevent exploitation. That being so, and the section being as it is, I say that the lands in question do not come within the section; and these people have property taken away from them for, mark you, a consideration that may or may not be adequate. But that was not the issue. The minister will not admit that it is not required for public work, and no question can be raised except by himself or by some other person acting for the crown.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is confusing two statements I made, or ignoring a part of one or the other. The statute under which the expropriation was made is just what he is quoting—necessary for a public work. This afternoon I was asked the question: Is this required for railway purposes? I said, no, beyond a certain small portion of it which the railway or part of its yards might conceivably require. May I point out to my hon. friend that no expropriation at Churchill could be completely covered by the term railway expropriation. Docks and other works connected with the port are distinctly public works and not railway works.

Mr. STEVENS: Is this required for a public work?

Mr. DUNNING: At the time the expropriation was contemplated a decision had to be made immediately.

Mr. BENNETT: That has to be taken by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DUNNING: No. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that under that section the minister acted within his powers, and if the minister did not he will be told in court very plainly.

Mr. BENNETT: No; they cannot question his judgment.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is surely evading the point.

Mr. BENNETT: No. Here are the words:

> —the same shall be deemed and taken to have been deposited by the direction and authority of the minister, and as indicating that in his judgment the land therein described is necessary for the purposes of the public work;

Mr. DUNNING: I have allowed my hon. friend to interrupt me. Now I hope he will allow me to complete the statement.

Mr. BENNETT: Excuse me; the minister raised the question.

Mr. DUNNING: When I was at Churchill I was compelled to indicate my views to the government in order that government action might be taken, and an immediate decision was necessary, a decision in advance of the determination of detailed plans of all that would be involved in the Fort Churchill works, harbour, railway and everything else. As a matter of fact, the chief engineer tells me now that this area will quite probably be required for water supply purposes for the town and works on the east peninsula. I know that portion of it will certainly be required for railway purposes. The question I was asked this afternoon was in relation to railway purposes, and I told my hon friend frankly that we did not know yet how much land in the vicinity of Churchill would be required for bona fide port development purposes. Particularly is that true with respect to areas containing gravel, a large quantity of which will be required in connection with concrete works. At the time the expropriation was filed there was no doubt at all as to the possible need of this particular quarter-section for bona fide public work development at the port, either in connection with the railway or in connection with the works themselves.

Mr. STEVENS: Then it was not taken to prevent exploitation?

Mr. DUNNING: That was a very important factor in my mind in recommending the course to be followed—undoubtedly.

Mr. BENNETT: Then he has no right.

Mr. STEVENS: Which is it?

Mr. BIRD: I wish to make some remarks with regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr Thorson). I had not intended to speak, but the remarks made by the minister in reply to the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ward) raised a doubt in my mind as to the appraisal of the situation by the minister. I should like to impress upon him that the public of Manitoba are very much exercised about this matter, and I should not like the minister or the house to think that this is a question of connecting Churchill with Winnipeg. It is a broader question than that; it affects the connecting of southern Manitoba with northern Manitoba. Unfortunately nature has divided Manitoba in a diagonal fashion by the great lakes of Manitoba, an obstruction which has not been felt in years gone by, for the reason, as everyone knows, that northern Manitoba was but a hazy possibility until two or three years ago. But with development in mining north of The Pas, and with the prospective seaport at Churchill, northern Manitoba has become the land of hope and glory for southern Manitoba, and we are all very much disturbed in our minds as to the immediate future.

Manitoba, as all hon. members know, is very restricted in an agricultural sense. We have pretty well reached the extent of development agriculturally, and the opening up of the northern part of the province in the last few years has created a new spirit throughout Manitoba. But we find that there is just a possibility of this prospect vanishing from before our eyes, because we have no railway connection whatsoever between north and south. The great lakes, as I say, cut our province practically in two.

I do not think there is any public question so vital to Manitobans at the present time as this one. The hon. member for Dauphin will agree with me that there is no subject on which it is easier to call together a public meeting than this one; irrespective of party, we are all deeply concerned and interested. I should not like, therefore, to have the impression go abroad, from what the minister said in reply to the hon. member for Dauphin, that he is not thoroughly apprised of the state of public opinion in that province. I do not think he meant it in that way, but it seems to me that he conceived there was no haste, that there was considerable time in which to discuss the matter, and that no decisive step was necessary this year. If that is so, the minister ought to revise his attitude. I believe that public opinion is so unanimous in Manitoba and so much in earnest that the minister ought to pay very close attention to this matter and do something substantial this year. An investigation ought to be set on foot. I think the investigation could be easily finished this year so that the question of some concrete scheme might be faced next year, and I do not think the problem is so very big.

I am sorry these alternative schemes mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre have entered into the question and created some difficulty. I do not think the combined water and rail route should be considered at all; I think it is one of those fanciful propositions which really might be swept aside at once. As for the

Gypsumville proposition, that has considerable merit, but the minister will admit that it means the construction of an entirely new Hudson Bay railway, a proposition which I think parliament will not be likely to consider for some years. However, I would remind the minister that the original Hudson Bay railway, which runs through the length and breadth of old Manitoba, is still in existence and that with very little adaptation, very little straightening out and the addition of cut-offs it could be made a very effective connection between northern and southern Manitoba. It would have advantages to which the other routes cannot lay claim at all. The old Canadian Northern runs diagonally across Manitoba to the west of the lakes and connects up the most fertile, productive and picturesque parts of that province. In addition to that, there is almost a direct connection between Winnipeg and The Pas which, as far as I can see, for all future time will be the basis for the great mining development in that country.

I would not like the minister to think this is simply a matter of connecting Fort Churchill and Winnipeg; in its broader aspect it is a question of provincial patriotism. We feel that we do not want to be deprived of the advantages which for all these years we have imagined would be ours. It would be strange irony if the province which has been foremost in advocating the Hudson Bay railway should be finally deprived of those advantages, which certainly will be the case if within the next few years some way is not found to connect us up more directly with the Hudson Bay Railway and with the other developments in that northern country. I am afraid all the forecasts made during my advocacy of the Hudson Bay railway in this house in years gone by will fall short of fulfilment if we do not very shortly get some connection with the road.

As I have already said, I do not want to leave with the minister the impression that I think he is treating this matter too lightly, but his rather offhand reply to the hon. member for Dauphin made me feel that his attitude would create a great deal of dissatisfaction back home in Manitoba.

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry if the brevity of my replies to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the hon. member for Dauphin gave the impression of offhandedness. I can assure my hon. friend that continuous representations in connection with these matters have been made to me during the last several months, especially by the hon. members from Manitoba, and I had no intention of conveying the idea that I did not

[Mr. Bird.]

regard the whole matter as one of very serious importance. I certainly do so regard it. If it were as simple from the point of view of the people of Manitoba generally as it is to my hon. friend from Nelson, who would build a connection from Mafeking to The Pas as the most satisfactory solution, the proposition would not be so difficult, but unfortunately the people of Manitoba do not agree that that is a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. I am not prepared to say, and no one else is prepared to say, what is the best thing to do having regard to the situation which has developed; I will go further and say that none of us will be able correctly to estimate what is best until we know more about the volume of inbound traffic via the bay and the ocean rates which will prevail. By that I do not mean that there should be any delay in tackling this problem, but I do say that this one uncertain factor is of very considerable importance in connection with its solution.

If I had desired to be so offhand as my hon. friend feared I was, I might easily have said that this was a proper problem for the management of the Canadian National Railways. I did not do so because of a recognition on my part and on the part of the government that the Hudson bay policy is a matter of government policy rather than of Canadian National Railway policy, although it must be remembered that all the connections at every point south of The Pas are Canadian National connections, and I am not sure that as a parliament we can undertake the building of another Hudson Bay railway down into the southern area, as my hon. friend indicated. I think he said that he doubted whether it would be possible to bring the government portion of the Hudson Bay road, as distinct from the Canadian National portion, south to Winnipeg. I am inclined to agree that before embarking on any project of that kind the government would have to consider very seriously many different aspects of the question. I did not tell my hon. friend from Dauphin to go to the Canadian National management, as I would have done in connection with an ordinary branch line, for the reason I have indicated, because at present this is a matter of government policy. Because of that fact I am prepared from a departmental point of view to investigate all these possible solutions and I will give the assurance that this investigation will be undertaken just as soon as we can organize for it. It was only when my hon. friend from Dauphin tried, with very good grace, to pin me down to a definite time for completing

that investigation that I refused to be bound, and I think the house will appreciate that it is very difficult for me to be definite in that regard, bearing in mind the volume of work on hand in the department in connection with the Hudson Bay railway and many other great undertakings in various parts of the country.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to ask the minister who lets the contracts for the construction of either the railway or the terminals?

Mr. DUNNING: In connection with the railway the Canadian National acts as agent for the minister and handles the contracts just as its own contracts are handled. My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre obtained information in the special committee on railways and shipping with regard to the contracts let by the Canadian National in that regard. With respect to the port itself no contracts have been let; the work is being done and has been done by the forces of the department up to the present.

Mr. CLARK: That is, the work on the terminals is being done by day labour and there is no cost plus contract at all?

Mr. DUNNING: There is no contract.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister say what proportion of the total number of contracts for the construction of the line was let on a cost plus basis?

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend is dealing with new construction, which of course is all with which I have had anything to do, no portion of the work has been done on a cost plus basis.

Mr. CLARK: Does the minister formally approve the contracts negotiated by the Canadian National Railways before they become effective?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: And the minister states that there have been no contracts of any kind at all relating to the Hudson Bay railway which have been let on a cost plus basis?

Mr. DUNNING: I do not know of any and I think that was the answer which was given, after investigation, to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), who asked a question relating to the matter. These answers are a matter of record in the proceedings of the special committee.

Sir EUGENE FISET: It is in the evidence.

Mr. DUNNING: It is in the evidence, yes. The following question was asked:

> What portion of the work is being done by day labour or what portion on a cost-plus basis, and if so, by whom is such work being done?

The answer given was as follows:

> The culverts, the telegraph lines, the track laying, the ballasting, and rehabilitation is being done by the Canadian National Railway forces, and no portion of the work is let on a cost-plus basis.

Mr. CLARK: That would mean it is being done by day labour?

Mr. DUNNING: By day labour.

Mr. CLARK: Practically all the construction, including the terminals is being done by day labour?

Mr. DUNNING: The only exception is the grading on the new portion of the line. My hon. friend will find that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre asked all these questions.

Mr. CLARK: The minister is making a too frequent reference to what was brought out in the committee. If the house has to accept what was brought out in a special committee, we will not get very far. Personally, I have not had the time to read the evidence given before the committee.

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend will ask the question I will answer it, even though it means that it is being answered for a second time.

Mr. CLARK: If it has been answered already in this house then the minister is justified in his attitude.

Mr. DUNNING: I thought my hon. friend would be satisfied to know where it could be found.

Mr. CLARK: I thought the hon. minister was complaining that I am going over ground which has been already covered before a small committee of eight members; if that is going to be his attitude, then I shall certainly be an objector to any such committee.

Mr. DUNNING: Surely my hon. friend does not understand me as making that complaint. I was merely indicating to him where he could conveniently find the information about which he was inquiring. If he desires me to repeat that information I shall be happy to do so, but it is already printed in the evidence. If my hon. friend will repeat his question I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. CLARK: If the minister will give me the reference in the evidence where the

answers can be found, that might hasten matters. I would like to know what portion of last year's vote was spent in contracts and what portion was spent on day labour.

Mr. DUNNING: In order to answer that question intelligently it will be necessary to separate the two pieces of work, the railway and the port. In connection with the railway, the grading work was the subject of tender. Seven tenders were received and the lowest tenderer received the contract for the work at the price of $1,270,100. With respect to all the other work on the railway it was done entirely by Canadian National forces on a day labour basis in the same way as the Canadian National carry out similar work for themselves. The department audits the day labour costs of the Canadian National on the work and the department pays the amount necessary to meet the accounts of the Canadian National in that regard.

Mr. CLARK: Is it not a new departure for a railway company to construct its line by day labour? Has it not always been recognized as being the best practice to call for tenders for certain sections of the line and let the contracts to the lowest responsible bidders?

Mr. DUNNING: That is true with respect to grading, and that is being done by the Canadian National at the present time in connection with all their work. The balance of the work such as ballasting, track laying, small bridges, culverts and telegraph lines is all done by Canadian National forces on a day labour basis. I am not sure of the practice of other roads, but I believe it is the same. For instance, large steel bridges would be matters of contract as my hon. friend can well understand that the day labour force of the railway would not be equipped to do work such as that. The practice followed here is the practice which has been followed by the Canadian National for some years in connection with their work, and it has been found to be satisfactory in operation.

Mr. CLARK: I assume that engineers' estimates are given for particular sections of the line before the work is commenced. Will the minister state whether or not those estimates have been exceeded, and if so, in what instances and by how much?

Mr. DUNNING: In answering my hon. friend's question, we have to take into account the character of a large portion of this work. Some 332 miles of the railway were, as my hon. friend knows, built a considerable number of years ago and were allowed to fall into very bad disrepair. That matter was all threshed out in the house during each of the last two sessions, and to estimate accurately what would be required to rehabilitate the old track, a large portion of which was not and could not be used for many years, was a matter of some difficulty. I do not think I have available the original estimate of the cost of rehabilitation which is, of course, the major factor. I can give the estimate of the cost of completion of the line from the Limestone river to Churchill, because that is all new work. Up to date I believe I am correct in stating that it is reasonably close to the estimate. Of course the work is in process of being carried out and it is impossible to give final figures in connection with that part of the work which is new work, that is the only new work on the railway.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister give the committee, then, the original estimate for the rehabilitation of the line and the actual cost?

Mr. DUNNING: The rehabilitation is not yet completed, but I will give such information as I can.

Mr. CLARK: Has the minister any information to indicate whether or not the estimates of the engineers are being exceeded?

Mr. DUNNING: The original estimate is likely to be exceeded with respect to the rehabilitation of the old line to mile 332. That statement is subject to the qualification that it depends upon what may happen with respect to subsequent settlement of embankments where the later are founded on frozen material which may disintegrate over a period of years. Then we have on the new portion of the line a problem which is also a qualification, namely, the possible cost of dealing with snow trouble across thirty-odd miles of open tundra. That is, there are thirty-odd miles of completely open country which, in those latitudes, produces a special snow problem that may add somewhat to the cost. There is a third qualification applying to the old line, namely, a possible cost of putting gravel ballast between mile 100 and mile 356, rather than leaving the present sand ballast, because in that area there is a stretch of the line which does not happen to contain locally adjacent ballast pits, and so far the best locally available material, pretty sandy in character, has been used. If the order is given to use gravel ballast drawn from considerable distances, that will be a qualification tending to increase the expenditure.

Mr. CLARK: Has the minister an approximate estimate of the amount by which the original estimate of the engineers will be exceeded? There must be some report on that.

Mr. DUNNING: As nearly as I can gather from the reports of the Canadian National engineers with respect to the matter, the original estimated cost to build the line from mile 356 to Churchill, that is what I call the new railway, was $7,543,000. It is not expected that that item will be exceeded save as affected by the qualification which I mentioned a few moments ago. With respect to the rehabilitation, the figures I have are of an inclusive character, including both the old line and the new, and I am trying to separate them as I go along, although it is somewhat difficult to do so. The present estimate of $29,300,000 to rehabilitate and also to complete the line to Churchill includes original cost figures, the cost of building the line originally. There is an estimated expenditure, from April 1, 1926, of $13,973,000, indicating an additional cost of $2,700,000 against the estimate for the lower standard, or about $1,362,000 greater than the estimated cost for the higher standard.

Mr. CLARK: I must confess that I am completely in the dark. I asked the minister whether he had an estimate of how much it would cost to rehabilitate the line. Let us fix that matter now. That was not my whole question. I asked him how much the original estimate for the rehabilitation of the line would be exceeded. I suggested to him that he must have from the engineers some statement as to the approximate amount by which the original estimate would be exceeded. I am now suggesting that we start at the beginning. Will the minister state what was the engineers' original estimate of cost for the rehabilitation of the line?

Mr. DUNNING: There were a number of qualifications, as my hon. friend will remember, to engineers' estimating upon such an uncertain proposition as rehabilitation. I am now having the black records searched to see whether we have any definite estimates from any engineers at any time as to what it would cost to rehabilitate the old line. My hon. friend will understand there were no standards whatever to apply to such a job. In some cases the cost was greater than it would have been to build an entirely new line. Then there would be stretches that would not be so bad. The best information I can give to my hon. friend is in this form. This is an old estimate by the Canadian National as to what might be required:

1A. Branch line standard rehabilitation from LePas to mile 332, $3,000,000.

1B. Better standard and facilities for heavier traffic Le Pas to mile 332, $4,373,000.

The total estimated cost, inclusive of the line to Churchill—that is the awkward feature because new line and rehabilitated line are used everywhere in the figures I have before me—is $12,611,000.

We are not in a position to say that that cost is being exceeded, until we get further along with the work but from the reports of cost we anticipate that difficulties of the kind that I referred to a little while ago, will develop to a point which may involve higher cost on the rehabilitated portion of the line than the estimate.

It appears, however, at the present time that the new line from mile 356 to Churchill may be expected to be completed reasonably within the figure I gave of $7,543,000. As I pointed out, our experience in those northern latitudes is that it is not possible to say with certainty when you finish a line, that it is really finished; that is, troubles are likely to develop in subsequent years and to require to be adjusted by capital expenditures.

Mr. CLARK: Apparently the major portion of this work consists of rehabilitating the line. The minister is unable to tell the committee what was the original estimate for the rehabilitation of that line?

Mr. DUNNING: That is the figure I gave.

Mr. CLARK: I want to be sure about this. I understood the minister to say that the cost of rehabilitation and of building a new line to Churchill was $12,600,000.

Mr. DUNNING: That is rehabilitation and constructing a new line.

Mr. CLARK: Exactly.

Mr. DUNNING: Of which $4,373,000 was the original estimate for rehabilitation.

Mr. CLARK: Plus $3,000,000.

Mr. DUNNING: No; that $3,000,000 was for another standard, a lower standard. If one standard were adopted, the cost would be $3,000,000. If another standard were adopted, the cost would be $4,373,000. The question is not one of adding the two amounts together.

Mr. CLARK: Then the estimated cost of rehabilitation is $4,373,000 on one basis and $3,000,000 on another. Which basis was adopted?

Mr. DUNNING: The higher.

Mr. CLARK: What has been the cost to date?

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is asking a type of question for which it is rather hard to get the answer out of information I have, which necessarily relates to the whole job, not merely to the part of it which goes to mile 332 and is rehabilitation, but I will try to get the information my hon. friend wants.

Mr. CLARK: Are the accounts not kept so that one can pick out the portion that relates to rehabilitation and that which relates to any ten-mile section of the road?

Mr. DUNNING: Of course the accounts are so kept, but I would ask my hon. friend not to expect me to bring all the accounts of the department here. I will get the information and I hope I may be able to extract it from the summaries which I have. But I would point out to my hon. friend that in spite of my bringing somewhat voluminous information, he has succeeded in presenting a question which requires a closer examination of the accounts to get an answer, but I will get it. Down to March 31st of this year we have expended through the Canadian National on rehabilitation, $4,413,000. That is to mile 332.

Mr. CLARK: What remains to be done?

Mr. DUNNING: I can best answer that by taking an estimate here given that it may exceed the amount originally estimated by about $1,362,000.

Mr. CLARK: That would be about 30 per cent more than the original estimate. I am correct in that, am I not?

Mr. DUNNING: I cannot say. My hon. friend is making the calculation.

Mr. CLARK: The original estimate was $4,373,000, and it is estimated that that will be exceeded by $1,362,000, which is roughly 30 per cent in excess of the original estimate. Apparently all this work on the Hudson Bay railway is being done on this basis—estimate, day labour, and then later we face excessive cost. Certainly we do in this case up to about 30 per cent. A contractor is bound to give a more accurate estimate than that. We could ask numerous contractors for their estimates, and the one who gives the lowest estimate could be tied down to that amount, and he would not be paid an excessive cost to the amount of $1,362,000 as in this case. The country would be saved money by constructing that line on a contract basis rather than by day labour or on a cost plus basis.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. DUNNING: I think my hon. friend wants to be fair, but again he is confusing two things—the reconstruction or rehabilitation of the old line and the building of that portion of the line which is new. He is basing his criticism upon an engineer's estimate which was made on the cost of rehabilitation. I am critical of engineers as a general rule, but I certainly think they cannot be criticized very severely in connection with an attempt to estimate what it will cost to rehabilitate 350 miles of railway over muskeg, with all the variable conditions of the track. That was an effort to give us something to guide us, and the engineers made it quite clear that there were none of the usual factors present which would enable them to estimate with any degree of accuracy. When it came to building new track we did let a contract, but my hon. friend is surely not under the impression that any contractor would make a bid for building a road through that country on a lump sum basis and stand by it. The Canadian National is doing the work under virtually the same conditions as those upon which a contractor would undertake it; that is, a unit price, so much per yard for this, that and the other material. A contractor would never think of tying himself down to a lump price for the whole job.

Mr. CLARK: I realize that.

Mr. DUNNING: When my hon. friend draws the conclusion that we could have saved money by letting a contract for this rehabilitation to some firm other than the Canadian National, I cannot agree with him at all. If we had asked for tenders for that work, in view of all the variable factors connected with it and the different kinds of work involved, we would have had to pay more than it will cost us to have it done by the Canadian National, with experienced forces and equipment of their own. If we had let a contract for that rehabilitation to some outside contractor we would have had to pay interest on the equipment and all that sort of thing. The Canadian National has the equipment in its own service and hence could perform and did perform that service more economically than a contractor could possibly have done.

Mr. CLARK: The minister, then, is of the opinion that day labour is more economical than tender and contract?

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend knows that I did not say that. In connection with this piece of work, being of the character it is, it was more economical for us to get the

Canadian National's regular forces to do that work for us, paying them actually what it cost them, than it would have been to let a contract to a contractor who because of the uncertainty of the volume and character of the work involved would undoubtedly have allowed a tremendous margin for safety in addition to his ordinary profit.

Mr. CLARK: A lot of the new work is being let on the day labour basis, is it not?

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. CLARK: I understood the minister to say that only the grading had been let by contract.

Mr. DUNNING: That is right.

Mr. CLARK: And that the remainder, the terminals and the laying of steel, was being done by day labour. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DUNNING: So far as the terminals, the roundhouses and that sort of thing are concerned, the Canadian National follows the same practice as it does with similar structures on its own lines. That class of work is done by contract. But again, I repeat, there are certain kinds of work which the Canadian National management, who are experts in this work, and who have proven by their successful management of the road that they know what they are about, have found can be most economically done by day labour; and we take their word for it that the application of precisely the same principles by the same men is the best and most economical way of building this new road.

Mr. CLARK: Are the terminals being built by day labour?

Mr. DUNNING: When my hon. friend says terminals, just what does he mean?

Mr. CLARK: I understand that this estimate that we are considering is for the Hudson Bay railway and terminals. I think the minister should be in a much better position than I to say what the terminals are. He has the information surely; I have not, and I am asking him. If there are no terminals, why is the word "terminals" used in this vote? It is a substantial amount, $6,500,000. What are we voting this money for if there are no terminals? If there are terminals what are they and how are they being built?

Mr. DUNNING: Surely my hon. friend is not serious, but I will try to comply with his request for information in so far as I can, and in so far as his questions are reasonable.

Mr. CLARK: Does the minister say it is unreasonable for me to ask what the terminals consist of, when the word "terminals" is used in this vote?

Mr. DUNNING: I understand fully my hon. friend's object. and I will try to be as courteous as I can in helping him to attain it. My hon. friend started by asking whether the terminals were being built by day labour. I asked him what he had in his mind when he asked the question regarding terminals.

Mr. CLARK: The terminals that are being built under this vote.

Mr. DUNNING: I will try again. Such structures as the Canadian National, for their own railway, would have built by contract—I have in mind roundhouses or station buildings—are being let to contract by the Canadian National in the case of the Hudson Bay railway. Such work as would be done on the Canadian National lines by the company's own forces is being done by the company's own forces in this case. All the work which is at present being carried on by the departmental forces in connection with the harbour terminals, the dredging work, and so forth, is being done by day labour.

Mr. CLARK: I wonder if the minister could tell whether in the committee the list of the contracts which have been let and are outstanding was given, with amounts.

Mr. DUNNING: No, it was not asked for. I can supply that readily.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to have that.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not know that I have it before me. There was just the grading contract, and I believe there was one contract for a steel bridge—

Mr. CLARK: The minister stated that the contract had been let for roundhouses, for instance. He now states that only the grading contract—

Mr. DUNNING: I was going on, if my hon. friend had not interrupted me, to speak of the possibility of there being contracts in connection with roundhouses. I know my hon. friend does not want to delay me, and that he is serious in seeking all this information, and I am very anxious indeed to give it to him. We have not at the moment a list of all the contracts let by the Canadian National Railways up to the present time. Such a list will be secured and will be supplied later, if possible to-day.

Mr. BENNETT: This money is being voted by parliament, and it is being voted for a

government undertaking. The Auditor General, therefore, should have control over the expenditure so far as this work is concerned. Is there any evidence, other than the payment to the Canadian National Railways, by which we can check it up in the public accounts?

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is quite right in stating that this being an expenditure by the government of Canada, of the funds of Canada, it is subject to the audit of the Auditor General. As to the agency relationship, the department, I presume under the direction of the Auditor General,—which is the same arrangement as exists in the department itself,—that is, under our own auditing staff, audits the accounts of the Canadian National Railways as presented to us, the day labour sheets, and all that sort of thing, in the same manner as the departmental audit staff deals with any other expenditure that is in progress.

Mr. BENNETT: That partly answers the question I am asking. To-day we vote, we will say, three millions dollars for the Hudson Bay railway. To what extent has this parliament, through the public accounts committee, the power next year to examine those accounts? As I see it, none at all.

Mr. DUNNING: Offhand, I do not know what the legal position is, but I would certainly expect the public accounts to have authority to examine everything. That would be my attitude absolutely.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it not a fact that the moneys are paid to the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: And that all we have control over is that the Canadian National Railways get the money, and we have no way of checking its expenditure of that money.

Mr. DUNNING: I consent to the principle right now that we are entitled to follow their expenditures right to the end when they are acting as agents for the crown in this matter.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister sees the the difficulty, does he not? If we had the expenditure made by the government direct to a contractor—and the Canadian National Railways must occupy that position either as contractor or as agent—we would then have in the public accounts committee all the expenditures made in connection with the Hudson Bay railway. At the moment all we have is a check to the Canadian National Railways; the Auditor General's report does not deal with that money so far as I can ascertain.

Mr. DUNNING: I am advised that the amounts paid to the Canadian National Railways are itemized in the public accounts.

Mr. BENNETT: Part of them; and in that connection I could not quite follow the answer given by the minister to my hon. friend from Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark)

Mr. DUNNING: That is what I am advised. Quite frankly I have not checked up on that feature of it, but I have no doubt at all as to the matter, particularly with respect to the public accounts committee having the right to follow these expenditures completely to the end. And I am advised that details of the amounts paid to the Canadian National Railways are given in the public accounts.

Mr. BENNETT: That is right, but the answer to a question asked by my hon. friend from Vancouver-Burrard is certainly at variance with that understanding.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not recollect the answer.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a dredge at Port Nelson at the end of a pier. I think it cost one million dollars delivered at Nelson, did it not?

Mr. DUNNING: I will get the accurate information. There are many years of history behind this project, and it is very difficult to have everything here.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not want to press the minister to answer what he is not in a position to answer. My advice is that the dredge cost something like one million dollars and is lying across the pier, thirty feet at each end, with just enough extension at one end to balance the machinery at the other, and the dredge is in good shape. But another dredge was purchased and brought in to be used at Churchill, and two new lighters from eastern Canada were brought to Churchill although there were boats at Nelson which, while a little out of repair, could easily have been put in commission. That is a matter about which I should like a statement from the minister.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not know the original cost of the suction dredge. My best advice is that it was delivered to the govern-

ment of that day at some point in eastern Canada at a cost of $270,000, to which must be added, of course, the cost of taking it up there, which would be very considerable. I do not want again to appear condemnatory of previous governments in regard to what was done, but my answer to my hon. friend may involve some little criticism in that connection. However, I will relate the facts as I know them. The material to be dredged at either Churchill or Nelson cannot be successfully and economically handled by a suction dredge. That was proven in the effort to use the suction dredge in question at Nelson, and the material at Churchill does not differ very much from the material at Nelson. I have related in this house before the circumstances of the storm which occurred before my time, and resulted in the dredge landing in its present position, substantially as stated by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. As to the suggestion of my hon. friend that it could easily be taken down and at little expense, I should like to say that the engineers are not agreed as to how that dredge is to be taken down from its present position either economically or safely. In view of the fact that it was certainly not suitable for any work we had up there, I did not deem it the part of wisdom to spend money on it at the present time, and, instead, secured the kind of dredge which everyone agrees can handle the type of work requiring to be done at Churchill.

Mr. BENNETT: Were they purchased?

Mr. DUNNING: The contract let for the building, yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Who supplied the new dredges?

Mr. DUNNING: The Canadian Vickers.

Mr. BENNETT: There were two, I am informed.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: What did they cost?

Mr. DUNNING: Churchill No. 1, $357,500; Churchill No. 2, $360,650. My hon. friend read or made some statement with regard to lighters at Nelson which might have been used and were not. I want to assure him that all floating plant there which was at all serviceable was put into shape and moved to Churchill and is there at the present time. There is left at Nelson no floating plant which is usable.

Mr. BENNETT: There were two new lighters bought, were there not?

Mr. DUNNING: We have a dump scow that is new, and a barge, and we got another scow from the Department of Public Works. The rest of the equipment, outside of tugs, is the equipment which was at Nelson and which is being put into shape. We had also at Nelson one tug which has been reconditioned and is in use at Churchill.

Mr. BENNETT: Was there a fire in the roundhouse at Churchill last summer?

Mr. DUNNING: No; my hon. friend's informant is evidently referring to what I mentioned in the house last winter. I gave then an account of a fire which had occurred in the roundhouse at Nelson, not at Churchill.

Mr. BENNETT: Then there has been no fire at Churchill since the operations were commenced there, by which any locomotives or materials were destroyed?

Mr. DUNNING: The fire occurred at Nelson.

Mr. BENNETT: It is advisable to clear this point up, not for my purposes but for the information of those who may read it and wish to be satisfied as to what the facts are.

Mr. DUNNING: The fire was at Nelson.

Mr. BENNETT: Would the government be in any sense responsible for the care of labourers who went to Churchill in the summer of 1928?

Mr. DUNNING: What does my hon. friend mean by "care"?

Mr. BENNETT: There were eighty-five workmen who were supposed to be at Churchill last year, including store bosses, blacksmith bosses, tractor bosses and superintendents and foremen. My information, given me by a reputable citizen desiring to find out the facts, is that twenty out of the eighty-five were superintendents and foremen, while the rest were labourers. The foremen received eighty cents an hour and worked fourteen hours a day and the labourers received forty cents in the warmer weather and forty-five in the colder and paid a dollar a day for board. We will leave it at that for the moment. Would the department know anything about this, or would it be the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. DUNNING: If what my hon. friend is stating relates to Churchill—

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, Churchill.

Mr. DUNNING: —then the workmen at the port would be departmental.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I am advised.

Mr. DUNNING: If they were working on the railway they would be Canadian National people. If my hon. friend would give me a copy of his statement I should be glad to have the facts ascertained and submitted to him.

Mr. BENNETT: The statement sent to me is interlarded with observations and queries, and I could not detach the statement itself. I am anxious to ascertain whether or not the Department of Railways and Canals carried on operations at Churchill in the summer of 1928, what wages were paid, and whether there was a doctor in charge of the men.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: How many men were there? Then there is another question—

Mr. DUNNING: Will my hon. friend ask the questions one by one? I have a record of all the operations at Churchill and perhaps I could answer them more intelligently that way.

Mr. BENNETT: It might be a good thing to put them on the record and my hon. friend could look them up in the meantime. The first question is this: Did the Department of Railways and Canals carry on, direct, operations at Churchill during the summer of 1928, employing some eighty-five men or thereabouts, of whom twenty were superintendents and foremen, the others being workmen? And what was paid the foremen per hour, and how many hours per day did they work?

Mr. DUNNING: We have more men than that.

Mr. BENNETT: This is the summer of 1928.

Mr. DUNNING: While the information is being looked up, I may advise my hon. friend that last summer's work consisted very largely in getting ready for the actual work of this year. Some fifteen thousand tons of cargo were taken in and unloaded, temporary piers were built, temporary tracks laid, two dredges taken in, bunkhouses built, and a lot of work of that character done. As I said a moment ago, a doctor is there appointed by the department to look after the men, and there is a limited hospital accommodation.

Mr. BENNETT: What was the doctor's name?

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. DUNNING: The total number of men at Churchill last year was three hundred and thirty-six.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the whole time, including the summer.

Mr. DUNNING: In 1928, yes. The numbers by months were: February, 17;. March, 30; April, 62; June, 227, making a total of 336.

Mr. BENNETT: How many stayed on the work?

Mr. DUNNING: They practically all stayed until the work was curtailed, and the staff put on a winter basis.

Mr. BENNETT: When was the work closed down?

Mr. DUNNING: Our last boat last year left Churchill about October 15 and there was a progressive reduction from that point on as the men could be taken out.

Mr. BENNETT: What was labourer's pay?

Mr. DUNNING: Forty to forty-five cents per hour.

Mr. BENNETT: How many hours a day?

Mr. DUNNING: Time and a quarter for time over ten hours and Sunday time.

Mr. BENNETT: Time and a quarter?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: And what did the foremen get?

Mr. DUNNING: Foremen-labourer, does my hon. friend mean?

Mr. BENNETT: There were both superintendents and foremen; what did they get?

Mr. DUNNING: There are different kinds of foremen. Does my hon. friend mean the foreman-labourer?

Mr. BENNETT: That will do for one.

Mr. DUNNING: Foreman-labourer, fifty to eighty cents an hour.

Mr. BENNETT: Anything for overtime?

Mr. DUNNING: The same arrangement for overtime; over ten hours, time and a quarter.

Mr. BENNETT: And board was paid for at the rate of $1 per day? Who ran the boarding house?

Mr. DUNNING: It was part of the organization.

Mr. BENNETT: Who was the doctor in charge?

Mr. DUNNING: Doctor Walton.

Mr. BENNETT: What did he receive in the way of pay? Was there a fixed deduction from the men's wages?

Mr. DUNNING: He received $250 a month and board.

Mr. BENNETT: Did the employment of the men commence at The Pas?

Mr. DUNNING: For a time, yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Were any of those men who went to Fort Churchill rejected because of medical unfitness at Fort Churchill and paid from the time they left The Pas until they returned?

Mr. DUNNING: The engineer advises me that there was only one such man.

Mr. BENNETT: Only one?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Was there a man taken on at Tisdale, subsequently rejected at Churchill and sent back at a cost to the country of $75 or $80?

Mr. DUNNING: The engineer in charge states that he can remember only one such case and it does not come to his mind where the man was sent from. He was sent out with the idea that it was cheaper to do so than to keep him in the hospital there.

Mr. BENNETT: Was there a man named Scott employed as a carpenter on the recommendation of Curtin and Grant, barristers, Regina?

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend might ask some of his own friends about the letters they sent me and the endeavours which were made to get men employed.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not dealing with the minister himself but with Curtin and Grant of Regina.

Mr. DUNNING: As far as I know Curtin and Grant of Regina had no power in the matter at all. Mr. Curtin is a friend of mine; I know him very well and he has recommended men to me on various occasions, but not as a barrister or anything like that. With regard to the man named Scott, what is it my hon. friend wants to know?

Mr. BENNETT: Was there a man named Scott who was sent up as a carpenter at 75 cents an hour? According to my information he did not know a crosscut saw from a rip saw.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend mentioned Scott previously this session. There were four Scotts there, working at different occupations.

Mr. BENNETT: This man was employed as a carpenter at 75 cents an hour.

Mr. DUNNING: There was a Scott who was a carpenter.

Mr. BENNETT: Classified as such?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, classified as such and working as such.

Mr. BENNETT: It is said that he did not know the difference between a jig saw and a rip saw.

Mr. DUNNING: Can my hon. friend make that statement on his own responsibility?

Mr. BENNETT: No. I am getting enough, much more than I expected. Then there was a man named Don Collins—not John—a former druggist and a brother of Matt Collins of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board. Was he employed; how long was he there; how long did he stay and what did he get? He was taken in to drive an engine at 85 cents an hour.

Mr. DUNNING: Is my hon. friend making that statement?

Mr. BENNETT: I am asking questions.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is putting statements on record and I want him to be fair to me in these matters. Inasmuch as my hon. friend is reading constantly from a document I am beginning to think I have a right to ask for that document.

Mr. BENNETT: You can keep on beginning, because you are not going to get it.

Mr. DUNNING: I think someone should take responsibility for some of the statements my hon. friend is making. I am willing to answer questions.

Mr. BENNETT: Then suppose you do so. If the minister would answer questions he would advance the work of this committee. I asked if there was a man named Don Collins employed as an engineer at 85 cents an hour.

Mr. DUNNING: Then my hon. friend went on to make a lot of statements about the Saskatchewan Liquor Board and so on.

Mr. BENNETT: I said he was a brother of Matt Collins of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not know that there is a Matt Collins on the Saskatchewan Liquor Board.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say you did.

Mr. DUNNING: The engineer informs me that there were two Collinses, one of whom was an engineer and the other a timekeeper. He is not sure which one of them was Don.

Mr. BENNETT: Does he not know their initials?

Mr. DUNNING: We have not the list of employees here. Has my hon. friend any criticism to make with regard to the employment of these two men? I am asking for my own information.

Mr. BENNETT: I will deal with that when the time comes. I am asking questions of the minister now; his estimates are before us. The public money is being spent and I am inquiring as to how it was spent. Now I want to know if a man called Buck Freeman was hired; if so, was he hired by a man named Miller of Ottawa, again on the recommendation of Curtin and Grant?

Mr. DUNNING: Is my hon. friend asking questions or making statements?

Mr. BENNETT: The minister knows exactly what I am doing.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend should be fairer to me than that.

Mr. BENNETT: I will put the question again. Was there a man named Buck Freeman taken to Churchill as a carpenter at 75 cents an hour; was he hired by a man named Miller, of Ottawa; was that done on the recommendation of Curtin and Grant; what was his physical condition when he went to Churchill?

Mr. DUNNING: The engineer cannot recall any such circumstances as those related by my hon. friend. I know nothing of the matter myself.

Mr. BENNETT: How many storekeepers were employed?

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 247, for the relief of Henry Feldman.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 250, respecting The Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 251, to ratify and confirm the organization and the election of directors of Family Trust, and to change the name of that company to Financial Trust Company.—Mr. Laflamme.

Bill No. 280, respecting Alliance Nationale. —Mr. Mercier (Outremont).

CENTRAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The house in committee on Bill No. 283, respecting Central Finance Corporation.—Mr. Lang— Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Object.

Mr. COOTE: Has this bill been printed?

The CHAIRMAN: It will be found on the Senate file.

Mr. COOTE: Have these bills been before the banking and commerce committee?

The CHAIRMAN: All have been before that committee.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. F. G. SANDERSON (South Perth) (for Mr. Lang) moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to call Your Honour's attention to the filing of these bills. It is impossible for any hon. member, unless he spends an hour or so, to find a bill on the Senate file. The letters are all mixed up.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is letter P2 of the Senate.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I know that. It is impossible in a reasonable period of time to find a bill on the file. I should like to have a brief explanation of the bill before it is passed. As a matter of fact, I think there should be a revision of the rules with respect to the filing of these bills. They could easily be filed and numbered in some simpler form. They are a hopeless muddle at the present time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's suggestion is a good one, and instructions will be given to that effect.

Mr. SANDERSON: The hon. member for South Timiskaming (Mr. Lang) is ill and has asked me to take charge of the bill to-night. The bill passed the Senate committee and was before the banking and commerce committee of the Commons. The superintendent, Mr. Finlayson, found no objection to it in any way. As a matter of fact, no objection was raised to it in the committee by any member. It is a bill, as I understand it, for the relief of those who have to borrow small amounts of money and who cannot be accommodated by a chartered bank where certain securities are required. They borrow from this company which, I understand, has been doing business for a number of years and is in a sound, healthy financial condition. It is for the relief of those who from time to time borrow small amounts of money and give their own notes or those of their friends. That is about the substance of the bill.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member said that the company had been in operation for a considerable time. What is it asking for?

Mr. SANDERSON: It has been in operation carrying on a certain form of loan business, but not the particular business it asks for under this bill.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is asking for an extension of powers.

Mr. SANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What are the powers it is asking for?

Mr. SANDERSON: I do not know that I can answer that question, although I was present at the committee when the bill went through. If the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) were here, he could answer it, because it went through his department and was endorsed by his superintendent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I see it deals with an increase in the interest rate.

Mr. SANDERSON: Yes.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

THE DOMINION OF CANADA GUARANTEE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. 309, respecting The Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Dominion of Canada General Insurance Company"—Mr. Geary—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Name changed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is this a senate bill?

The CHAIRMAN: This is not a senate bill; it is to be found on the House of Commons file.

Mr. RYCKMAN: This bill has been before the banking and commerce committee. No objection was taken to it by the Superintendent of Insurance. There was no conflict of opinion on any point. The bill provides merely for a change of name, saving of rights, and an increase in the capital stock. The company is an old-established and flourishing insurance company. It deserves all it asks for and everybody has conceded this.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 281, respecting The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada.—Mr. Smith (Stormont).

Bill No. 300, for the relief of Stella Pearl Duncan.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 302, for the relief of Hurley Alexander Fummerton.—Mr. Thorson.

Bill No. 314, for the relief of Barbara Elise Sewell de la Penotière.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill 315, for the relief of Oliver Milton Martin.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 317, for the relief of Mary Jane Teeson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 319, for the relief of Charles Smolkin.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 320, for the relief of James Franklin McDonagh.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 321, for the relief of Joseph Louis Philippe Corbeau.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 322, for the relief of Ruth Elizabeth Greene.—Mr. Young (Toronto Northeast).

Bill No. 323, for the relief of Frances Thirza Edlund.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 328, for the relief of Mabel Bullis.—Mr. Stinson.

Bill No. 333, for the relief of Vera Alice Griffin.—Mr. Sanderson.

SAM GLADSTONE

On the order for the second reading of Bill No. 318, for the relief of Sam Gladstone.—Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I notice that several of these bills are being presented with the sponsor absent. These sponsors live in

Toronto and Montreal, and they say they are unavoidably absent. They are usually unadvoidably absent on Friday evening. I think we shall have to ask that these bills stand until the sponsors are present. Some of us who come from a distance are utterly tired of carrying on business in the absence of members who find it convenient to be away over the week end.

Motion stands.

FLORENCE GERTRUDE SINGER

Mr. A. J. ANDERSON (Toronto-High Park, for Mr. Lawson) moved the second reading of Bill No. 237, for the relief of Florence Gertrude Singer.

He said: The sponsor of this bill was called away from the city last night but will be here to-morrow. In his absence I would move the second reading of this bill. He is very regular in his attendance in the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be only one rule.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Might I ask what that rule is, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is that the sponsor of the bill must be present. I am quite willing, however, that the motion be put by the hon. member for Toronto-High Park if there is unanimous consent.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): I would ask for unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have not been able to hear at this end of the chamber one word of what has been said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Toronto-High Park has said that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Lawson) is constant in his attendance at the house but has been called away and will be here to-morrow, and has asked the unanimous consent of the house, in the absence of the sponsor, to move the second reading of this bill.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not like to be discourteous, but there have been a number of other bills standing in the name of the hon. member for West York. I cannot see how we can object in the one case and let other bills pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: The objection is well taken.

Motion stands.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

RIGHT OF MARRIED WOMEN TO ESTABLISH DOMICILE

Mr. W. J. WARD (Dauphin) moved the third reading of Bill No. 75, respecting the domicile of married women in proceedings for divorce.

The SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The house divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Anderson (Toronto-High Park),
Anderson (Halton),
Bancroft,
Barber,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bennett,
Bird,
Black (Yukon),
Bowen,
Brown,
Campbell,
Casselman,
Cayley,
Chaplin,
Clark,
Coote,
Dickie,
Donnelly,
Dunning,
Edwards (Waterloo South),
Elliott,
Euler,
Evans,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Fansher (Lambton East),
Forke,
Fraser,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Garland (Carleton),
Gershaw,
Glen,
Gott,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnston (Long Lake),
Kellner,
Kennedy,
Ladner,
Lucas,
MacDonald (Cape Breton South),
MacLaren,
MacLean (Prince),
McLean (Melfort),
Macphail (Miss),
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McPherson,
McRae,
Millar,
Milne,
Neill,
Plunkett,
Price,
Ralston,
Rennie,
Ross (Kingston City),
Ross (Moose Jaw),
Ryckman,
Senn,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Queens),
Smith (Stormont),
Smoke,
Speakman,
Spence,
Spencer,
Spotton,
Steedsman,
Stevens,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Stinson,
Stirling,
Telford,
Thorson,
Vallance,
Ward,
Woodsworth,
Young (Toronto Northeast).—80.

NAYS

Messrs:

Beaubien,
Benoit,
Boivin,
Boucher,
Boulanger,
Bourgeois,
Cahill,
Chevrier,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Dubuc,
Fafard,

Ferland,	Perley (Sir George),
Fiset (Sir Eugene),	Perras,
Jenkins,	Pouliot,
Laflamme,	Power,
Lapierre,	Quinn,
Lapointe,	Robitaille,
Letellier de St. Just.	St-Père,
McMillan,	Sanderson,
Morrissy,	Séguin,
Motherwell,	Verville.—32.

Mr. ARTHURS: I was paired with the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon). Had I voted, I would have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ILSLEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. MacNutt). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. KAISER: I was paired with the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Lavigueur). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ROWE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the third time and passed.

REPORT

First and final report of the joint committee of both Houses of Parliament on the restaurant. —Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLY

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. BENNETT: When the committee rose I was asking the minister a question with respect to the employment of two or three persons named; I wanted to know whether or not he could locate them.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not catch what my hon. friend said.

Mr. BENNETT: I had given the minister the names of several persons, asking if they were employed and if so in what capacity, at what rate per hour, how many hours constituted a day, and the allowance for overtime.

Mr. DUNNING: If my hon. friend will give me the names, I have brought down the files in reference to all these employees and I think we can pick them out.

Mr. BENNETT: The first one was Don Collins.

Mr. DUNNING: Donald Joseph Collins was an engineer operating the dinky locomotive. His rate of pay was 65 cents per hour and the hours worked were June, 30; July, 336¼; August, 351; September, 338 and October, 372½.

Mr. BENNETT: At sixty-five cents per hour?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, with time and a quarter for over ten hours whenever more than ten hours were worked in one day.

Mr. BENNETT: The next was Buck Freeman.

Mr. DUNNING: If the man in question was Charles Freeman, who apparently was the only Freeman we had, he came in as a carpenter at 75 cents per hour and on August 1 was disrated to the status of a labourer and reduced to 45 cents per hour, and he continued in that capacity until October. The number of hours worked were June, 30; July, 340; August, 293; September, 289 and October, 291. From August 1 he was paid 45 cents per hour and prior to that time he received 75 cents.

Mr. BENNETT: At the same rate for overtime?

Mr. DUNNING: The same condition applied to all overtime.

Mr. BENNETT: Is there anything in the records with reference to a man who became mentally deranged and was taken out?

Mr. DUNNING: The engineer advises me that during the winter of 1927-28 there was such a man, but not during the past year. This man went wrong mentally during the winter and was taken out.

Mr. BENNETT: Apparently this man has been confused with someone else. Were the supplies which were purchased for the operation of that camp acquired by tender or otherwise?

Mr. DUNNING: The purchasing department had charge of that in the usual way; I have no personal knowledge of it, but we will get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT: My information is that they were not purchased by tender.

Mr. DUNNING: Undoubedly the general policy of the department is purchase by tender.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the reason for my question. Will the accounts in connection with this expenditure be available? In the answers given the other day before the select standing committee it will be observed that during the

year 1928 over $6,000,000 was expended, and that about $319,000 has been expended under the 1929-30 estimate. Of that expenditure $2,770,000 was made at the Fort Churchill terminal by day work and for material.

Mr. DUNNING: That would probably cover equipment purchased, including the two barges and the tugs, which would account for a very considerable amount.

Mr. BENNETT: There was spent on the railway roughly $3,390,000. The answer given to the first question was that the only contracts let by tender amounted to about $1,270,000, and therefore the balance of the money must have been otherwise expended.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not quite understand that.

Mr. BENNETT: The first question put in the select committee was with regard to contracts, and it was stated that the only contract, which was let to the lowest tenderer, was for $1,270,000. Therefore the remainder of the expenditure must have been made on the basis of day work or under some other scheme worked out by the Canadian National system. I was seeking to ascertain whether it is correct to say that the expenditure, less the amount mentioned as being the amount of that contract, was expended on day work or under the system mentioned in connection with the operations of the Canadian National?

Mr. DUNNING: Subject to this contract into which the Canadian National entered with the Canadian Bridge Company, Limited, for the fabrication, delivery and erection of steel superstructures for two bridges.

Mr. BENNETT: How much was that?

Mr. DUNNING: I will have to refer to the order in council which it was necessary to pass approving of the contract. Section 2 of the order in council states that the lowest tender received was that of the Canadian Bridge Company, Limited, which for both structures amounts to $60,740.90, being $2,109.80 lower than the next tender.

Mr. BENNETT: There seems to be some difficulty there, because in the answer to the question asked in the select standing committee no mention was made of the tender to which the minister has referred. However, we will leave that for the moment; it is quite clear that some $6,000,000 was expended last year, and I am endeavouring to ascertain what part of that amount was expended under contracts which were let after tenders had been called for.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. DUNNING: Expended on the railway?

Mr. BENNETT: The figures with which we have been supplied give the total expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929, as $6,159,562.95, and I am endeavouring to ascertain what part of that amount was expended under contract after tenders were called for.

Mr. DUNNING: Then my hon. friend is including both the port and the railway in his question?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. DUNNING: My deputy advises me that probably the reason why this $60,000 was not included in the railway expenditure was because that contract was let during this railway year. In any case it was not included, but it is the only addition to the figures which have been given in that connection. Now with respect to the port, I am having the matter of supplies checked up, but I never have been advised that anything other than the usual practice of the department has been followed in that regard. The dredges, of course, were constructed under tender and contract, and that applies also to the hopper barge and the scows, and in addition one scow was acquired from the Department of Public Works. Other equipment which was at Nelson and which was still useable was conditioned and removed to Churchill. Nelson accounts would, of course, be credited with the salvage value of the material which was moved from there to Fort Churchill.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a substantial sum of money, $6,000,000.

Mr. DUNNING: The great bulk of it was on railway account.

Mr. BENNETT: At little over half.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. I have the details before me, and my hon. friend will probably be able to follow them. They are as follows:

Dredge Churchill, No. 1	$357,500
Dredge Churchill, No. 2	360,650
Dump Scow	42,000
Hopper Barge, Chesterfield	200,000
Repairs to the Ocean Eagle	18,600
Hopper Barge foremost	90,000
Tug Graham Bell (not yet built)	110,000
Shear Legs	11,200

Mr. BENNETT: Was that all spent in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929?

Mr. DUNNING: The tug Graham Bell is not paid for; all the other items were expended in the fiscal year and would be in-

cluded in the figures. I rather expected that these matters would be examined into in the public accounts committee, and I should be very glad to have that done.

Mr. BENNETT: There was some difficulty in arranging for enough meetings to deal with the matter.

Mr. DUNNING: The details of the expenditure chargeable to capital on the Hudson Bay railway and terminal appear in the Auditor General's report, part W-57.

Mr. BENNETT: And does that cover all the expenditures or only those which were made by the department itself as apart from the expenditures made by the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. DUNNING: The Auditor General's report gives the detailed accounts paid to the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. BENNETT: When I looked through the accounts I assumed that they covered both the departmental expenditures and the railway expenditures.

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: But in view of the answer which the minister gave this afternoon to a question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver Burrard (Mr. Clark), I put this question to the minister: did the railway company call for tenders for any part of the work in connection with the Hudson Bay railway as agents for the department?

Mr. DUNNING: The Canadian National called for tenders for the grading and for the two bridges of which I spoke; with respect to the other supplies with which the department was charged by the Canadian National, such as ties and that sort of thing, they were handled by the purchasing department of the railway under the system which prevails in connection with the purchasing of the railway's own supplies. There is one item which is the subject matter of negotiation between the department and the railway, brought about through number one relay rail being used.

Mr. BENNETT: That is eighty-pound steel.

Mr. DUNNING: Nothing less than eighty pounds. It is necessary to set a price for that material, but the price which is set is the same price as is used by the Canadian National within its own system and in connection with new branch line construction.

Mr. BENNETT: Tenders were called for the grading of 300 miles.

Mr. DUNNING: No, for the grading of the new work.

Mr. BENNETT: How much would that be?

Mr. DUNNING: One hundred and fifty-four miles.

Mr. BENNETT: That would include everything?

Mr. DUNNING: Just the grading.

Mr. BENNETT: But that would include the total mileage?

Mr. DUNNING: The total mileage of new work.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that $1,270,000 contract the contract for the grading?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the only contract there is?

Mr. DUNNING: Other than the contracts for the bridges.

Mr. BENNETT: How much was allowed for extras on the grading, if any?

Mr. DUNNING: There is no allowance; the contract entered into by the Canadian National Railways with the contractor is a unit price contract.

Mr. BENNETT: I will take the answer given before the select committee.

Mr. DUNNING: That answer was based upon the computation of the quantities involved.

Mr. BENNETT: In order that the minister may not be misled, I will read the question. It is as follows:

How many tenders were received, and what was the figure in each instance?

The answer given is as follows:

Seven. $1,270,100; $1,377,700; $1,388,300; $1,496,500; $1,836,150; $1,855,450; $1,899,100.

Mr. DUNNING: Grading contracts are made on unit price tenders and the figures are extended using the same multiplication factor which, as my hon. friend knows, is the number of units estimated by the engineers to be involved in the job. That computation was carried out in this case and the gross amount arrived at, assuming that the yardage is correct, was the figure given in reply.

Mr. BENNETT: How much did it cost?

Mr. DUNNING: Of course the contract is not completed.

Mr. BENNETT: The grading is finished.

Mr. DUNNING: As I said this afternoon, there are nearly one hundred miles of skeleton track.

Mr. BENNETT: And that is just laid on the frozen ground?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: How much has been paid thus far on the contract?

Mr. DUNNING: I have not that information before me.

Mr. BENNETT: I would like to have that because it involves the question of classification, about which there are so many stories.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not anticipate that there will be any classification difficulties in this case, because there is comparatively little rock along that section.

Mr. GOTT: The minister is in apparent good health; could not he raise his voice a little?

Mr. DUNNING: I will do the best I can.

Mr. BENNETT: I have no desire to inconvenience the minister.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall get that information.

Mr. BENNETT: Any one reading the statement made in the select committee would assume that a contract was let for the grading at a price of $1,270,000; as a matter of fact, the minister says that this work is let on a unit basis.

Mr. DUNNING: All such contracts are.

Mr. BENNETT: As the work is not finished, I should like to know how much has been paid out. Who was the contractor?

Mr. DUNNING: Stewart & Cameron.

Mr. BENNETT: What was the unit cost? I should like to have that information for a very special reason?

Mr. DUNNING: I have a schedule here which I will read. The contract is made up of the following schedule of prices, in the usual form which the railway company uses for this purpose.

Mr. BENNETT: I would like the unit cost of each item.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. DUNNING: The unit cost alone, or the estimated quantity and the unit cost?

Mr. BENNETT: The estimated quantity and the unit cost.

Mr. DUNNING: The statement is as follows:

	Unit cost
Clearing, 2,200 acres	$30 00
Grubbing, 1,200 acres	75 00
Cross-waying, 10,000 square feet	100 00
	per 100 units
Solid rock, 5,000 cubic yards	2 00
Loose rock, 10,000 cubic yards	1 00
Hard-pan, 25,000 cubic yards	50
Earth or other material, 2,960,000 cubic yards	35
Over-haul, per 100 feet over 500 feet free-haul, 40,000 cubic yards	05
Riprap, 1,000 cubic yards	3 00
Culvert excavation, 10,000 cubic yards	40
Freighting supplies, et cetera, 14,000 ton miles	1 00
Cross-cutting winter roads, 80 acres	45 00
Cordwood for fuel in engineer's construction camp, 500 cords	10 00
Supplying of material for and erection, of four log houses for engineers' headquarters, lump sum of	4,000 00

Those things that are dealt with are in accordance with the call for tenders. Then the quantities are extended in the contract, making up the total referred to. I will find out just how much has been expended to date and give my hon. friend the information later. I do not know that I can get that to-night.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister realizes what I want. Owing to the difficulty in the public accounts committee, I want to know what sum has been paid that contractor.

Mr. DUNNING: I will get it.

Mr. BENNETT: I want to know also what amount of the work is still undone; what sums were paid as extras, if any; what variations of classification, if any, were made.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member means in quantity of each classification?

Mr. BENNETT: Not quantities at all. The engineers' estimates upon which payments were made, classified the material in a certain way, and I would like to know what those classifications were and whether, in the aggregate, there was a variation between that and the estimate of the engineers when the tenders were called for.

Mr. DUNNING: I shall be glad to get that information.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister cannot get it now?

Mr. DUNNING: No, and my hon. friend will appreciate the fact that the work not being completed and these quantities being aggregated as estimated quantities, I doubt whether—

Mr. BENNETT: That is exactly the reason I am asking for this information. Does the minister realize what I mean? That is a contract based upon unit costs on an estimate of material. I want to know how much the total is. It amounts, I understand to $1,270,000, as the minister stated.

Mr. DUNNING: Assuming the quantities were correct.

Mr. BENNETT: I want to see the variation between the quantities which it was alleged were the quantities upon which payment has been made to date, and conditions as indicated by the contract, and I should like to know what the classification was with regard to rock, riprap, hardpan and so forth; that is the engineers' classification upon which payment was made. Who is the supervising engineer?

Mr. DUNNING: The chief engineer of construction of the Canadian National, Mr. Gzowski, is in supreme charge.

Mr. BENNETT: But who is the supervising engineer who classified and estimated the quantities?

Mr. DUNNING: Mr. H. A. Dixon, chief engineer of the western region is, I am advised, responsible for the classification of work in that region and for the estimating of the quantities.

Mr. BENNETT: Who was on the job?

Mr. DUNNING: The man on the job is Major J. G. McLachlan.

Mr. BENNETT: Was he on the job all the time?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes, the Canadian National put him on the job when rehabilitation first commenced.

Mr. BENNETT: And he has been there continuously since then?

Mr. DUNNING: I think so.

Mr. BENNETT: Could the minister look up the correspondence between the late deputy minister and Major McLachlan by telegram and letter as to classification? I understand the minister himself to say he knows nothing about it.

Mr. DUNNING: The present deputy advises me that he knows of no such correspondence on the part of the late deputy minister, but we shall have that looked up.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister must have the last estimate, because it usually recites the previous one upon which payments were made, showing the advances made to the contractor.

Mr. DUNNING: We shall get that.

Mr. CLARK: The minister stated that he had some answers to give to me.

Mr. DUNNING: I understood they were included in the answer I gave a moment ago as to the contracts let by the Canadian National on the construction of the road. I answered a similar question put by the leader of the opposition as regards the contract for the grading and the $60,000 contracts let by the Canadian National for the building of two steel bridges.

Mr. CLARK: Were the amounts and names of the contractors given?

Mr. DUNNING: As regards the grading, the contractors were Stewart and Cameron under another contract price which we have just been discussing, amounting, on the basis of the estimated quantities, to $1,270,000, and for the two steel bridges the contractors were the Canadian Bridge Company of Walkerville, the two contracts amounting to $60,000 for the superstructure, The substructures were erected by the Canadian National's own forces.

I should like to make just a general statement regarding the work which was carried out last year, in justice to the men engaged in and controlling it. The department and the Canadian National are well satisfied with the work which the men responsible were able to carry out last year under very difficult conditions. The work done in preparation for this year's work certainly merits appreciation on our part. The men worked well. The department endeavoured to feed them well, and so far as the Canadian National forces were concerned, their work was undoubtedly appreciated by the department. In respect to the answers that I may give on behalf of the Canadian National, I would naturally prefer that the officers of the company might be in a position to give that information directly. That was our intention in the special committee. The point arose early in the sessions of the special committee as to whether questions relating to the Hudson Bay railway would be answered

before that committee. Sir Henry Thornton stated that he would be very glad to have his officers give information to the committee in connection with the work done by the company on the Hudson Bay railway in exactly the same way as they were prepared to give information respecting any other railway.

Mr. BENNETT: What was the date of the grading contract?

Mr. DUNNING: I will give that in a moment. To continue my statement, the committee was very busy in connection with an exhaustive examination of the general accounts of the Canadian National railway, and not much time was spent on the Hudson Bay railway. I think the hon. member for Vancouver Centre presented some questions in writing which were answered by the department or by the railways, and there was not much discussion. I think it would be better in connection with this work, as in connection with all Canadian National railway work, to examine wherever practicable the officers of the railway concerned in the work. The department has to deal with this matter entirely as it would deal with an ordinary Canadian National piece of construction, and I feel sure that the officers of the company would be just as ready to give information respecting it as they would with respect to any other line that they may have under construction. The date of the contract was November 1, 1927.

Mr. BENNETT: Providing for completion on or before when?

Mr. DUNNING: Time for completion, from mileage 356.5 to mileage 450, by October 15, 1928; from mileage 450 to Churchill by September 1, 1929.

Mr. BENNETT: The part that was to be completed by 1928 was completed within the time limit?

Mr. DUNNING: That is my information.

Mr. BENNETT: It will be observed that the whole was to be completed by September, 1929; that is some time hence. The reason I am asking these questions must be apparent to the minister. Since the contract was awarded we have spent over $6,000,000 on the railway. The minister has said that much of the grading still remains to be done. I am endeavouring to ascertain how much has been paid to these grading contractors.

Mr. DUNNING: I will get the figures for my hon. friend. I think my hon. friend forgets that a skeleton track has been laid from the end of the grade, from mileage 450 to Fort Churchill, and that includes all the rails and ties involved in that. However, I will get the figures and give the information later.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the minister would do this. We will complete as nearly as possible the discussion on this item, and then perhaps the minister can report progress and we can conclude the discussion in the light of the information that the minister will supply on Monday. The Minister of Finance spoke to me before dinner and said that one of his colleagues would be ready to go on, because I anticipated that the Minister of Railways would not be able to give all this information this evening. Perhaps the minister might be able to go on with some canal items, and this item might stand in the meantime.

Mr. THORSON: Perhaps the hon. leader of the opposition after his lengthy cross-examination of the Minister of Railways, has now received sufficient information to enable him to communicate to the committee whether he has changed the opposition which he displayed towards the construction of the Hudson Bay railway in 1926, when he stated to the committee that he was opposed to the construction of a single additional foot on the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. BENNETT: Go on and give the rest. Here is a gentleman who poses as the dean of a law school. He may be able to take hon. gentlemen's amendments away from them and appropriate them as his own, but he cannot make a citation and call himself a member of the profession if he quotes only the part that suits himself.

Mr. THORSON: I am asking whether he has that additional knowledge now to enable him to indicate to the committee whether he is of the same view with regard to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway and the terminals as he was in 1926. The leader of the opposition prides himself on his excellent memory.

Mr. BENNETT: He does not.

Mr. THORSON: I must give him credit for possessing a splendid memory. He gave a splendid example of it this morning. He said in 1926—

Mr. BENNETT: In this house.

Mr. THORSON: Yes:

From the information I have I could not under any circumstances vote to extend the railway a single foot beyond the present end of steel.

Further on he gave some reasons for his opposition to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. He gave as one of his reasons the opening of the Panama canal and the possibility that wheat might be diverted from its present channels and go to the markets of the world through the Panama canal. Secondly, he gave as another reason that it would divert traffic from the Canadian National railway. Throughout his speech is one of opposition to further construction of the Hudson Bay railway. Is the hon. leader of the opposition now in possession of sufficient information to enable him to say to this committee that he is now favourable to the construction and completion of the Hudson Bay railway, or is he of the same view that he held in 1926 when he opposed the construction of a single additional foot of the Hudson Bay railway? I am sure that this committee would be interested in knowing what his views are and whether his opposition to the Hudson Bay railway scheme has altered or not.

Mr. BENNETT: I can readily understand the distrust which those who have to deal with the hon. member have. Twice within the last five minutes he has left an entirely erroneous impression. I said, "from the information I then had" He commenced his question by leaving that out and also wound up his question by leaving it out. What sort of mentality has a man who is supposed to teach the young men the ethics of the profession and who will make a citation in part and leave out the vital part?

Mr. THORSON: I read the whole of it.

Mr. BENNETT: Not until you were driven to it—like the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg which he appropriated as his own. Let us deal with what took place in 1911. I came to this house and in the first speech that I made to this house I declared unequivocally for the Hudson Bay railway and for its immediate completion, and I gave reasons for it. In the meantime, from 1911 to 1926, certain events happened in this country through the action of the hon. gentleman's friends in connection with the National Transcontinental, the Grand Trunk, and the Canadian Northern railway company, that brought disaster on this country financially in connection with its railways. The hon. gentleman seems not to have memory enough to remember it. I am glad that I remember these things. I came to this house and I made that statement. Now the hon. gentleman at this late date, in 1929, wants to know what my opinion is. I pointed out in 1926 that from the information I then had I did not feel warranted in supporting it, but this house did appropriate the money, and in 1926 when the election was on, my then leader read a statement which I read to the electors of Portage la Prairie, and which was misstated in the press, just as the hon. gentleman is misstating my attitude to-night. This misstatement resulted in my having to go to a great deal of trouble and effort to secure from the Canadian press a statement that was made in every daily newspaper in Canada that my attitude had been misrepresented and that an injustice had been done to me, when in fact I had repeated the language of my leader in Portage la Prairie. I still say we have not yet proven that as a grain route the Hudson Bay railway is a success. It was built as such, but a continuation or extension of the precambrian field into that particular country and the construction of this line gives promise of its being a success. This is the story; the Conservative party up to 1922 spent $14,467,000 on the road, and since that time ten million dollars have been spent. It is true that there have been spent on Port Nelson some six million dollars, and a little over three and a half million dollars have been spent on Churchill since that port was selected. So far as I am concerned, my position is a very simple one. When this country's financial burdens were great after the war, when this country was in grave difficulty in connection with her national expenditures, I placed myself on record as requiring further information before I could throw myself wholeheartedly into this enterprise, to which I had given my fullest support, with all the power at my command, when I came into this house in 1911 and made my first speech in it. The Minister of Railways spoke this afternoon of stating half the facts and thereby misstating the whole truth. That is the kind of language he used this afternoon, but the hon. gentleman who has spoken chooses to read a part and then leave the rest out. I have only this to say; the minister knows perfectly well that what I said was the opinion of most of his friends with respect to this enterprise. I am one of those who believe

that it is always desirable to cut your garment according to your cloth, and everything I said in the House of Commons in 1926 with respect to the Hudson Bay railway, if read in its entirety, will bear out what I said. If we had plenty of money, few obligations, few liabilities, there is no reason why we should not have gone ahead in 1911 and completed the enterprise quickly. The minister himself said in 1926 what his proposals were with respect to the matter, but mineral discoveries have made it possible to proceed with more expedition than we otherwise would, and with more confidence, which is more to the point.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not want to get into this fight, but if my hon. friend will please refrain from quoting me he would be on safer ground.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister's speech is on Hansard.

Mr. DUNNING: I would much prefer to have it quoted from Hansard.

Mr. BENNETT: Than from my memory. He is quite right. I hesitate to rely upon my memory, in this house or elsewhere. I desire to rely on the record as far as possible.

Mr. THORSON: I asked the hon. leader of the opposition to indicate whether from the information which he has now obtained he is favourable to the Hudson Bay railway since in 1926 he was opposed to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. He certainly left the impression upon his own followers in the house that he was opposed to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. He may have advanced as a reason for that position the fact that he had not sufficient information at his disposal. But I should like to ask this committee whether we would have had the Hudson Bay railway in as advanced a state of completion as it is to-day if the members of the government had taken the same attitude towards it as the hon. leader of the opposition took to the construction of it at that time. There could be no doubt whatsoever in the minds of the people of western Canada what the attitude of the hon. leader of the opposition was with regard to the Hudson Bay railway, and had it prevailed we would not now have steel laid to Churchill.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BENNETT: I suggested to the minister that the matter should stand, and that we should proceed with the other items, so that the questions he will answer might be dealt with.

Item stands.

Trent canal—construction and betterments, $13,300.

An hon. MEMBER: Explain.

Mr. DUNNING: For the acquisition of additional land submerged or affected by canal construction in 1904 on the Balsam-Simcoe subdivision; $4,000 outstanding and new claims for right of way, damages, legal fees, and so forth, $4,500, the whole of which is a revote, and lockmaster's house, $4,800.

Item agreed to.

Welland ship canal—construction, $10,000,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): May I ask the minister if the date set for the opening is the same as that set last year?

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend said "the date set". He will remember that one year ago I was very careful to say that I would not indicate definitely the date, but that our expectation was during 1930. We still have that expectation. There is no reason at the present time for us to change our view in that regard.

Item agreed to.

To provide for contribution of $32,000 to the town of Thorold and $18,000 to the village of Merritton towards the costs of constructing filtration system, $50,000.

Mr. FRASER: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. DUNNING: For many years the town of Thorold and the village of Merritton have been obtaining their domestic water supply from the summit level of the Welland canal under leases from the Department of Railways and Canals, and under which the department assumes no liability as to the purity or other conditions of the water.

Until construction operations commenced on sections Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the Welland ship canal, this source of supply was satisfactory but the extensive dredging necessary for these portions of the ship canal work has during the past several seasons made the waters in the summit level of the Welland canal turbid and unsafe for domestic use—these conditions prevailing in spite of the

fact that the contractors for the various sections have taken every reasonable precaution to reduce to a minimum the turbidity of the water resulting from their dredging operation.

By reason of the unsatisfactory condition of the water supply the board of health of the province of Ontario, in the interest of public health, instructed both the town of Thorold and the village of Merritton to install filtration plants in their water supply systems, and, although the department has no legal liability in either case, the capital expenditures by these municipalities consequent upon the instructions of the provincial board of health have been largely necessary by reason of the unavoidable condition of the waters of the Welland canal resulting from the construction of the Welland ship canal. It is really on compassionate grounds, if one can view it that way. I do not anticipate much opposition from the other side. There might be if the constituencies were Liberal, but I feel sure there will be no opposition.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not think the remark of the minister is called for.

Mr. POWER: Not at all.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not think the minister has any right to say there is no legal responsibility and that the question is merely a moral one. As a matter of fact, the minister knows, and I know, that a former minister of the crown, when the Welland canal was originally projected, agreed with all these municipalities to take care of their water supply and this is the outcome of that agreement. That is all there is to it.

Mr. DUNNING: I have met the situation to the best of my ability, but I am bound to stand behind the opinion of the Department of Justice, that there is no legal liability. Be that as it may, I can say something that will please my hon. friend. In the supplementary estimates I hope to take care of St. Catharines as well.

Mr. POWER: I understood yesterday from the Minister of Finance that it was not considered proper for any minister to disclose in advance what was going to come down in the supplementary estimates, and it is particularly improper for the minister to disclose to hon. members opposite anything so agreeable.

Item agreed to.

Trent canal—improvements, $274,175.

Mr. STINSON: Will the minister explain this vote?

Mr. DUNNING: The amount required is made up of the following items:

Item			
	A.—Eastern Division		
1.	Gate building plant and construction of replace gates. (Revote $6,000)	$10,000	
2.	Dredging.. (Revote 10,000)	17,500	
3.	Concrete protection at toe of canal embankment, dam No. 6..	6,500	
4.	Concrete protection to slope below dam No. 3..	3,000	
5.	Concrete piers and walls—dam at outlet of Grace and dark lakes..	4,200	
6.	Dam at outlet of Farquhar lake..	4,750	
7.	Reconstruction of timber dam at outlet of Crab lake..	4,500	
8.	Reconstruction of timber dam at outlet of Trout lake..	3,000	
9.	Rebuilding and repairs to reservoir dams.. (Revote 2,000)	10,000	
10.	Miscellaneous .. (Revote 2,450)	6,000	
			$ 69,450
	B.—Western Division		
11.	Dam at lock 25.. (Revote 60,000)	85,000	
12.	Dam at lock 22..	40,000	
13.	Cement.. (Revote 14,000)	20,500	
14.	Motor truck for use on Severn subdivision..	650	
15.	Wharf at Port Severn..	1,200	
16.	Removal of rock and other excavated material from east side of Couchiching lock.. (Revote 1,000)	1,000	
17.	Two gas light outfits..	650	
18.	Forest fire pump for Severn subdivision..	725	
19.	Miscellaneous surveys, investigations, etc..	2,000	
20.	Engineering staff, salaries and working expenses.. (Revote 6,000)	53,000	
			204,725
	Total..		$274,175

Item agreed to.

Welland canal—improvements, $30,000.

Mr. SPENCER: When will this work be finished.

Mr. DUNNING: This is for the existing Welland canal. We are still hopeful of opening the new canal in its entirety some time during the summer or fall of 1930. I do not wish that to be taken as a promise because large undertakings of this kind sometimes involve unforeseen delays, but that is our expectation.

Item agreed to.

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada: maintenance and operation, $309,220.

Mr. SPENCER: Can the minister give us the reason for this increase?

Mr. DUNNING: Statutory increases and new positions involve an increase of $18,180; reductions amounting to $1,560 deducted from that figure leave a total of $16,620.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Are motor cars supplied to members of the board, and if so, to what members?

Mr. DUNNING: There is an item here for one official car, $3,000; but that amount is for the maintenance of the official railway car of the board, and there is nothing in this vote for the maintenance of any automobiles.

Mr. BENNETT: Could the minister say when Mr. Commissioner Norris resigned as a member of the legislature of Manitoba? If my information is correct he continued to be a member of the legislature long after he was appointed to the board and did not resign his seat in Lansdowne until it suited the convenience of Mr. Bracken to have him do so. It has been suggested to me that we should have some statement as to whether a man should be eligible for an appointment of this kind while still a member of a provincial legislature, and I would like to know definitely when he resigned.

Mr. DUNNING: I have not the information before me, but I will obtain it for my hon. friend, perhaps he might allow this item to pass in the meantime.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous services, including salaries and expenses of experts employed temporarily, $38,000.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Does this item include Mr. Palmer's recent fee?

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—railways and canals—including H. F. Alward, solicitor and counsel at $6,000, $274,065; contingencies, $8,900.

Mr. FRASER: In connection with this vote I should like to ask the minister whether the officials of this department who have to do with the collection of revenue are bonded?

Mr. DUNNING: As a matter of fact most of the revenue of the department is not handled by the officers but comes in the way of payment on leases and that sort of thing. However, wharfage fees are collected at some points and I am finding out now as to the officials who are responsible for the collection of those fees.

Mr. FRASER: What revenue is collected by the department?

Mr. DUNNING: For the last fiscal year the total revenue of the department was $1,237,022.98. I notice one item here under the heading of miscellaneous revenue, "wharfage and storage"; that amounted in all to just $40,000. I will procure the information with regard to the bonding of employees and give it to my hon. friend on any item, if that will serve his purpose.

Mr. FRASER: I have some further questions along the same line. I do not know whether or not the minister was in the house the other day when I put certain questions to the Minister of Immigration—

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. FRASER: Then I will read the question, which I asked of the several departments of the government:

> How much of the consolidated revenue has been paid by each of the departments of the government as premiums on security bonds of its employees, in contravention of the Public Officers Act, R.S., chapter 164, section 5?

This was passed as an order for return, but I find that no reply was received from the Department of Railways and Canals. The officials of this department collect a substantial amount of revenue and I should like to know why the requirements of the statute are not complied with and why the question was not answered.

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry, but my officials do not recall any return of that nature to which an answer was not given. I must have my hon. friend's statement checked up, but I can assure him that officials of the department who do collect revenue are bonded.

Mr. FRASER: Are they bonded under a guarantee company or do you carry the insurance yourself?

Mr. DUNNING: It is under a guarantee company.

Mr. FRASER: Answers to this question were not received from the Departments of Labour, National Defence, Justice, External Affairs, Agriculture, Post Office, Railways and Canals and Public Works. I should like to have those answers.

Mr. ROBB: I directed the attention of the officials of the treasury board to the questions asked by my hon. friend the other night and requested them to prepare for me a complete statement, since I expected the matter to come up later. I hope to be able to have that information for my hon. friend early in the week.

Mr. FRASER: For all departments?

Mr. ROBB: I will ask for a statement from all departments.

Mr. FRASER: Under section 12 of the Public Officers Act each department is required to register with the Secretary of State within one month after the bond is entered into a statement of that bond. I have a statement which was laid upon the table and I find no return from the Railway department. Section 32 of the act provides that a report is to be laid upon the table within fifteen days after the session opens. This report was tabled but the information contained therein is very meagre; there are only 38 bonds registered for all departments, and those which are registered involve quite small amounts. I do not think this question of the bonding of officials is being followed up as it should be.

Mr. ROBB: With regard to the question asked the other evening by my hon. friend, I have directed the attention of the officials to the matter of the legality of the payments referred to in my hon. friend's question, and I have asked them to obtain an opinion from the Department of Justice.

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps the matter which I would like to discuss, Mr. Chairman, is not entirely appropriate to this item, but it is near enough. I suppose we are allowed a certain latitude of give and take in discussing these estimates especially when they are being put through so quickly.

On January 16 of this year, Mr. G. G. McGeer, on behalf of the council of the United Farmers of British Columbia, presented an appeal by way of a petition to the privy council, which in this case is the cabinet, against certain rates from the prairies to the coast. I am not going to start at this day and date to argue the whole question; I desire only to indicate briefly the situation and ask the minister when a decision is likely to be given. The question at issue is the discriminatory rates allowed on wheat for export going from the prairies to British Columbia, as compared with the rates on wheat of an inferior grade for domestic consumption. The export wheat is generally numbers 1, 2 and 3, while the domestic wheat used for poultry feed is generally numbers 5 and 6, yet the more valuable wheat takes a rate less than half the rate charged for the inferior grade. The rate on export wheat from a central point of the prairies to Vancouver is 21 cents per hundred, and the rate on wheat for domestic use in British Columbia, taken out under identically the same conditions, is 41½ cents; a very heavy discrimination. It was brought out in the argument that Alberta grain could be landed in Yokohama for 50 cents a ton less than the same grain could be landed in Vancouver for domestic use. It would seem more profitable for our poultrymen to migrate to China and raise their eggs there and ship them to Canada. It was shown that the difference in rates amounted to something like $1,000,000 a year to our British Columbia poultrymen. The cry is being raised for protection against eggs coming in from the United States and China, but here is a method which can be used, without raising the bogey of a tariff, which would give very substantial relief. The Minister of Railways will probably offer the time-honoured argument that export rates throughout the world always take a lower rating. I do not think that that argument will apply in this case, because there is no competing water route. In most cases where a lower export rate is quoted it is generally quoted in connection with water competition in whole or part, but there is no such thing as water competition between Calgary and Vancouver. Even allowing that the export rates should be lower—I do not allow that proposition, and the argument of Mr. McGeer does not allow it; in fact, he argues against it quite successfully, I think—than the rates for domestic use, I would point out that perhaps ten years ago there was a certain spread between the two rates. But in the course of time, through the application of various legislative enactments, the export rate has been reduced but the spread was not reduced accordingly. The export rate was reduced again but the spread still increases. Assuming that the spread between the export rate and the domestic rate ten years ago, was just and fair, which I do not agree to, it cannot be just and fair to-day, because that spread has been increasing. As each successive decrease in the export rate was made no appropriate and corresponding reduction was made in the domestic rate, so

that to-day the spread between the two rates is something like double what it was a few years ago.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. DUNNING: Mr. Chairman, this is an important point which I think will have to be decided now because of the possibility of this discussion extending. We are now in this position; the parties have appealed to the privy council, from the decision of the Board of Railway Commissioners in a particular case. The hon. member is now asking me a question and I am in the position presumably of being one of the judges of the court which will be trying this case. I do not know much about the rules of the house, but I do know that I cannot enter into a discussion with respect to a matter which I shall be compelled to hear in a quasi-judicial capacity. I do not object to my hon. friend bringing up this subject during the discussion of my civil government estimates, although, as he himself acknowledges, it hardly relates to that matter; but when I see indications of its developing into a debate I think it well to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the position into which we may be driven. I can give my hon. friend this information without any impropriety: the privy council has set the date of the hearing, I believe for some time in September. I can confirm that date with the clerk of the privy council, but in any case the date of the hearing has been set.

Mr. NEILL: The matter has not come up yet?

Mr. LADNER: When the minister rose I was on my feet intending to raise the point which the minister referred to. Not that I disagree at all with the argument of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, on the contrary, I support it enthusiastically, but there is a certain form of procedure in our judicial system, which in my judgment—I think when the hon. member's attention is drawn to it, he will agree—should be followed with respect to these matters. As a matter of fact I am acting as counsel for the government of British Columbia and have in hand an appeal covering the same subject matter in which the United Farmers are interested. Although tempted many times to do so, I have refrained from discussing this matter, which is one of extreme importance to the people of British Columbia and of the prairies. It is an appeal from the Board of Railway Commissioners, a judicial body, to the Privy Council of Canada, another judicial body. Under the practice of our courts it is not considered good form, in respect to matters occupying such a position, either to spread propaganda or to discuss them in parliament or the press. I submit to my hon. friend, although I heartily concur in the viewpoint he has placed before the committee, that this is not the place to enter into the matter; otherwise it would invite a general discussion, and I have in my room upstairs an argument which would take three or four hours to deliver and which could be submitted with advantage to my province.

Mr. NEILL: I thank the minister for his courtesy in allowing me to introduce this in not exactly the technically correct place. He has stated that the case is now before the privy council and that he does not wish to prejudge it now. I can quite appreciate that. He states it will not be heard until September. That is all, I presume, I can do in the matter just now. But this house being the highest court in Canada—and the Minister of Railways says he is one of the judges—I know of no better occasion than here and now to present my views before the minister on behalf of British Columbia.

Mr. KELLNER: I wish to submit, on a point of order, that the question which was introduced by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is not the question which is submitted to the governor in council. The question which I understand, is submitted to them is that of Crowsnest rates not applying on Alberta grain going to the coast. The question my hon. friend introduced was as to the discrimination between domestic and export rates, a different question entirely. During the session of 1925, when the Railway Act was before the house, we had the assurance of the Prime Minister and, I think, of the Minister of Railways as well, that the Crowsnest rates would be made applicable to grain going from Alberta to the coast. That is the question which, I submit, is shortly to be brought before the governor in council, and not the question of discrimination between domestic and export rates.

Mr. DUNNING: I can assure my hon. friend that he is under a misapprehension in that respect.

Mr. BENNETT: One of the anomalies of our present system is that after the Board of Railway Commissioners has dealt with a matter there is an appeal to the governor general in council, that is the privy council, which is a political tribunal. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will recall that one of the leading journals of western Canada a few months ago pointed out that in the end this meant that governments must accept re-

sponsibility in connection with even matters of freight rates, although a tribunal was appointed that heard the case in the first instance. I said to my hon. friend from Vancouver South, who has been retained to act in this matter, that clearly no answer could be given by the Minister of Railways in connection with it because he could not give an answer on an ex parte statement by the hon. member himself, and to involve us in an argument would probably take longer time than the hon. gentleman would care to give to the question. But we have the anomaly that while there is an appeal on a question of law under certain circumstances to the Supreme Court of Canada, there is an appeal on questions of fact to the privy council which is a political body, and that involves, it seems to me, with all due deference, a prohibition against the minister giving answers to questions that are asked in the House of Commons touching matters that must be considered by him and his colleagues who must give judgment after hearing all parties concerned.

Item agreed to.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—canals—staff and repairs, $2,690,812.

Mr. BENNETT: Before we dispose of this item, I had intended to ask the minister some questions with respect to the item of civil government and particularly with reference to the salary of the deputy minister. I was under the impression the civil government item had not passed. I think the house is entitled to a statement in this regard in view of the dual position which the deputy minister occupies as a director of the Canadian National railway system and Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. The position is somewhat anomalous and may lead hereafter to some difficulties. I think it is not an unfair request that the minister should make a statement to the committee.

Mr. DUNNING: The item being passed, I do not wish to revert to it, but I will make a brief statement of the position. The house, of course, is aware of the serious loss which the department and the service of the country suffered in the death of the late deputy minister, Major Graham Bell, who had been a servant of Canada for more than thirty-eight years in various capacities, rising to Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals and a director of the Canadian National Railways. The problem of replacing Major Bell was a very difficult one. After casting around, the government determined on the appointment of the present deputy minister, Mr. R. A. C. Henry, who had had a number of years' experience in the department and who, since reorganization, had been in the service of the Canadian National Railways as Director of the Bureau of Economics. I think all will acknowledge that Mr. Henry is eminently qualified in every way to serve. Frankly, I do not think I need enlarge upon the difficulty of securing, at the salary usually available for a deputy minister, the services of a man of the type required, who has to deal day by day with the high officers of the two great railway corporations. After the problem had been considered, it was decided to appoint Mr. Henry to the position at the salary usually accorded a deputy minister, to appoint him director of the Canadian National Railways, as his predecessor, Major Bell, had previously been, and, in addition, to take a few months of actual experience in the work to find out what extent the Canadian National Railways might properly be charged with a portion of his salary in respect to the services rendered as director of that institution. When I say a portion of his salary, I mean the enlargement of his salary beyond the amount ordinarily paid to a deputy minister. The committee will understand the problem when I say that Mr. Henry was receiving as Director of Economics of the Canadian National Railways more than half as much again as a deputy minister's salary. It is one of those difficulties which arise in connection with departments of this type dealing with such large affairs and requiring of its deputy minister a degree of ability and experience which the customary salary, as allowed by parliament, will not command. That is the difficulty, and I may tell the leader of the opposition that, as to the ultimate arrangement, nothing definite can be said to be settled. It was highly important that a capable and efficient deputy minister should be appointed. That was the first essential to keep the service operating and I am sure all who know Mr. Henry will applaud his selection, which I recommended to the government from the point of view of efficiency, ability and knowledge required. I am hoping that we shall succeed in making arrangements to retain Mr. Henry's services permanently. The problem had to be met immediately, and while I appreciate fully the difficulties involved, the solution arrived at is, I think, the best possible having regard to all the circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT: The situation is obviously an embarrassing one to deal with. I have heard nothing but the highest recommendation and commendation of the gentleman in

question. But apart altogether from the National Railway and leaving out the Canadian Pacific, it must be remembered that we have in Canada the Michigan Central railway, the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, and one or two other independent lines, the first named being the most important of them. The difficulty is that under the act the Department of Railways and Canals and the deputy minister must deal with problems of very great importance affecting sometimes questions that intimately concern the operations of the road of which the deputy minister is a director, and it is not right to ask the gentleman to assume responsibility as a director, and then act in a judicial capacity in establishing relations between his company and other companies under the act in question. The position with Mr. Bell was entirely different. He was merely a nominal director of the Canadian Northern acting as a liaison officer between the government and the railway. The present incumbent occupied a position of great importance with the railway company and has now assumed the position of deputy minister, and it is very difficult to divorce a lifelong association with the railway company from one's duties in a new capacity. Until 1911, during a number of the formative years of my life, I was associated with a railway company, and for many years afterwards I found it exceedingly difficult to approach problems with that free and disinterested mind which is absolutely essential for the conduct of business. I merely mention that because it does appear to me that the difficulty is much greater than the minister has indicated. There are very serious problems with which the deputy minister has to deal, and there are unconscious influences that shade and temper one's judgment, as I learned in my own life during a period of five or six years after I divorced myself from my previous employment with a railway company. That is a fact that cannot be lightly disregarded. I mention it because I think it is in the public interest that it should be mentioned. It is not a pleasant thing to refer to on the floor of the house, but the minister must realize that in the conduct of public business there are duties cast on those who sit to the left of the Speaker which are not pleasant but which must be discharged if it is not fairly to be said that they are derelict to the duties devolving upon them.

Mr. DUNNING: These further remarks move me to say that both the minister and the deputy minister of railways are in a somewhat anomalous position in view of the present railway situation in Canada. Under the Railway Act of Canada the minister and also the deputy minister have a definite statutory relationship and responsibility with respect to all the railways of Canada, but with respect to the Canadian National railway the minister occupies the position of representing the proprietors. He is, of course, for that reason open—I will not say to the suspicion—but to conjecture that he might be inclined to favour the Canadian National system. In my capacity as Minister of Railways I have tried to be as judicial as one humanly can, and the deputy minister is just as capable, if not more capable than myself, of absolute fairness in these matters. But there is this to be remembered, which will be of some comfort to the hon. leader of the opposition, and I am sure he knows it already: that since the institution of the Board of Railway Commissioners the major part of what might be called the judicial functions of the minister and the deputy minister as between the different railways has been transferred to the board.

Mr. BENNETT: Not wholly.

Mr. DUNNING: Not wholly; because it is impossible to transfer them wholly, but certainly that anomalous position has been lessened by recent developments. I make no complaint over the question being raised by my hon. friend. I deem it of vital importance to the conduct of the Department of Railways and Canals that I should secure as deputy a man having the experience, training and ability, beyond all question, to deal with all phases of the department's work, and I am satisfied that in Mr. Henry I have such a man.

Mr. BENNETT: Would it not be desirable that the country should pay him a salary commensurate with his work on the principle enunciated in connection with the post office workers that the labourer is worthy of his hire? The deputy minister, with the best intentions in the world, sits at the board and arrives at a conclusion with respect to a matter of policy that greatly affects the interests of one or two or three of the other railways in this country. He must then give effect to that policy in his capacity as deputy minister so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned with administration in connection with that policy, and it is placing upon him a burden that is very difficult. He has to make invidious distinctions which, although I think he is a very highly trained officer, he must at times find it a little difficult to make. An ordinary person such as myself found that difficulty very

acute from 1911 to 1916. I should like to see the country pay a sum for such services as would gratify the wish of the minister that he should have about him a deputy upon whose judgment, knowledge and ability he can with confidence rely.

Mr. DUNNING: The situation in that regard is, as I indicated, still unsettled. I shall bear in mind my hon. friend's observations, although I would point out that if we once concede, as I think we must, that Canada's tremendous railway interests demand that the Deputy Minister of Railways should be a man capable of acting at least as vice-president of a railway corporation,, then the magnitude of the problem from the point of view of adequate remuneration becomes apparent. I shall not discuss it further except to thank hon. members opposite for the manner in which they have referred to the matter.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does this department have control over the right of way of steamships passing through the canals?

Mr. DUNNING: Yes. We control the flow of traffic through the canals.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Then I have three complaints which I would like to bring to the minister's notice. I tried to bring them up last year, but no action was taken. First, certain boats have right of way over all others. Second, there is the right of way that is given to what is known as package freighters, but there is a complaint that this right of way is given to package freighters carrying non-perishable fruit and that any boat not classed as such, when it comes to the entrance of the canal, may have to wait some hours till these other boats go through. The third complaint is that two American boats known as the Twin Ports and Twin Cities ran all last summer with right of way in Canadian canals which was not granted them in their own American canals. This right of way was given to the Twin Ports and the Twin Cities over the steamship Keystate. The complaint says that all last year and this year these two boats have been given the right of way. They are a faster boat and the same right of way is not given them over their own American canals.

Mr. DUNNING: I remember my hon. friend raising the matter a year ago, and I am not sure that I then read the regulation. So far as the three boats which he mentions are concerned, it is a question of which class they fall into under the regulations. I will read regulation 24 which relates to priority of passing through locks:

As regards priority of passage through the canals or locks, the following shall be the order of precedence:—

1. Any government vessel.
2. Vessels built and navigated for the express purposes of the passenger traffic, running on schedule time; also excursion steamers and market boats.
3. Vessels carrying general merchandise or package freight running on schedule time and taking on, or delivering freight at local ports en route.
4. Vessels built and navigated for the express purpose of freight traffic, even though carrying passengers to some limited extent; also private pleasure boats, yachts, skiffs, canoes, etc.

In the case of a vessel of the first or second class, above-mentioned, approaching a lock and being within such distance that she would be seriously or unduly delayed if any other boat lying in the tier and over which she has precedence were passed through before her, the lock shall be held for her accommodation.

Any violation or attempt to violate these provisions of precedence shall subject the owner or person in charge of the offending vessel to a penalty of not less than five dollars, and not exceeding one hundred dollars.

I shall be glad to have the cases referred to looked into again.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would like to read this, because I asked the complainant to give it to me in writing. Last year he gave me the complaint that they arrived at the canal some hours before and yet had to wait there simply because these other two boats had sent a message ahead that they were on their way. This is the complaint:

First, there are several Canadian boats which are listed as package freighters, but carry non-perishable goods such as iron, pipes, etc. westbound, and grain cargoes on the return trip. These vessels do not run on schedule yet they are being given the right of way, and due to the congestion in the canals we are compelled to wait from ten to twelve hours to enter the locks and then permit these boats to go ahead of us. Whereas a light ship requires only about twelve hours to pass through the canals these others take approximately twenty-four hours. At present there are a large number of boats which have a just claim for the right of way, and we are therefore delayed enough by these.

My second complaint is regarding the movement last year of two American boats, the Twin Ports and Twin Cities. These vessels were refused the right of way in American canals but still were given the preference over Canadian boats in Canadian canals.

In the third place I would like to refer to conditions at the west entrance to the Cornwall canal, Dickinson's landing. In previous years there was a float there which enabled boats to enter the lock in safety but it has been removed; and due to the current caused by the flow of water used for power purposes, the approach to the canal is now dangerous.

Mr. DUNNING: With respect to the Cornwall canal, the last matter which he mentions, the improvement necessary there has been undertaken and is now practically

complete. With respect to the former matters I shall be glad, this being a matter of record, to have them carefully investigated.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The reason I read this was so that it would be on Hansard. This is from the captain of the steamship Keystate. He feels that his complaint is fair.

Item agreed to.

Pensions—J. L. Weller, $3,500.

Mr. SPENCER: This is a larger amount than most of the other items in the same category. May we have a short explanation?

Mr. DUNNING: This is the same vote as last year. Mr. Weller entered the service of the department in 1883 as an engineer in canal construction and operation. In 1900 he was appointed superintending engineer of the Welland canal, which office he held till 1912 when he was appointed engineer in charge of survey and design of construction of the then proposed new Welland ship canal. He remained in charge of the work till 1917, when it was closed down owing to the war, and his services were dispensed with. From January, 1919, to March, 1927, the services of Mr. Weller were retained in a consulting capacity because of his early connection with the development of the Welland canal plans. He is now retired, and in view of his services it was thought that $3,500 was not an unreasonable allowance to make. He is a very old man and has no other pension rights whatever.

Item agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public Works—Miscellaneous—

Accounts branch—salaries of agents, clerks, travelling and contingent expenses of outside service, $25,000.

Architectural branch—salaries of architects, clerks of works, inspectors, draftsmen, clerks, messengers of outside service, $83,000.

Engineering branch—salaries of engineers, inspectors, superintendents, draftsmen, clerks and messengers of outside service, $495,000.

For operation and maintenance of inspection boats, $20,000.

Maintenance and operation of water storage dams on Ottawa river and tributaries, surveys in connection therewith, and settlement of land damages, $50,000.

National Gallery of Canada, $130,000.

National Monument on Connaught place, $75,000.

River gauging and metering, $30,000.

Surveys and inspections, $120,000.

Balance of expenditure for works already authorized for which the appropriations may be insufficient provided the amount for any one does not exceed $200, $5,000.

Compassionate allowance to Alphonsine Thibault, widow of the late Paul Thibault, foreman at Bic, P.Q., who was fatally injured by an accident while on duty, $3,355.—Total, **$1,036,355.**

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is the vote which we had reached last evening when we stopped. I want to hand to my hon. friend from Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Clark) the statement which I promised him yesterday with regard to the total expenditure up to date on New Edinburgh mills. That includes everything. The net total for the acquisition of the property and the fitting up of the buildings includes $36,047.94 expended on alterations, heating and electric fittings, and the shop that is at present being fitted up for the research council.

Mr. STEVENS: May we have that statement put on Hansard?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes. The statement is as follows:

New Edinburgh Mills Property

Cost of Acquirement—		
Purchase price from Gatineau Power Co. Ltd.	$525,000	00
Purchase price, small lot from Mrs. M. D. Cranston	8,250	00
Survey, recoupment to Gatineau Co. of outlay for taxes etc., etc.	6,998	99
	540,248	99
Less old machinery sold from mill	1,002	39
Net total acquirement of property.	$539,246	60
Fitting up buildings on Green Island for Dominion Bureau of Statistics—		
Cost of alterations and sundry permanent, heating and electric fittings	73,720	07
Fitting up buildings on John St. for national research laboratory—		
Cost of alterations and sundry permanent, heating and electric fittings	36,047	94
Grand total of expenditure upon acquirement and immovable improvements to these properties to date	$649,014	61

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) asked for a statement of the National Art Gallery purchases. I have had a statement copied, which I will hand to my hon. friend. I have also had prepared for him, and will hand to him—which is perhaps the most convenient way for him to get it—the annual report of the National Gallery for 1926-27, and also for 1927-28, and the catalogue. I desire to state with regard to the pictures to which my hon. friend from Vancouver-Burrard, the hon. member for Kingston and the member for Muskoka referred, that I had hoped last night before the discussion ended to be able to give them the information they asked for. Some of the staff got in touch with the director and asked

whether he could give any information with regard to the whereabouts of these three pictures. Unfortunately he was not able to do this offhand with any degree of definiteness. There are in the gallery about 6,000 pictures which are exhibited at various points throughout Canada, being lent to local galleries, and it is difficult for even the director to be able to say offhand just where these particular pictures are.

Mr. BENNETT: All he can say is, they are not here.

Mr. ELLIOTT: He cannot say even that without checking it up. However, he gave me a statement this morning with regard to the three pictures referred to. I have the following memorandum with regard to these portraits:

Lord Byng: This portrait by John Sargent belongs to the national gallery collection and not the Canadian war memorials and was purchased in 1925 from the national gallery vote. It has been hanging in the collection ever since and is hanging now on floor No. 2.

General Currie: This portrait by Orpen belongs to the Canadian war memorials collection. It has hung temporarily in the national gallery at various times and is at present on loan to His Excellency the Governor General, at government house.

General Lipsett: This portrait, also by Orpen, belongs to the Canadian war memorials. It has been exhibited temporarily in the national gallery at various times.

It was withdrawn first for loan, at the urgent request of the commandant, to the Royal Military College, Kingston.

Later it was again lent to Sir William Orpen for the purpose of making a replica for presentation to General Lipsett's native town. Merthyr Tydfil, at the request of that city. It has now been returned and, pending the usual rearrangement of the exhibition in the national gallery it is being kept with the rest of the Canadian war memorials collection in the new fireproof storage space in the auditorium building.

Mr. CLARK: Since what date has the Sargent picture been hanging?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Since it was purchased.

Mr. CLARK: I made a very careful search a few weeks ago and asked particularly for it but I could not find it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have given my hon. friend the statement submitted to me by the director and I take it to be correct.

Mr. CLARK: What jurisdiction has the director of the gallery over the war memorial pictures?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The national gallery has been the custodian of the Canadian war memorials since 1919. The national gallery has exhibited them temporarily twice and they have also been exhibited twice in Montreal and Toronto during that time. The whole collection consists of 360 paintings and sculptures and prints, and it would be impossible to exhibit them permanently in the national gallery for want of space. The national gallery, out of its own fund, has paid for necessary restoration work and upon its representations to the government last year, better and more perfectly fireproof storage was secured for them in the auditorium building. The collection is there now waiting for the building of a new national gallery which it is expected will include a special wing devoted to them. The trustees of the national gallery have never ceased to urge in every annual report and through every other possible means the necessity of providing a permanent and public home for the Canadian war memorials.

Mr. CLARK: What proportion of this year's vote will be expended on new pictures?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The sum of $85,000.

Mr. CLARK: Does the minister think he is justified in purchasing new pictures when we have nowhere to hang them?

Mr. ELLIOTT: These picutres that are being purchased are by noted artists and include what are considered by the trustees of the gallery to be works of special merit which they should obtain. Not only are they exhibited in the gallery, as far as it is possible to display them, but part of the scheme is to lend them to various local organizations from one end of the country to the other. They are kept on exhibition practically all the time in one place or another.

Mr. CLARK: I cannot possibly understand why these war memorial pictures should be locked up in basements. Why is it necessary that portraits of men like General Lipsett should be stored in some basement in the city of Ottawa? Why should not such a portrait be hanging in the gallery? From personal observation I know that there are in the gallery things which I at any rate consider absurdities when compared with such portraits. If the minister will visit the gallery he will see there pictures of ducks and bunches of roses and geese and numerous landscape scenes, as well as George Washington, who, it is true, was a great character and all that. But why should there not be some portraits of our own national characters? I cannot understand a policy that excludes from the gallery the portraits of men who have made history for our country, while

we hang there things that are really of no interest to the public. I should like to know from the minister who the men are that administer the gallery.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The present board of trustees comprises Mr. Harry Southam, of the city of Ottawa, the chairman, who is replacing the late Doctor F. J. Shepherd of the city of Montreal. The other trustees are Mr. Norman MacKenzie of Regina, Hon. Vincent Massey, and Mr. J. O. Marchand, architect, of Montreal, with Doctor MacTavish of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CLARK: I hope the minister will direct the attention of these gentlemen to the remarks that have been made on this subject and suggest that consideration be given to hanging some Canadian portraits in the gallery. I am quite sure that if some of these men will visit the gallery they will be able to eliminate some of the roses, some of the fruit and perhaps some of the foreign gentlemen and consider making space for the portraits of our own men who have made history for this country, and which are now buried in some of the basements.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to have my hon. friend's representations forwarded to the trustees. May I point out, however, to my hon. friend that matters of art are decided only partly by the identity of the person whose portrait is being painted. The question of who the man was is important in regard to the persons to whom my hon. friend has referred, and I quite agree with him with regard to the importance of General Currie and the other gentleman to whom he has alluded. I hope I have not left in his mind the impression that the portrait of General Lipsett has been stored permanently in a basement; it is not in a basement but in the best fireproof space available in Ottawa for the storage and preservation of these various pictures at a uniform temperature and proper humidity.

Mr. CLARK: But that is only a recent development; they were formerly in the basement of the Victoria building.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is quite so, but they have been transferred. The portrait of General Lipsett has been moved from one place to another, just as the other portraits have been placed on exhibition in various places, and this happened to be the only one of the three pictures referred to which at present is temporarily stored in the auditorium building.

Mr. McGIBBON: Will the minister tell us whether all precautions are taken when these pictures are loaned to see that they are not destroyed or injured?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, they are fully insured.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Monday, June 3, 1929

The house met at 11 o'clock.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

Sir EUGENE FISET (Rimouski) moved:

That the first and final report of the joint committee on the restaurant be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING—SENATE BILL

Bill No. 336, for the relief of William John Blight.—Mr. Neill.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GOVERNMENT DREDGES

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. How many government-owned dredges and other units of dredging equipment are lying idle at Victoria and Vancouver?
2. What is the total value of such dredges and dredging units?
3. What is the annual cost for maintenance, services of watchmen and upkeep of such dredges and dredging units?
4. What was the cost per cubic yard for dredging and dumping material during the time the dredge Mastadon was operating in Vancouver harbour?
5. Did the Board of Harbour Commissioners for the port of Vancouver, or the government, award a contract for dredging in Vancouver harbour to a private company or person?
6. If so, is such work now being carried on by such company or person, and by whom?
7. If such work is now being performed by a private company or person: (a) what price per cubic yard is being paid for dredging; (b) what price is being paid for dumping the material so dredged?

8. Has the Board of Harbour Commissioners of the port of Vancouver any inspector, or inspectors, employed on the work? If so, how many and at what monthly wages?

9. Did the government or the Board of Harbour Commissioners of the port of Vancouver secure any estimate from the dredging engineer or any other engineer of the Public Works department prior to awarding such contract?

10. If so: (a) what was the estimated price per cubic yard of dredging; (b) of dumping the material so dredged?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Stand.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Is there any intention of answering this question at this session? I would like to have it answered if possible during this session.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I hope to be able to give my hon. friend the answer, but it is information that had to be obtained from Vancouver, and is in process of being obtained as rapidly as possible.

LEGERE, N.B., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. GRIMMER:

1. Who occupies the position of postmaster at Legere, Northumberland county, New Brunswick?

2. When was the appointment made?

3. On whose recommendation?

4. Who held the office prior to such appointment?

5. For what reason was the change made?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. Archie Desroche.

2. 19th November, 1926.

3. Member for constituency.

4. Mrs. Rose Legere.

5. Mrs. Legere's husband was postmaster up to the 19th August, 1926. In June, 1926, charges of active political partisanship made against the postmaster were investigated and proven. The office was transferred to Mrs. Legere in August, 1926. In November, 1926, the office was transferred to Archie Desroche.

WHITNEY, N.B., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. GRIMMER:

1. Who occupies the position of postmaster at Whitney, New Brunswick?

2. When was he appointed?

3. Who was his predecessor?

4. What was the reason necessitating a change, and on whose recommendation was the change made?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. Gregory Dunnett.

2. 1st September, 1927.

3. P. A. Forsyth.

4. Political partisanship. On recommendation of member for constituency.

TRADE COMMISSIONERS

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many trade commissioners were employed by the Department of Trade and Commerce in the year 1921?

2. How many trade commissioners are now employed by the Department of Trade and Commerce?

3. How many assistant trade commissioners were employed by the same department in 1921, and how many are now employed by that department?

4. How many offices were maintained in 1921: (a) in British countries; (b) in foreign countries?

5. How many offices are now maintained: (a) in British countries; (b) in foreign countries?

6. Does the government intend establishing additional offices in the near future for the extension of Canadian trade, and if so: (a) how many; (b) where?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton) (for Mr. Malcolm):

1. On March 31, 1921—19.

2. 33 (including Y. Lamontagne on loan to the Egyptian government).

3. (a) in 1921—none; (b) now—11.

4. (a) 10; (b) 9.

5. (a) 14; (b) 18.

6. Yes; as and where occasion requires.

TRADE STATISTICS—MOST FAVOURED NATIONS

Mr. TOBIN:

1. With what foreign countries did Canada exchange most-favoured-nation treatment in 1921?

2. With what foreign countries does Canada now exchange most-favoured-nation treatment?

3. What were the total imports and exports with the treaty countries of 1921 in the fiscal year 1921-22?

4. What were the total imports and exports with the foreign countries with which Canada now exchanges most-favoured-nation treatment, in the fiscal year 1928-29?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton) (for Mr. Malcolm):

1 and 3. Canada's imports from and exports to foreign countries which granted to or received from Canada tariff concessions during the fiscal year 1921-22 under trade treaties and agreements or provisions of most favoured nation clause in British treaties binding on Canada.

Countries	Total Imports from	Canadian Produce	Total Exports to Foreign Produce	Total Exports
1. Argentina	$ 2,355,100	$ 3,233,423	$ 97	$ 3,233,520
2. Belgium	3,845,718	12,359,300	59,951	12,419,251
3. Colombia	360,509	127,199	621	127,820
4. Denmark	119,315	2,243,181	680	2,243,861
5. France	13,482,005	8,208,228	40,210	8,248,438
6. Italy	1,387,370	15,335,818	4,612	15,340,430
7. Japan	8,194,681	14,831,520	45,648	14,877,168
8. Netherlands	4,002,047	9,582,924	10,014	9,592,938
9. Norway	426,928	3,913,372	859	3,914,231
10. Russia	1,683	2,617,739	4,989	2,622,728
11. Spain	1,779,408	816,977	31,518	848,495
12. Sweden	245,295	1,220,196	822	1,221,018
13. Switzerland	8,671,608	345,626	22,158	367,794
14. Venezuela	294,305	512,499	.....	512,499
Total	$45,165,972	$75,348,002	$222,179	$75,570,181

2 and 4. Canada's imports from and exports to foreign countries which granted to or received from Canada tariff concessions during the fiscal year 1928-29 under trade treaties and agreements or provisions of most favoured nation clause in British treaties binding on Canada.

Countries	Total Imports from	Canadian Produce	Total Exports to Foreign Produce	Total Exports
1. Argentina	$ 7,427,568	$ 14,493,191	$ 607	$ 14,493,798
2. Belgium	12,014,538	27,301,384	149,680	27,451,064
3. Belgian Congo	.....	189,180	.....	189,180
4. Colombia	6,849,408	1,797,393	4,487	1,801,880
5. Cuba	4,903,506	4,442,953	76,778	4,519,731
6. Czecho-Slovakia	3,297,563	1,703,825	3,798	1,707,623
7. Denmark	152,721	5,981,035	2,862	5,983,897
8. Esthonia	168	88,680	.....	88,680
9. Finland	98,286	2,122,129	540	2,122,669
10. France	26,215,696	16,131,188	112,559	16,243,747
11. French Africa	153,244	475,026	.....	475,026
12. French East Indies	1,099	52,055	416	52,471
13. French Guiana	.....	53,017	.....	53,017
14. French Oceania	.....	40,042	.....	40,042
15. French West Indies	1,719	511,374	56	511,430
16. Madagasca	1,865	36,425	.....	36,425
17. St. Pierre and Miquelon	55,524	2,729,124	22,360	2,752,484
18. Hungary	18,001	134,026	.....	134,026
19. Italy	4,260,325	23,024,899	3,933	23,028,832
20. Tripoli	.....	732	.....	732
21. Italian Africa, Other	.....	12,974	.....	12,974
22. Japan	12,921,317	42,099,968	6,985	42,106,953
23. Korea	2,359	160,995	.....	160,995
24. Latvia	22,102	34,315	.....	34,315
25. Lithuania	10,301	7,239	.....	7,239
26. Netherlands	9,016,763	44,366,888	98,976	44,465,864
27. Dutch East Indies	704,663	3,605,367	330	3,605,697
28. Dutch Guiana	52,592	123,580	.....	123,580
29. Dutch West Indies	173,319	185,044	902	185,946
30. Norway	989,504	7,435,537	1,591	7,437,128
31. Portugal	678,030	5,735,299	5	5,735,304
32. Azores and Madeira Islands	84,804	187,199	.....	187,199
33. Portuguese Africa	.....	943,194	.....	943,194
34. Portuguese Asia	.....	1,683	.....	1,683
35. Roumania	32,364	568,432	16	568,448
36. Serb-Croat-Slovene State	25,543	48,829	.....	48,829
37. Spain	2,700,033	5,704,255	5	5,704,260
38. Canary Islands	7,060	71,374	.....	71,374
39. Spanish Africa	15	65,789	.....	65,789
40. Sweden	2,185,089	4,765,818	30,672	4,796,490
41. Switzerland	7,917,445	483,919	76,541	560,460
42. Syria	18,368	476,229	.....	476,229
43. Venezuela	701,935	1,792,549	136	1,792,685
Total	$103,694,837	$220,184,154	$595,235	$220,779,389

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

TRADE STATISTICS—BRITISH COUNTRIES

Mr. TOBIN:

1. With what British countries did Canada enjoy customs tariff preferential treatment in 1921?

2. With what British countries does Canada enjoy customs tariff preferential treatment?

3. What were the values of the total exports to these countries: (a) in the fiscal year 1921-22; (b) in the fiscal year 1928-29?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton; for Mr. Malcolm):

1, 2 and 3. British countries that granted customs tariff preferential treatment to Canadian products in 1921, and that give preferential treatment at the present time; with Canada's domestic exports to these British countries: (a) in the fiscal year 1921-22; (b) in the fiscal year 1928-29.

(a) In the Fiscal Year, 1921-22

British Countries	Canada's Domestic Exports to
1. United Kingdom	$299,361,675
2. New Zealand	4,128,531
3. Union of South Africa	3,890,390
4. Southern Rhodesia	
5. Northern Rhodesia (Zambesi Basin)	
British West Indies—	
6. Barbados	1,377,984
7. Trinidad and Tobago	4,548,535
8. Bahamas	1,829,798
9. Grenada	
Leeward Islands—	
10. Antigua	
11. Dominica	
12. Montserrat	
13. St. Kitts-Nevis	
14. Virgin Islands	
15. St. Lucia	
16. St. Vincent	
17. British Guiana	2,298,105
18. British Honduras	150,964
19. Western Samoa	Included with New Zealand
20. Cyprus	Not specified
Total	$317,585,982

(b) In the Fiscal Year, 1928-29

British Countries	Canada's Domestic Exports to
1. United Kingdom	$429,730,485
2. Irish Free State	4,144,743
3. New Zealand	17,357,763
4. Australia	19,470,305
5. Union of South Africa	12,231,773
6. Southern Rhodesia	
7. Northern Rhodesia (Zambesi Basin)	
8. Bermuda	1,628,003
British West Indies—	
9. Barbados	1,681,950
10. Jamaica	5,266,083
11. Trinidad and Tobago	4,153,571
12. Bahamas	4,656,219
13. Grenada	
Leeward Islands—	
14. Antigua	
15. Dominica	
16. Montserrat	
17. St. Kitts-Nevis	
18. Virgin Islands	
19. St. Lucia	
20. St. Vincent	
21. British Guiana	2,238,506
22. British Honduras	900,034
23. Fiji	329,797
24. Western Samoa	Included with New Zealand
25. Brunei	Not specified
26. Sarawak	Not specified
27. Mauritius	Not specified
28. Gibraltar	75,391
29. Cyprus	Not specified
Total	$503,864,623

EXPORTS—MANUFACTURED GOODS

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What was the value of the total exports of fully or chiefly manufactured goods in the fiscal year 1921-22?
2. What was the value of the total exports of fully or chiefly manufactured goods in the fiscal year 1927-28?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton) (for Mr. Malcolm):

1. Canada's total domestic exports of fully or chiefly manufactured goods in the fiscal year 1921-22 were $303,642,174.
2. Canada's total domestic exports of fully or chiefly manufactured goods in the fiscal year 1927-28 were $458,796,551.

STEAMSHIP TYVIAN—COAL SUPPLIES

Mr. QUINN:

1. What quantity of coal, if any, was supplied steamship Tyvian by A. T. O'Leary and Company during the period from February 1, 1928, to April 30, 1929?
2. What was the price paid?

Mr. ELLIOTT:

1. 1,063 tons.
2. $7.50 per ton.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

Mr. GOTT:

1. What were the Canadian exports to Great Britain for the year ending March 31, 1929?
2. What were the Canadian imports from Great Britain during the same period?
3. What were the exports to and imports from Great Britain during the years ending March 31, 1927, and March 31, 1928?
4. What were the Canadian exports to the United States for the year ending March 31, 1929?
5. What were the Canadian imports from the United States for the same period?
6. What were the exports to and imports from the United States during the years ending March 31, 1927, and March 31, 1928?
7. What quantity of the following products was exported to the United States for the year ending March 31, 1929: (a) wheat; (b) wood reduced to pulp; (c) pulpwood; (d) silver ore and bullion; (e) raw hides; (f) logs; (g) raw fur; (h) printing paper; (i) unmanufactured leather; (j) raw wool; (k) asbestos raw; (l) aluminum bars; (m) whiskey; (n) malt liquors: (o) settlers' effects?
8. What quantity of the following products was imported into Canada from the United States during above period: (a) machinery, showing various classes; (b) motor cars; (c) parts for motor cars?

DOMINION NOTES

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What was the amount of Dominion notes advanced under the Finance Act, and outstanding at the end of March, June, September and December of each year from 1926 until the present time?
2. What were the amounts of securities accepted as a basis for the foregoing issues of Dominion notes?
3. What were the different clases of securities and the various amounts of each accepted for rediscounting, for the same period?

AVIATION FATALITIES

Mr. GOTT:

1. When students are invited, or permitted, to join an Aero Club to become aviators, does the government assume any responsibility in case of fatalities?
2. Is insurance required?
3. Are planes insured, and for how much?
4. What was the nature of the fatality at the Walkerville Aero Club in the fall of 1928?
5. Who was killed?
6. Was there any insurance on the life of the deceased, government or otherwise?
7. Was an investigation made?
8. If so: (a) by whom; (b) who was consulted; (c) what transpired at the investigation?
9. Whether the aeroplane was equipped with parachutes.
10. Whether it is the intention of the government to provide aeroplanes with parachutes.
11. Whether proper precautions were taken to see that students were properly looked after while taking the course.
12. Whether more precaution is now taken in this regard than prior to the fatality, and the nature of same.
13. Whether any allowance was made by the Government to the family of the unfortunate student, and, if so, how much.
14. Whether any financial assistance was given to the family by the Aero Club, and, if so, how much.
15. Whether Government aeroplanes are now equipped with parachutes, and, if so, from what date.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS—J. L. BOURGOULD

Mr. G. R. GEARY (South Toronto):

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to the appointment of J. L. Bourgould as inspector of operations in the operating department of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

GUS CARRIER—PRINCE ALBERT PENITENTIARY

On the motion of Mr. Clark:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to Gus Carrier, Prince Albert penitentiary, from January 1, 1925, to date.

Mr. CLARK: I think that in the absence of the Minister of Justice this motion should stand.

Motion stands.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—
MR. RICHARDSON

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer) (for Mr. Garland, Bow River) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, applications, ratings, and all other documents in the possession of the Civil Service Commission and the Department of National Revenue, together with copy of report of the proceedings and decisions thereof with respect to the appointment of Mr. Richardson, assistant dry goods appraiser at Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am not sure whether the information asked for is wholly of a character that can be produced. Some of it may be confidential. If we pass the motion in the absence of the Minister of National Revenue, I would like it to be understood that the minister will reserve such rights as he has in the matter.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: In the absence of the hon. member for Bow River, perhaps the motion had better stand.

Motion stands.

STEWIACKE VALLEY RAILWAY

Mr. THOMAS CANTLEY (Pictou) (for Mr. MacNutt) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions, reports and other documents in the possession of the government, in connection with the Stewiacke Valley railway, in the county of Colchester, from the first day of January, 1870, to date.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): This order runs back into history pretty far. I doubt if we now have any telegrams and the like sent in 1870, but I may say that any documents which may be still available in the department will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

AUTOMOBILE SEIZURES AT ATHELSTAN

Mr. G. R. GEARY (South Toronto) (for Mr. Bell, St. Antoine) moved:

For a return showing the number of automobiles seized at the port of Athelstan during the years 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927 and 1928, the name of the parties from whom seized, date of seizure, date of sale, to whom sold, amount received, how long in storage, name of party with whom stored, and amount paid for storage.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In the absence of the Minister of National Revenue I think the motion should stand.

Motion stands.

PRIVATE BILLS

MARION ROSE HARRISON

The house in committee on Bill No. 255, for the relief of Marion Rose Harrison—Mr. Lawson—Mr. Power in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Right to marry again.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved, and if so, what provision has been made for them?

Mr. LAWSON: There are no children of this marriage.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MARION ANN TERRY

The house in committee on Bill No. 286, for the relief of Marion Ann Terry—Mr. Taylor—Mr. Power in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Right to marry again.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case? The sponsor of the bill is not here, and perhaps it had better stand.

Mr. SANDERSON: The sponsor is ill and cannot be here. He has asked me to sponsor this bill in his absence. There are three children.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is there any provision being made for them?

Mr. SANDERSON: We have no power to make provision for them.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is not necessary for us to go into that; we need not grant the divorce until provision is made. All I ask at this stage is are the children being provided for? According to the information now before us we are breaking up a home and making no provision for the children.

Mr. SANDERSON: The children are now in the care of the petitioner.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is she in financial circumstances to enable her to care for them?

Mr. SANDERSON: I understand so.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

JOSEPH EDWIN WOOD

The house in committee on Bill No. 290, for the relief of Joseph Edwin Wood—Mr. Howden—Mr. Power in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Where is the sponsor in this case? I am given to understand that he is sick. It is rather remarkable the number of hon. gentlemen who are sick at the end of the session! But if the sponsor is ill, we had better let the bill pass.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported read the third time and passed.

CHARLES EDWIN WALKER

The house in committee on Bill No. 296, for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker—Mr. Sanderson—Mr. Power in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This is a bill to which the attention of the private bills committee should be especially called. The respondent denies that she is guilty. There are several corespondents named in this case. As I understand it, at the present time the respondent is in receipt of a separation allowance. She believes that this is simply a "frame-up" in order to relieve her husband of the responsibility of paying this separation allowance. In this case, as in a number of others, there is no notification given to the respondent before she comes to the divorce committee of the Senate as to what charges she is to meet. When she appears before the committee charges are introduced of which she has no knowledge whatever, and hence she is not able to produce witnesses in refutation of those charges. Further, only a limited amount of money is granted to her in order that she may make good her defence, and this allowance is not sufficient for her to call the witnesses necessary when several corespondents are named. I call these allegations to the attention of the private bills committee in order that this particular bill may receive careful consideration there. If not, I am afraid we shall have to take it up in detail and ask for the evidence here on the floor of the house.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat the same way as my hon. friend. When the charge of adultery is brought against a woman she should have full particulars and ample time to prepare her defence. When she goes before the divorce committee and swears positively that she has not committed that offence, I give great weight to her evidence, because my experience is that in civil cases a woman hesitates very much before she perjures herself. I think a great deal is to be said in favour of this bill being reheard by the private bills committee, or at least being postponed for further consideration by this house.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Power): Shall section 1 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Power): Those in favour of section 1 will please say "aye."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Power): Those opposed will please say "nay."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Power): In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Mr. BOYS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know whether anybody appeared on behalf of the respondent when the bill was before the private bills committee. I do not know what the proceedings were there; I have not the record before me. One would almost imagine that if the respondent denied the charge, and asked for an opportunity of calling evidence to prove the falsity of the allegation by the petitioner, her request would have been granted. I do not know whether she asked for the opportunity or not, but there is one sure thing, if she asked for it, and it was refused, there was no reason in the world why she should not have appeared before the private bills committee when they had the bill under consideration and given some indication of her evidence and asked permission to call witnesses. From my knowledge of the atmosphere in the private bills committee this session, had that been done I have no doubt full opportunity would have been given her. If no such request was made of the committee why now should we be asked to send the bill back? I certainly do not want to stand against any woman wrongly accused, but it does seem to me there should be some finality to these proceedings. I am in accord with what has been said that perhaps the opportunities given to the respondents in these cases are more or less insufficient. There is nothing in the petition except the allegation that a certain woman has committed a certain offence with a certain man on divers occasions. Perhaps that procedure should be amended. But that is not before us at the present time. The divorce committee dealt with this bill. I think we ought to be told whether the request that I have referred to was made. If it was made and refused, why did not the respondent through her counsel, or through my hon. friend, if he is interested—as he has been in other cases

and taken action and well taken it—appear before the private bills committee instead of waiting until we get to the last days of the session before raising this point? It does not seem to me to be fair to the other side—and there are two sides to this question. I think before we send this bill back to the private bills committee, somebody with knowledge of the situation should acquaint us with the proceedings before the divorce committee and before the private bills committee when the bill was under consideration there.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, personally I know nothing with regard to the evidence in this case. It is some two weeks ago since I had a letter from the respondent asking that something be done for her protection.

Mr. BOYS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I think the time has come when some stand should be taken by this house as to what right any member has to introduce and place upon Hansard letters written to him privately by one of the parties to a divorce action, which letter could never be admitted before a committee of this house or any court of justice.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Mr. BOYS: I am raising a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Power): The member for Simcoe has the floor on a point of order. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will please sit down.

Mr. BOYS: My point of order is that no member of this house has a right to quote from a private letter he received from one of the parties to a divorce suit, which letter would not be admitted before either the divorce committee or the private bills committee or any court of justice.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Power): With all respect to the judgment of the hon. member for Simcoe, I am inclined to think that his point of order is not well taken. In my view any member of this house has a right in debate to quote any document if he will produce it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have that ruling. But it may relieve the mind of the hon. member for Simcoe if I tell him that I had no idea of reading a letter. He complained that this matter ought to have been brought to the attention of the house at an earlier stage. I stated that several weeks ago I had a letter from the respondent urging that something be done in the case. Now—

Mr. BOYS: Is not that quoting from a letter?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, that is not quotation; it is a reference.

Mr. BOYS: You might as well read it as state what is in it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will the hon. gentleman let me have the floor for a moment? A few minutes ago he complained that nothing had been done, and inferentially he suggested some of us should have done something. I say I had no personal knowledge of this case, but that one of the parties concerned had written to me simply because I had been taking a stand in a general way against these cases. She had written to me asking that something should be done. I had brought one or two cases before the house. In this case I did not want to weary the house at the time by reading another letter into the records and making another appeal. I am not a member of the private bills committee; I have to attend other committees of the house and to do work outside of this divorce question. I take it for granted that the members of the private bills committee, including the hon. member from Simcoe, should have given some consideration to this case when it was before the committee, but apparently nothing was done.

Mr. BOYS: Would you suggest that we should delay it without a request from the respondent?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I suggest that every bill which comes before the private bills committee should receive consideration.

Mr. BOYS: I suggest that the hon. gentleman had better read this case and the other cases before he starts to object to what has been done.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would remind the hon. member for Simcoe that the only two measures which have been held up in this house and have been referred back to the private bills committee have resulted in one being withdrawn and the other voted down. Out of 250 cases coming before this house, only two were carefully examined by the private bills committee and both of them were rejected. I do not suggest that this proves that if all of the 250 were so considered that they would all be rejected, but I do say that it is a most remarkable thing that such a decision should have resulted in regard to these two. When I, as a private member of the house, am appealed to to take such action as will delay a case of this sort, it seems to me that I have a perfect right to voice an

objection to proceeding with the bill. This woman the respondent in this case, claims that the whole matter is a frameup, and so far as I am able to observe the procedure as carried on by the Senate committee, the way is wide open for a frameup. Here let me emphasize a point which I mentioned and which I think is worthy of the consideration of this house: the respondent was given no opportunity whatever to know what charges were being made against her. Several corespondents were named, and it would require a very heavy expenditure of money for her to bring witnesses from a distance in order that her case might be established, and possibly the evidence against her refuted.

Mr. BOYS: Did the respondent's counsel before the divorce committee ask for an appeal?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, I believe so.

Mr. NEILL: Was the respondent represented by counsel?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, but that did not altogether meet her need, because she had not the money to bring the witnesses who were required.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend knows that if she requires money an allowance is made.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: A certain allowance is made, but I would ask the hon. member how far $75 will go in paying fees of counsel and in bringing witnesses to testify to several distinct charges. Here is one fact I gather from the evidence; the most material witness for the respondent was not able to be present. It is a queer thing that we should damn a woman in this way simply because it does not meet the convenience of the Senate committee to postpone the case.

Mr. STEVENS: Is the evidence to which the hon. gentleman has just referred the evidence in this case?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am quoting from:

> The petition of Charles Edwin Walker for a bill of divorce from Eva Mary Leroy Walker: report of the committee on divorce, together with evidence received by the committee. Minutes of evidence, the Senate, Ottawa, April 22, 1929.

On page 9 I read:

> Mr. Shorey: Mr. Chairman, before the evidence is taken I want to make a formal application for a postponement on behalf of the respondent. I assume ordinarily that it would be made after the plaintiff's case is in. I do not want to delay the taking of evidence this morning, but there is one witness in particular for the respondent, a Mrs. Irene Henderson, a cousin with whom the respondent has been living practically since the respondent and her husband separated, who is a most material witness for the respondent. In March she had a major operation. . . . .

And she was not able to be present. What was the answer of the Senate to that? I read a little further on on the same page:

> The Chairman: One of the difficulties is this: the committee is made up of different members, and you cannot always get the same members together to hear the second part of the case.

That is a beautiful court. Part of the jury is present to hear one part of the evidence and another set of members wander in to hear the second part. So the divorce committee refused to grant the delay in the case. They were anxious to get through with a grist of business and so the case had to be proceeded with. The woman not having the opportunity of bringing her witnesses and not having the funds with which to do so, not having any knowledge until she came here as to what particular charges she would have to meet—all these things are contrary to the practice of any respectible court; and when the matter does comes before our committee there is no check whatever in regard to the case. Under these circumstances I think I am quite right in asking that this bill should be either voted down at the present time or be referred back to the committee for consideration. I am aware that the members of the private bills committee do not want to be held up in their work; they do not want to have to reconsider these matters at this late hour in the session. But if they cannot give the case proper consideration it would be far better to have the bill withdrawn rather than, in haste and irrevocably, to pass on this woman a judgment which could never be recalled. This, it seems to me, is a reasonable position to take.

Mr. SANDERSON: I move that the bill be referred back to the private bills committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is not in order at this stage. Shall section 1 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress might be reported, and when the Speaker is in the chair the motion can be put to have the bill referred back to the committee.

Mr. SANDERSON: I move that progress be reported.

Motion agreed to and progress reported.

Mr. Speaker having taken the chair:

On motion of Mr. Sanderson, the bill was referred back to the special committee on miscellaneous private bills.

WILLIAM EDWARD KING

The house in committee on Bill No. 267, for the relief of William Edward King—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children?

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

EDITH LAURA HEWITT

The house in committee on Bill No. 299, for the relief of Edith Laura Hewitt—Mr. Casselman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children?

Mr. KAISER: The hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Casselman) asked me to sponsor this bill in his absence.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But are there any children?

Mr. KAISER: He said not.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

RUTH LEONARD WISER

The house in committee on Bill No. 306, for the relief of Ruth Leonard Wiser—Mr. Rowe—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children?

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsor is not present and there is no one here to answer the question. The bill will stand.

Bill stands.

BERTHA JANE PHELAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 301, for the relief of Bertha Jane Phelan—Mr. McQuarrie—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

78594—200½

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCER: I would like to ask the hon. member, whom I know is well posted on this bill, whether there are any children?

Mr. McQUARRIE: There are no children living.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 258, for the relief of Robert Wilson Reoch.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 268, for the relief of John Wilson Pickering.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 273, for the relief of Wallace Wellington Corkum.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 291, for the relief of Dora Chearnley Chearnley.—Mr. Howden.

Bill No. 295, for the relief of William Edgar Baird.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 303, for the relief of Roland Emory Anderson.

Bill No. 304, an Act for the relief of Olive Marion Gerrard.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 305, for the relief of John Beck.—Mr. Kaiser.

Bill No. 307, for the relief of George King.—Mr. Bowen.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 318, for the relief of Sam Gladstone.—Mr. Ilsley (for Mr. Jacobs).

Bill No. 324, for the relief of Vivian Elizabeth Pearce.—Mr. MacLaren (for Mr. Lennox).

Bill No. 325, for the relief of Alice Clarke.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 326, for the relief of Kathleen Mary Hambourg.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 327, for the relief of Florence Gertrude Singer.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 329, for the relief of Fanny Elizabeth Reed Kendall.—Mr. MacLaren (for Mr. Bell, St. Antoine).

Bill No. 330, for the relief of Robert Henry Dunlop Ellis.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 331, for the relief of Evelyn Cowie.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 332, for the relief of Enid Marjorie Judd.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 334, for the relief of Christina Adams Bourne.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 335, for the relief of Ruth Agnes Townsend.—Mr. Lawson.

PELEE ISLAND

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) advise what steps have been taken for the safeguarding of Pelee island which has been lately partially destroyed and the occupants of which are very fearful of what will happen in the future if preventive steps are not taken.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): The matter to which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) refers was investigated last week by the engineer for that particular district. This is one of the many complaints we have received of flooding which has taken place within the last two or three weeks. My recollection of the report is that the flooding was very bad on Pelee island, but any remedy suggested does not come within the scope of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BENNETT: It is suggested that a very small expenditure now might save some more later on. That was the only reason why I was asked to bring the matter to the attention of the minister.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think what my hon. friend refers to is the breaking away of dykes. They were not, if my information is correct, originally constructed by this department, or by this government, but are drainage works.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is it not a fact that the taking away of gravel and sand from part of this island is more or less accountable for the trouble to-day?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It has not been so reported by the engineers.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I think it would be well for the minister to make inquiries in that regard.

PRIVILEGE—MR. THORSON

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Winnipeg South Centre): I rise to a question of privilege. On Friday evening the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) made with regard to me certain statements which are not correct. In reply to a question put by me as to the hon. gentleman's attitude to the Hudson Bay railway, he made amongst other statements, the following observations with regard to myself:

> He may be able to take hon. gentlemen's amendments away from them and appropriate them as his own.

Later on he said:

> Not until you were driven to it—like the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg which he appropriated as his own.
>
> [Mr. McQuarrie.]

These statements are both irrelevant and incorrect. I realize, of course, that the hon. gentleman was excited when he made them, but I cannot allow them to remain on the record uncorrected. I deny that I have ever appropriated any hon. member's amendment as my own. If the leader of the opposition had taken the trouble to consult Hansard, he would have seen that the statements of which I now complain are incorrect.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): With respect to the question of privilege raised by the hon. gentleman, there was no excitement about the matter at all. I could not hear very well what the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) said, but what I did say—

Mr. THORSON: I rise to a point of order. I have made a denial absolutely that I have ever appropriated any other hon. member's amendment as my own, and that statement must be accepted by the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. BENNETT: What I observed was that, listening the other evening to the hon. member for North Winnipeg, my hearing indicated that he said that one of his amendments had been appropriated by the hon. gentleman. It was to that I referred. If my information is incorrect, my statement is incorrect and unwarranted in fact, but I certainly understood the hon. member for North Winnipeg stated that to be the fact. I will turn up Hansard and see what he said in order to be certain. But if his statement was as I heard it, my statement is correct.

Mr. THORSON: Do I understand the leader of the opposition to accept my statement that I did not at any time appropriate any other hon. member's amendment?

Mr. BENNETT: The answer is this: that if the statement made by the hon. member for North Winnipeg is correct, I accept that statement. If the statement made by the hon. member who has just spoken is correct, I must accept that statement. I have therefore to take the choice between the two and I have not yet decided which to take.

Mr. THORSON: I think the leader of the opposition should abide by the rules of the house. I have made a denial that I ever appropriated any other hon. member's amendment as my own. I make that statement as a member of the house and it should be accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the leader of the opposition has accepted the statement of the hon. gentleman.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. BENNETT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I have a more difficult matter to speak to with respect to a representation made in a newspaper, apparently indicating why the hon. gentleman asked me some questions the other evening. This appeared in a newspaper published in Saskatoon—and perhaps the observation of the Minister of Justice the other day that there is an election in Saskatchewan may also have something to do with this—"Tories block Hudson bay port." Those who were present the other evening will recall that no objection was taken to the project, but an effort was made to ascertain how much money had been expended in the past, there having been no opportunity in the public accounts committee to elicit this information. If the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) were here—and I in common with every other member regret that it is necessary for him to go to the hospital—he would agree, as the record shows, that no effort was made to block the vote; further, that I stated clearly that the party with which I am associated stands squarely behind the enterprise, and has done so from its inception, and that at the Winnipeg convention it passed a resolution which it will be my duty to endeavour to carry out, namely, to see that that road is completed without unnecessary delay.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I understand from the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) that the opposition desire to raise certain matters for discussion on the motion to go into supply. Several of the ministers are absent this morning attending the funeral of the late Mr. Lanctôt. I have explained the situation to my hon. friend, who has agreed that if we give an opportunity for discussion later in the day, we may be permitted to go into supply immediately. I will undertake to say on behalf of the government that when we have concluded the morning session, it will be moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day, and to-night at eight o'clock any matter may be brought up for discussion.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The Prime Minister was not present for the moment, and I agreed with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) that if possible we would make that arrangement. The Prime Minister to whom I communicated the matter this morning, has stated the communication correctly.

Mr. SPEAKER: As we approach prorogation, it is always understood that the committee of supply may report back and sit again the same day, so we shall follow that rule to-day.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Public Works—chargeable to collection of revenue—graving docks:

Champlain graving dock..	$ 97,000
Lorne graving dock..	42,000
Esquimalt graving dock.	81,400
Total..	$220,400

Mr. KAISER: When may we expect the supplementary estimates?

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): That is a matter in regard to which the Minister of Finance would be able to give my hon. friend more information than I can, but I expect them very shortly.

Mr. BENNETT: They were promised for Friday last.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think that is correct.

Item agreed to.

Public Works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers generally, $30,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This item was discussed and was allowed to stand. I am not sure whether it was passed.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the minister explain this term "generally"? Is it miscellaneous?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, it is.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What is this for?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is the general vote for harbours and rivers, to cover general expenses. It is not limited to any one province.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is more to cover emergencies?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What class of emergencies would be done under this vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is required to cover travelling expenses, printing, stationery, instruments and so forth which cannot con-

veniently be charged against any one item in particular of the general appropriations for construction, improvements or repairs in the different provinces.

Item agreed to.

Telegraph and Telephone Lines

Prince Edward Island and mainland, $7,000.
Land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels for cable services, $218,000.
Alberta and Saskatchewan, $114,000.
British Columbia, mainland, $36,000.
British Columbia, Vancouver island district, $132,000.
British Columbia, northern district, $88,000.
Yukon system—main line, $139,000.
Telegraph and telephone services generally, $5,000.—Total, $739,000.

Mr. FRASER: What repairs or improvements are proposed on the Yukon system? Does this vote cover repairs proposed to be made during the present season?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This is the maintenance vote. It is required for working expenses, including salaries, repairs, supplies and living expenses in connection with the system for the year 1929-30.

Mr. FRASER: What repairs are proposed to be made on the Yukon system under this vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The repairs intended to be covered by this vote are estimated to cost $25,000. That is a general lump sum to cover repairs, renewals, office supplies, materials for the line, blankets, and so forth.

Mr. FRASER: There are no specific repairs in mind at the present time?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No.

Mr. McQUARRIE: With respect to the telephone lines in the interior of British Columbia, a sale was made last year of some of the lines to the British Columbia Telephone Company. Is it proposed to sell any more of these lines?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I answered that question the other day when we were considering vote 148, but I shall be glad to answer my hon. friend's question. It is proposed this year to sell lines north and east of Kamloops. They will be advertised and sold if satisfactory tenders are received.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The sale is going to be advertised this time?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Last time the lines were not advertised for sale at all; they were sold to the British Columbia Telephone Company without any advertising for tenders. I believe that the Okanagan Telephone Company, which has been carrying on business in that territory for quite a number of years, was not given an opportunity to buy those lines, but that instead the British Columbia Telephone Company was allowed to go into that territory, and I am informed that the Okanagan Telephone Company was prepared to make an offer for the lines if there had been any competition. Would the minister explain why no opportunity was given to other companies to bid on the lines the government proposed to sell last year? The minister perhaps knows something about the Okanagan Telephone Company, or at all events his deputy will, because it is quite a large concern and has been carrying on business for a great number of years. It would seem to me to be most unfair to cut in on the Okanagan Telephone Company, one of the pioneers in that district, in the way that has been done. I have not got it here but in my room I have a lot of correspondence in connection with the matter, and it seems to quite aparent that this deal with the British Columbia Telephone Company was put through behind the backs of the Okanagan Telephone Company, which had been I think negotiating for some time with the government. The Minister of National Health (Mr. King, Kootenay)) who is a cabinet minister from British Columbia, knows something about it. I think certain conferences were held in British Columbia with the directors of the Okanagan Telephone Company. Perhaps the minister could give us an explanation.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to do so. I do not think that the Okanagan Telephone Company will say they were not given an opportunity to bid on the line that was sold last year. My hon. friend will remember that this matter was under discussion a year ago when the estimates were before the house. Of course I have not the details here, but I can assure my hon. friend that what took place was this: The Okanagan Telephone Company was interested only in a very small portion of the line, and they wrote the department I think making perfectly clear that they were interested in only a small proportion of the line that was to be sold. That particular portion was the best revenue producing part of the line, and it was felt that we could not sell it without selling the balance. We had only one bidder for the whole line, and it was sold to that bidder. I understand that the Okanagan Telephone Company is this year in a position to bid for

the lines that are proposed to be sold, and they and everybody else will have an opportunity to tender.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am afraid the minister's information is not entirely accurate because I was informed by the manager of the Okanagan Telephone Company just shortly before I left for Ottawa that had they known that those lines would be sold by the government they certainly would have offered a better price than the government got from the British Columbia Telephone Company. I think the statement was made by the previous Minister of Public Works that the government would not sell any part of the line unless they got rid of the whole thing, but as a matter of fact the government did sell only part of the line. That is what I am objecting to, and that is what the Okanagan Telephone Company objects to, that the government did sell a part of the line without giving the Okanagan Telephone Company a chance to bid on that part at all. I do not know that this vote should go through until we have some further information from the minister.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The whole section, of which the part that the Okanagan Telephone Company proposed to purchase was only a very small part, was sold.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But the price that the government put on the line when the negotiations were taking place with the Okanagan Telephone Company was very much higher than the price at which the lines were sold. If I remember correctly the price which the government got from the British Columbia Telephone Company was $100,000. Am I right?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think you are too high; I think it was less than that, but I would not say positively. I shall be very glad to show my hon. friend the correspondence, and I think I can satisfy him that the statement I am making as to what took place is absolutely accurate.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In any event the minister states positively that with respect to any future sales a chance will be given for other concerns in British Columbia to bid?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is correct.

Mr. CAYLEY: How did the federal government come into possession of these lines?

Mr. ELLIOTT: These are part of the lines that were originally constructed for the purpose of giving to the settlers in the outlying districts, where no commercial company would undertake to build, facilities to enable them to keep in touch with the rest of the world.

Mr. CAYLEY: I notice there is one line in Prince Edward Island. Was that built by the federal authorities?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is part of the arrangement made at confederation to provide Prince Edward Island with telephone communication to keep the people in touch with the mainland.

Mr. LUCAS: Why are there two votes dealing with telegraph and telephone lines; vote 313, $739,000 and vote 147, $258,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Vote 147 is for construction and does not include salaries. The other vote includes salaries for maintenance.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the mileage of the federal telephone lines in Alberta?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot offhand give the mileage for Alberta. I have a statement which I shall be very glad to hand to my hon. friend, showing the total mileage of telephone and telegraph lines.

Mr. COOTE: Has the minister given consideration to the possibility of consolidating the telegraph lines from Edmonton to the Peace River country? I am told that the lines run in close proximity to the railway telegraph lines. I am not personally familiar with the situation, but I have had a few letters about it. If the minister has not given consideration to such a consolidation, will he have his officers look into it this year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The object of these lines is to provide accommodation where there is no other means of communication. The matter to which my hon. friend refers has had consideration, and the general policy of the department as far as possible is not to have two lines in close proximity. One line is expensive enough in that sparsely settled country.

Mr. COOTE: I am not suggesting that any telegraph lines should be discontinued to points that are not served by the railway telegraph lines; but from the map it appears to me quite possible that there might be a consolidation of some of the lines running from Edmonton up to the Peace River country.

Mr. NEILL: This is a departure from what I think should be the established policy of the government. I would consider it of interest to my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) if he can

distract his attention for a moment from the divorce bills. This is a departure from the principle of government ownership. The government builds these telegraph lines and then as soon as they become profitable, or nearly so, they hand them over to a private company. It is not fair to the system. And it is not fair to the principle of government ownership, towards which we are supposed to be working all the time. I can see the day when perhaps this policy will be extended all over British Columbia. It is altogether undesirable because we have had some experiences of privately owned telegraph lines. While they are well conducted business propositions, the private companies are absolutely coldblooded and will not give accommodation unless there is good money in it for themselves. The government telegraph service, like the Post Office Department, gives some assistance to the outlying pioneer districts. If this principle of selling out is extended, I can see the day when those people will be cut out from such facilities. When the service becomes profitable why not keep it on and so help to balance up some of the unprofitable sections?

Mr. ELLIOTT: If it is decided to go into government ownership and operation of telephones—

Mr. NEILL: And telegraph lines.

Mr. ELLIOTT: —telegraph and telephone lines, because they are working together so far as those the government operate are concerned, perhaps there is a great deal to be said in favour of it.

Mr. NEILL: You are in it now.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, but only for the purposes of providing facilities that are not otherwise obtainable. We are not in it as a commercial proposition. If it were entered upon as a commercial proposition, then my hon. friend will see we would endeavour to take over what no doubt he has in mind—we would take them all over and run the profitable as well as the unprofitable lines.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Why should the government turn over the profitable lines to private companies?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The reason we build these lines in the first place is to supply facilities that a commercial company will not supply because it does not look like a profitable venture. As soon as some commercial company will take them over and operate them in conjunction with other lines that they have, which make them profitable, the government endeavours to get rid of the deficit by handing over those lines.

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But why should the government do all the pioneering work and be at all the loss of initiating a system and then as soon as it becomes profitable turn it over to a commercial company? It seems to me the government should retain the system when it becomes profitable.

Mr. NEILL: On the principle enunciated by the minister we shall find the government selling the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Further, as regards telegraphs, have we not a system of practically government-owned telegraphs in connection with Canadian National Railways?

Mr. ELLIOTT: For the operation of the railways; that is correct.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But in commercial work, in connection with the railways?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, part of it anyway.

Mr. EVANS: There are still in Saskatchewan some telegraph lines which I do not think are needed. There is a part of the old line from Qu'Appelle to Battleford, and New Humboldt, some twenty miles, still in existence, and this side of Battleford, at a place called Baljennie an operator is maintained all the time, although there is not much work to do. All he gets over the wires are the market reports, and there is absolutely no need of that line. I understand that the line was only a year or two ago practically renewed from Baljennie to Battleford. It may be needed further northwest up to Fort Pitt and further up, but the other part of the line is certainly not needed and there is no reason why we should pay an operator to be there all the time doing nothing.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What is the name of the line?

Mr. EVANS: I am referring to the line from Baljennie to Battleford, twenty odd miles.

Mr. ELLIOTT: From the data I have I am not in a position to say whether or not that line is still being operated, but I am able to give to my hon. friend details in connection with the lines we operate in Saskatchewan and Alberta. The mileage in the two provinces is as follows:

The mileage is made up as follows:

In Alberta—	Miles	Miles
Edmonton-Hudson Hope	739½	
Athabasca-Fort McMurray	245	
Athabasca-Lac La Biche	78	
Mooswa-Onion Lake	37	
Junor	8	
		1,107½

In Saskatchewan—		
Pegasus to Barnes Ferry	14	
Battleford-Isle la Crosse	335	
Lloydminster-Onion Lake	42	
Assiniboia-Willow Branch	84	
Grouard-High Prairie	38½	
Dawson Creek	8	
Kilkerran	6	
		527½
Total		1,635

The total mileage the government operates is around 10,000 miles.

Mr. EVANS: Is that line running down to Willow Branch still maintained—and from Moose Jaw south?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am under the impression that it is, but I cannot say.

Mr. EVANS: It is not needed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I can assure my hon. friend that the moment it is not needed it will be discontinued. There is this difficulty in regard to the lines that are not largely used: unless someone else is willing to take them over, there may be a few people along the line who are using it and who would feel it a great hardship if the service were discontinued.

Mr. EVANS: But in this case it crosses a great many of the railway lines and runs alongside some of them. Moreover, the whole country is pretty well served by telephone as well.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am obliged for the information and I will make a special inquiry to see just what the conditions are.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is there a government telephone line running north from Edmonton? If so, why not join up with the Alberta government lines from Edmonton?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think the one from Edmonton north is a telegraph line.

Mr. ADSHEAD: That is in conjunction with the Canadian National Railways at Edmonton.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the principle on which these lines are built?

Mr. FRASER: I want to ask the minister a question in connection with the fourth item in vote 313—British Columbia, mainland. That vote has been reduced from $92,000 to $36,000. Is that on account of the sale of the lines south of Kamloops during the last year?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: How much of the $92,000 of last year's vote was actually spent?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The revenue was $22,485. For 1928-29 the expenditure was $114,183.42 to March 31. That is Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He is asking for British Columbia.

Mr. FRASER: The total vote was $92,000 for British Columbia.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The expenditure last year on the British Columbia mainland was $59,978.10 out of the $92,000. That is why the appropriation has been reduced this year.

Mr. FRASER: This year $36,000 is being asked to carry on these lines. It is proposed also to sell the lines east and north of Kamloops. Tenders are being called and the proposition is to dispose of the lines. Suppose these tenders are accepted: there is an important administrative office in Kamloops; what is to become of that office?

Mr. ELLIOTT: If the line is sold the office will of course be discontinued. If the line is sold to another company the office will disappear so far as we are concerned.

Mr. FRASER: What about the men in the service? What will become of them? A certain number of official positions will be abolished and what will become of the officials who have no jobs left?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the past, as largely as it has been possible to do so, those who were operating lines sold by the department have been taken over by the purchaser. That is usually what does happen and what we hope will happen to a large extent here.

Mr. FRASER: I do not think you have ever had to face a situation exactly like that which exists in Kamloops at present. There you have had an administrative office with administrative officials in a central location; you have sold the lines south of the city, but of course you have not done away with the administrative offices. However, now it is intended to sell the lines to the east and north of the city and there will be no need of those administrative officials in the future. I am not concerned about the ordinary clerks or operators, because they will probably have an opportunity of being taken over by the purchasing company, but some of the administrative officials have spent a long time in the service. I know that one man, the superintendent, has been in the service for twenty-five or thirty years, but now his office is to be abolished and I would like to know what disposition is to be made of this man and other ranking officials in that office.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot say anything definite about what will happen to the general superintendent or any particular officer, but I can assure my hon. friend that it will be the aim of the department to provide, as far as it can be done, for those who are not taken over by the purchasing company.

Mr. FRASER: I suppose it has not been decided whether it would be possible to move these administrative officers from Kamloops to Ashcroft?

Mr. ELLIOTT: We cannot say at present

Mr. BRADY: I would like to ask the minister whether any extensions are contemplated in the telephone system of northern British Columbia?

Mr. ELLIOTT: If my hon. friend will turn to vote 148 on page 45 he will find that it includes the extensions which are proposed for this year. The vote of $88,000 to which he refers is for the purpose of operating the lines we have at present and does not include the construction of new lines.

Mr. BRADY: I have before me a resolution from the Associated Boards of Trade of Central British Columbia with reference to telephone facilities in the northern part of central British Columbia extending from Terrace for about three hundred miles along the Canadian National line, embracing the whole of Ominica county as well as the Skeena. I think perhaps at this time it would be well to let the minister know the great needs of this part of Canada in regard to an up-to-date telephone system. The resolution, I propose to read, is very brief:

Whereas present telephone facilities throughout the central interior of British Columbia are most inadequate, and many settlements are without this means of communication altogether;

And whereas this large district, which is increasing in commercial importance every year, has to depend on insufficient telegraph facilities, and a tri-weekly mail service;

And whereas telephone lines traversing important parts of this district not served by telephone would be of very great benefit to the various business interests established in the district, and to settlers:

Be it therefore resolved that this convention of the Associated Boards of Trade of Central British Columbia do ask that the Dominion government have a survey made of the situation herein related, with a view to the construction of telephone systems where required, at the earliest possible moment.

I will not delay the committee very long, but I would like to draw attention to the remarks made by the minister a few minutes ago. He said that the department was desirous, so far as it was possible and without considering the commercial aspect, of giving these aids to the scattered settlements throughout Canada. Ontario and Quebec do not call upon this government to develop their telephone systems—they are able to look after their own—but I honestly think this department has been very dilatory in coming to the aid of the settlers in those districts of central British Columbia who must depend on the Dominion government. I travelled in that country last fall and found that places like Colley Mount, in the Francois lake district, where there are very fine farms and numerous settlers, have no connection with the outside world. The result is that there is a retardation of development, because the people are reluctant to go far away if they do not get telephone accommodation.

Once more I would ask the government to heed the requests of the people who go to such trouble to present their needs to this department; I think at least the government should have a proper survey made in order to find out really what extensions are necessary so that definite steps may be taken to assist in the settlement of these areas. I believe that the money spent in telephone extensions in a country which is being settled is money which undoubtedly will bring results later on. I hope this matter will receive the sympathetic consideration of the government.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will be very glad to inquire into the matter to which my hon. friend has referred. It is the desire of the department to impress upon the people who go to the outlying districts of the country the fact that they will not be cut off from the more settled portions of Canada and that they will be provided with facilities for communication with their friends and business connections so far as it is reasonably possible to do so.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I would like to ask the minister a question with reference to the telegraph service from Vancouver north along the coast of the mainland. I believe the line runs as far as Pender Harbour, and I understand that the service given is not satisfactory in that the offices are closed on Sundays and holidays. In the summer time a great many people go to the seaside resorts up along the coast and when an accident happens or someone becomes ill on a Sunday or a holiday there is no way in which a telegram can be sent. It seems to me that some arrangement could be made whereby messages would be accepted by the Canadian National Railways Telegraph Company for delivery in Vancouver on Sundays and holidays. The

men who send the messages are available because the offices are generally located in their stores. I have endeavoured myself to send out messages on several occasions but have found that it was impossible to do so.

Mr. ELLIOTT: These lines are pretty primitive, and a great many offices are located in the houses of the operators. These men are usually available but they cannot be expected to stay on the job all the time. There is only one operator at each office, and there are bound to be periods when he would be taking time off. However, the sugestion made by my hon. friend is worthy of consideration and I shall be very glad to look into it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am afraid I have not made myself clear to the minister. The trouble is not with the men who send the messages, but with the delivery of the messages in Vancouver.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The hon. member's objection is that the receiving end is not kept open.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Yes. I suggest that it might be possible to make an arrangement with the Canadian National so that they would accept messages from along the coast and deliver them in Vancouver on Sundays and holidays. They could also send out messages where the operators could be reached.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No complaints have reached the department with reference to the particular matter the hon. member has mentioned. We have an arrangement with the Canadian National applying to certain places.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. McQUARRIE: This item is not carried as yet, because I desire to speak with reference to the Okanagan Telegraph Company again.

Progress reported.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): With the consent of the house I would like to advance Bill No. 254 in connection with the terminal facilities at Montreal, if my hon. friend is ready to proceed with that.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I thought we were going on with supply after eight o'clock. That was the arrangement.

SUPPLY—AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to direct the attention of the government and of the house to the very serious condition of certain branches of the agricultural industry, particularly that of dairying. Hon. members on the government benches are continually boasting of what they choose to call the abounding prosperity of the country. If the prosperity of which they speak is as general as they would lead us to believe, it should be shared at least by such an important industry as agriculture. I am afraid, however, that they will have great difficulty in persuading the average farmer of the Dominion of Canada that he enjoys that prosperity. The fact is that agriculture is not prospering today, and I intend to submit to the house two reasons out of the many that might be advanced for making such a statement.

First of all, let me say that ever since this government came into office in 1921, there has been a steady depreciation in land values. In many communities, large numbers of farm holdings are being offered for sale, and in many instances it is impossible to sell those farm holdings for the value of the buildings themselves. In fact, from my own observation and experience I feel that I am safe in saying that land values have depreciated by from 30 to 40 per cent during the past seven or eight years, since this government came into power.

My second reason for making the statement is the fact that there is a continual exodus from our rural communities. In many country districts it would be difficult to find a concession or even a farm from which young men and young women have not gone to our cities and to the country to the south for the purpose of finding a job and making a living. It is entirely unnecessary for me to advance any further proof of the fallacy of the government's claim of prosperity. Members of the government themselves, I believe, are more or less aware of the true state of affairs in this respect. I think it was the late member for Frontenac who, speaking in the house on the budget, quoted from a speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) some time previously in which he used these words:

> The fact of the matter is, that the farmer is spending more to-day than 100 acres of land will ever yield.

I am sure the Minister of Trade and Commerce or any other member of the government will not contend for a moment that the standard of living of the farmer should be lower than that of any other class in the community, and it is surely a serious condition of affairs when 100 acres of land will not yield a sufficient income to maintain a reasonable standard of living for the owner of the farm and his family. The responsibilty for this lack of prosperity in the agricultural industry must be laid at the door of the present government. They must be aware of the financial position of the average farmer, and if so, they have absolutely failed to take any measures to assist him in improving his position.

Just as it is true that agriculture is the basic industry of Canada, it is also true that the foundation of agriculture is dairying. In all the provinces the average farmer, while producing other lines of farm products, produces a considerable quantity of milk. It will be found that in the central provinces, in the maritimes and in British Columbia every farmer is producing dairy products, and prior to a short time ago it was true that the dairy business was expanding quite rapidly in the prairie provinces also. The dairy business cannot be built up in a day, or a month or a year; it takes a number of years properly to equip a dairy farm, to build up a dairy herd and to put production on a dairy farm upon a paying basis. But after that has been accomplished, the ultimate success of the industry depends very largely upon the stability of the market and the prices which the farmer can procure. Perhaps hon. members on the other side of the house will not agree with me in the statement that I am going to make, but I am sure hon. members on this side will very largely agree that the greatest factor in stabilizing prices of farm products, with the exception perhaps, of wheat, is the home market itself. The continued invasion of our home markets by foreign producers has done much to create a lack of confidence in the mind of the dairy farmer and to discourage him. In fact it has brought the industry almost to the verge of disaster. On the one hand we find that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) and the government are spending large sums of money every year to aid the dairy industry by regulating the standards of dairy produce, by provision for proper grading of dairy products and the accreditation of dairy herds, while on the other hand the government has sat quietly by, absolutely neglecting the most important matter of all, that

of taking proper measures to retain the home market for the Canadian producer. Other countries are doing everything within their power by means of tariff duties and regulations to safeguard the interests of their agricultural population. We have a concrete example of this in the recent action of the congress of the United States. Not content with the provisions of the Fordney-McCumber tariff, they have taken more extreme measures to assist agriculture, while our government, knowing the condition of the Canadian farmer as they must know it, has sat quietly by, inactive and impotent. Although there has been and is to-day a general demand that the duty on poultry products be increased, the government has done absolutely nothing; indeed, in some ways it has been worse than negligent. Last year, by rescinding the order in council giving the Minister of National Revenue power to set a fair market value on natural products, it worked a great injury to the fruit and vegetable industries, while in other ways, especially by its trade agreements, as has been repeatedly pointed out by hon. members on this side of the house, it has materially injured the farming industry, particularly dairying. The order in council of September, 1926, extending the provisions of the Australian agreement to New Zealand is a striking example of this very thing. I wish to show briefly—I am not going to quote many figures—the effect of the New Zealand agreement on the dairy industry and upon agriculture generally in Canada.

In the fiscal year 1925-26, just before the New Zealand agreement came into effect, Canada had an exportable surplus of butter of some 23,303,000 pounds, while for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929, Canada had to import some 25,000,000 pounds of butter to meet her own requirements. That is a difference in the three years since the New Zealand agreement came into effect of approximately 50,000,000 pounds. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking on the budget some time ago, tried to explain this by saying that milk products in other forms than butter were being exported in increasing quantities to other countries. and that better returns were being obtained than would have accrued had the milk been manufactured into butter. I have a report in my hand which was sent out by the dairy and cold storage branch of the Department of Agriculture, which goes a long way towards disproving the minister's statement. It shows the amount of milk and cream exported prior to the agreement and since, as well as the amount of condensed milk, powdered milk, evaporated milk and casein,

and in every instance the report shows distinctly that there was a less amount exported in 1929 than in the fiscal year 1925-26, prior to the agreement. In the fiscal year 1925-26 Canada exported some $7,843,000 of milk and cream, and in 1928, $6,460,000 worth, or a decrease of approximately $1,389,000. Of condensed, evaporated and powdered milk there was a decrease in the calendar year 1928, as compared with the fiscal year 1925-26, of some 8,000,000 pounds, the value of which was about $750,000. There was also a decrease in the export of casein, so that the contention of the minister that exports of other forms of milk products than butter are increasing is scarcely founded on fact.

Further figures which I obtained from the Bureau of Statistics show that the number of dairy cows in Canada decreased in the year 1928 by some 102,000. On the other hand, the statistics show that while this decrease has been going on in Canada, the number of dairy cows in New Zealand has been increasing by some 50,000. If the dairy industry in this country were in a flourishing condition one would naturally expect that the population of our dairy herds would be increasing, and that our milk production would also be on the up-grade. However, we find that our milk production is not on the up-grade. In the year 1927, the production of milk in Canada was reduced by some 340,000,000 pounds. The figures are not available for 1928, but it is only reasonable to suppose that when the population of our dairy herds decreased by some 100,000 milch cows, the production of milk in the same period would also show a decrease. I do not intend, however, to go any further into that phase of the question, because no doubt it will be dealt with later on.

That the Liberal press of this country are more or less alive to the situation is very apparent. They have been trying to explain the present conditions, and they have been spreading propaganda, in some instances at least, to the effect that the price of butter in Canada is higher than in other countries. I have here, however, a statement of prices taken from the Montreal Gazette showing that during the past six months the price of butter in New York and Chicago has been uniformly from six to eight cents per pound higher than in Montreal. That, it seems to me, is sufficient evidence that the price of butter in Canada is not higher than it is in other countries.

But the dairy industry is not the only branch of agriculture which is being affected adversely by this trade agreement. Other classes of farm products such as are being produced in Canada are coming into the country in ever-increasing quantities. Let me refer to beef. Frozen, chilled and fresh beef came into Canada from New Zealand last year in quite an increased quantity over the importations of former years, the increase between the years 1926 and 1929 amounting to 1,875,000 pounds. The same can be said of fresh, frozen and chilled mutton. Just here let me say that only the other day I had a gentleman in my office whose home is in New Zealand, and he said to me quite frankly that this trade agreement has been a real boon to the New Zealand farmer because of the increased quantities of mutton and beef which they are now shipping into Canada.

In regard to other farm products, I have a return that was asked for by the late hon. member for Frontenac-Addington, dated February 27, 1929, showing that of farm products of a class or kind produced by Canadian farmers there was imported into Canada during the fiscal year 1926 some $2,725,000 worth from New Zealand, and in the year 1928 over $9,461,000 worth, or an increase of some $6,736,000. We must bear in mind that every pound of meat which is brought into the country replaces a similar amount of the Canadian product in our own home market. I have given the house figures which I think demonstrate quite clearly that there has been a steady falling off in milk production during the past year, that there has been an encroachment upon the Canadian market by foreign agricultural products, and that in a great measure this serious condition has been brought about by the provisions of the New Zealand trade agreement. I do not intend to weary the house with any further figures. That the dairy industry is in a critical condition is acknowledged by everyone who is acquainted with the facts. Our milk production is decreasing; our dairy herds are being depleted; foreign agricultural products are finding ready access to our markets. Agriculture is labouring against great odds because of unfair competition.

To my mind the remedy is simple. Measures should at once be taken by the government to ensure the full benefit of the home market to the Canadian producer. I fully believe in the development of trade within the empire. Nothing is more desirable than trade agreements of mutual advantage to sister dominions; but we cannot afford to pay too high a price to attain that object. The ruination of the dairy industry is too great a price to pay. We cannot afford to purchase trade concessions in foreign markets for cer-

tain of our industries, if the whole burden is to be borne by some other one industry. I believe the government should negotiate with New Zealand with a view to bringing about a more equitable trade arrangement. If that cannot be accomplished, the agreement should be terminated before our dairy industry is absolutely bankrupt.

Mr. W. E. TUMMON (South Hastings): Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from a dairy district, where practically every farmer is a dairy farmer, I am naturally interested in anything that concerns or affects the dairy industry. I have listened carefully while hon. gentlemen in this house have declared that the importation of butter at one cent per pound duty did not injuriously affect our dairy industry. As I have listened to them it has seemed to me that they could not be in very close touch with the dairy industry, at least with those whom this importation of butter most vitally concerns, namely, the producers—the dairy farmers.

In a great agricultural country like Canada, where all governments in the past have sought to encourage and foster the dairy industry, a country which has gained a place as one of the leading dairy countries of the world, it does seem to me reasonable that we should at least be able to supply our own requirements. I think I am voicing the opinion of thousands of those who are engaged in the dairy industry to-day when I say that had there been no importation of butter at one cent per pound duty, our butter production would have kept pace with the times, and we would not now be importing such large quantities of butter.

For years the dairy farmers of the district which I have the honour to represent were urged by the department of agriculture to engage in winter dairying. We were told by the dairy and cold storage branch that our prospects for increased prices for butter would be better could an all the year round supply be provided. Now, in a country like Canada an all the year round supply can be provided only by winter dairying. Up to within a few years ago winter dairying was on the increase in our district, but at the present time, with the exception of the production of sweet milk for our towns and cities, winter dairying is practically a dead issue.

Dairying in Canada made great progress from 1900 until 1926. What is the reason that it has not continued to forge ahead? Is the dairy farmer less patriotic than he was in 1926? Is he less capable of producing to-day than he was a few years ago? Rather is the failure not due to the fact that a few years ago this government took away the slight advantage which the dairy farmer held in his home market, and forced him—nothwithstanding the fact that he must stable his cattle from six to seven months in each and every year and give them extra care—forced him, I say, to take a price for his butter based upon the competitive cost of producing a pound of butter fat in a country where conditions as to climate and feed are very favourable.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the dairy farmers of this country have a right to expect fair play. Fair play is all they ask. It is a significant fact that Canada is the only British dominion that permits the importation of butter at 1 cent per pound duty. Australia has a duty of 12 cents per pound; New Zealand, 7 cents; South Africa had a duty of 4 cents per pound, but in 1926 when Australia succeeded in shipping large quantities of butter into South Africa the duty was raised to 10 cents per pound to preserve the home market to the South African producer; the United States has a duty of 12 cents per pound, and if indication counts for anything now, that duty will soon be raised to 14 cents per pound; Argentine has a duty of 6.18 cents per pound; while in Canada, where dairying is carried on perhaps under even more difficult conditions than in any of the countries that I have named, this government has decided that the only protection the Canadian dairyman is worthy of is one cent per pound. Since that decision was made and became effective, in 1925, the farmers of the Antipodes have been capturing the butter market of Canada. The Australian treaty was made applicable on and after October 1, 1925, and at that time by order in council the 1 cent rate on imported butter was extended to New Zealand. It is true that Australia did grant certain concessions to Canada in return for the concessions that Canada granted to her; but as far as I am aware neither then nor since has New Zealand granted any concessions to Canada in return for the concessions that Canada granted to her.

Now, I should like the house to note for a moment the imports of butter from Australia and New Zealand for the fiscal years ending March 31, 1921, to March 31, 1925, or the

five years preceding the coming into effect of the Australian treaty and the New Zealand order in council. I will not weary the house with all these figures. I might say that I have two or three other tables here that I shall ask the indulgence of the house to place on Hansard. I do not take up much of the time of hon. members, and I trust that this indulgence will be granted to me.

The figures are as follows:

Production of Milk by Provinces 1926 and 1927

Province	Lbs of milk 1926	Lbs of milk 1927	Increase	Decrease
Prince Edward Island	174,695,130	178,564,368	3,869,238	.....
Nova Scotia	539,502,783	526,412,334	.....	13,090,449
New Brunswick	422,565,110	403,614,618	.....	18,950,492
Quebec	3,953,741,220	4,057,161,966	103,420,746	.....
Ontario	5,602,202,761	5,128,278,311	.....	473,924,450
Manitoba	634,706,590	660,449,500	25,742,910	.....
Saskatchewan	994,689,201	1,049,216,124	54,526,923	.....
Alberta	813,196,472	761,633,312	.....	51,563,160
British Columbia	272,040,990	294,911,760	22,870,770	.....
Total	13,407,340,257	13,060,242,293	210,430,587	557,528,551

Total decrease for 1927 as compared to 1926, 347,097,964 lbs.

Production of Dairy and Creamery Butter by Provinces, 1926 and 1927

Province	Lbs. of butter 1926	Lbs. of butter 1927	Increase	Decrease
Prince Edward Island	2,844,213	4,019,442	1,175,229	.....
Nova Scotia	6,789,590	11,059,740	4,270,150	.....
New Brunswick	8,732,027	4,398,212	.....	4,333,815
Quebec	69,557,061	73,592,954	4,035,893	.....
Ontario	88,541,176	94,471,921	5,930,745	.....
Manitoba	24,654,342	22,727,882	.....	1,926,460
Saskatchewan	35,329,136	29,495,531	.....	5,833,605
Alberta	29,412,466	25,679,712	.....	3,732,754
British Columbia	6,349,276	6,533,553	184,277	.....
Totals	272,209,287	271,978,947	15,596,294	15,826,634

Decrease over increase, 230,340 lbs.

Production of Factory and Homemade Cheese by Provinces, 1926 and 1927

Province	Lbs. of cheese 1926	Lbs. of cheese 1927	Increase	Decrease
Prince Edward Island	2,003,787	1,658,178	.....	345,609
Nova Scotia	121,408	112,591	.....	8,817
New Brunswick	1,066,432	810,719	.....	255,713
Quebec	46,456,384	37,591,951	.....	8,864,433
Ontario	119,510,674	96,253,607	.....	23,257,067
Manitoba	972,484	722,659	.....	249,825
Saskatchewan	399,724	286,371	.....	113,353
Alberta	1,489,721	880,457	.....	609,264
British Columbia	227,762	155,792	.....	71,970
Totals	172,248,376	138,472,325	.....	33,776,051

Total decrease 1927 compared to 1926, 33,776,051 lbs.

For the five years ending March 31, 1921, to March 31, 1925, the total importations of butter from Australia were 310,890 pounds; from New Zealand, 7,154,907 pounds—a total of 7,465,797 pounds. It will be noted that of this total only 310,890 pounds came from Australia. From these figures it is evident that New Zealand butter was better known and better liked in Canada than was Australian butter. Notwithstanding any effect of the Patterson scheme in the importation of Australian butter, the granting of the same concessions to New Zealand took away from Australia, as it were, the advantage

which she hoped would accrue by the concessions which Canada had granted to her.

Now, let hon. members note the quantities of butter imported from these two countries for the four fiscal years following, that is 1926, 1927, 1928 and 1929.

Year	Pounds
1926..	4,828,468
1927..	5,705,960
1928..	14,195,789
1929..	24,952,611

It is a significant fact that during the last three months of the fiscal year just closed —that is to say, January, February and March—the importations were as follows: 1929, 7,660,681 for January, in comparison with 3,183,289 for January 1928; February 1929, 6,598,476 in comparison with 3,052,311 for February 1928; March 1929, 3,259,145 in comparison with 2,676,492 for March 1928. In other words, there was a total increase of 8,606,210 pounds for the three months January, February and March, 1929, in comparison with the corresponding three months in 1928.

Some people will ask, what about the consumer? They will say that if it were not for this importation of butter at one cent a pound duty the consumer would have to pay more per pound for this product. I am not so sure of that. The most discouraging thing the Canadian dairy farmer has to face to-day is the fact that he is not secure in his own home market. The people in the towns and cities of the districts I have the honour to represent are not much concerned about a few cents a pound on butter. They believe that the greatest asset they can have is a prosperous farming community at their door. They believe that a prosperous farming community right at their door is of greater value to them than a prosperous farming community three thousand miles away. Similarly, the farmers of that district believe that towns and cities at their door, where workmen are busy making the tools and implements they require on their farms—and the farmers of Canada at large require—are of greater value to them than prosperous towns and cities in the United States or anywhere else in the world.

The foundation of the entire dairy industry is the production of milk and the success of any one branch of that industry is no indication of the success of the industry as a whole. A farmer, if he is geographically so situated, will perhaps send his milk to the cheese factory this year and next year to the creamery to be made into butter. That is a common occurrence throughout Ontario. I repeat, the success of any one branch is no indication of the success of the industry taken as a whole; but the production of milk is the foundation or basis of the entire industry. Upon it all branches of the dairy industry are built. From 1910 to 1926 the dairy industry in Canada made great strides forward; but something seemed to have gone wrong in 1927. It is well to remember that the Australian treaty and the New Zealand order in council went into effect fifteen months prior to the beginning of the year 1927. Let us note what the total dairy production in Canada was for the two calendar years 1926 and 1927—that is, the total dairy production of Canada expressed in pounds of milk and covering milk made into butter, both dairy and creamery, home made and factory cheese, miscellaneous factory products, and milk consumed fresh or otherwise. The figures for the years from 1924 to 1928, inclusive, are as follows:

Year	Pounds	
1924	12,318,538,000	
1925	12,651,308,000	Increase over 1924—332,770,000 pounds
1926	13,407,340,000	Increase over 1925—756,032,000 pounds
1927	13,060,242,000	Decrease from 1926—347,098,000 pounds
1928	Not yet available	

I regret that the dairy statistics for the year 1928 are not yet available, but I will venture this opinion, that when they are available they will show a corresponding decrease in the basis of the entire dairy industry production of milk in comparison with 1927. Let us take the decrease of 347,098,000 pounds in the foundation of the dairy industry in 1927; at the usual average ratio of 3·5 pounds of butter fat to 100 pounds of milk, this would represent 12,148,429 pounds of butter fat. A pound of butter fat is equivalent to 1⅛ pounds of butter. Thus the decrease in the milk production in Canada in 1927 compared to 1926 is equivalent to 14,378,115 pounds of butter. Now we have a rather interesting comparison. If we go back and look at the importations of butter into Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1928, which covers the milk producing periods of 1927, we find that the importations were 14,195,789 pounds. In other words, the shrinkage or decrease in the base or foundation of the entire industry in 1927 compared with 1926, expressed in pounds of butter, agrees with the amount of butter imported during the same period from the Antipodes, and most of which came from New Zealand. There could be no stronger evidence to show that the importation of butter at one cent a pound duty from the Antipodes is gradually driving the Canadian dairyman back. The two oldest branches of the dairy industry in

Canada are cheese production and butter production. The importation of butter into Canada at one cent per pound duty does not come directly into competition with such branches as sweet milk for cities, condensed milk, sweet cream for ice cream and sweet milk and cream for exportation into the United States. The New Zealanders cannot compete directly with these branches. But the importation of butter does directly compete with those dairymen who follow the two old natural branches, the production of cheese and the production of buttter. The dairy farmers who follow these two branches are for the most part geographically so situated that they must depend upon these two lines for a market for their milk, and often, if they are so situated, they may change from one branch to the other from season to season.

I think this is clearly demonstrated if we look at the figures for Ontario. In 1927 as compared with 1926 the production of milk decreased by 473,924,430 pounds, but notwithstanding there was an increase of 5,930,745 pounds in the production of butter. However, there was a decrease in the production of cheese of 23,257,067 pounds. There was a total decrease in the production of dairy and creamery butter in Canada of 230,340 pounds as compared with 1926; that is a comparatively small reduction, but the reduction in factory and home made cheese amounted to 33,776,051 pounds. Here again, if you take the pounds of milk necessary to make this quantity of cheese in addition to the pounds of milk represented in the decreased production of butter, you will find that it agrees. Thus in the year commencing fifteen months after the New Zealand order in council came into effect, under a duty of one cent per pound we had an importation of butter amounting to 14,195,789 pounds, which is equal to a reduction of 347,098,000 pounds of milk, the production of which is the foundation of the dairy industry, and the effect of that importation was reflected in the decreased production in the two natural branches of the dairying industry, cheese and butter.

On page 9 of the pamphlet issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce in connection with dairy factories we find that during 1927 the total delivery of milk to cheese factories in Canada was 1,384,860,282 pounds, but the decrease in the production of milk in that year as compared with 1926 is equal to about one-third the entire cheese factory supply of milk in Ontario in 1927.

If we exclude Ontario and consider the other eight provinces, the decrease in the production of milk is greater by 42,425,128 pounds than all milk supplied to all cheese factories in those eight provinces in 1927. As the previous speaker (Mr. Senn) has said, there has been a great decrease in the number of dairy cattle in Canada; in 1927 that decrease amounted to 75,275 milking cows, as compared with 1926. It may be said that United States dairymen are coming to Canada and buying our cattle. Why should they not do so? They are protected and secure in their home market, and they can come to Canada for our cattle. Surely there is something wrong with the dairy industry of this country, and when any business begins to go back it is time to look for the cause and apply a remedy. The dairy farmers know something is wrong and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) knows something is wrong, or if he does not know I wonder what he meant when he spoke before the National Dairy Council at the King Edward hotel in Toronto last November, where he is reported to have said:

> You know that for the last year or two Canada has been relying on the west for the production of butter, and the west has rallied to that reliance by increased production. As far as I can see there is no visible increase in eastern Canada, and the west has been converted during the last decade and a half from an importing country to an exporting country in butter. But now there has been a cessation of that increase during the past two years. We will not inquire into the reasons for it.

Then there was laughter.

> There may be many and just as you will look at it, right up in Saskatchewan people differ as to the cause of it.

Then there was great laughter.

> I feel that is true, but common sense will suggest to both east and west that whatever the causes may be, few or many, they should be removed at the first opportunity, otherwise our production of butter and other products is going to decrease. The west was your best bid for the production of butter, but whatever the cause or causes—it may be due to our poor class of dairy cattle; in our hard times we may have been induced to sell off our best cattle—

Imagine a minister of this government talking about hard times during the past two years! If a member on this side of the house made that statement he would be accused immediately of talking blue ruin.

> —with the result that production gradually went down—it may have been due to non-nutritions feed during the winter and bad falls, which sometimes come about, or it may be a combination of all these and some other things.

Then there was great laughter, but the minister continued:

I take this ground, with your admonitions right in my mind; and I think it should appeal eventually to all of us that whatever the disabilities and limitations of the west to better production may be they should be diplomatically, quickly and quietly removed, whatever they may be.

That is the attitude we on this side of the house are taking on this matter, that the handicaps or disadvantages under which the Canadian dairyman is labouring to-day should be quickly and quietly removed. As the previous speaker just said, this is not a question of empire trade, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) does not look upon it as such. Speaking in Woodstock on September 21, 1925, the Prime Minister is reported to have said:

There is one condition of that treaty which says that we are free to alter or to abrogate it altogether on six months' notice. I say to the farmers of Oxford that if the Australian treaty does any injury to your industry I will undertake to say on behalf of the government that I will give that six months' notice on short order.

I say this is not a matter of empire trade but a matter concerning the welfare of the dairy industry of Canada. That is why we bring this question to the attention of the government, and in the words of the Minister of Agriculture we say that the handicaps under which the dairy industry is labouring should be diplomatically, quietly and quickly removed.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): The hon. gentleman who brought up this question on the motion to go into supply made the broad statement that this government had done nothing to help the farmers of Canada. When he made that statement I recalled the opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1924 when we reduced the duty on agricultural implements, on dairy utensils and on machinery required for work in our orchards, and removed altogether the sales tax from agricultural implements and dairy utensils.

Mr. HANSON: Beautiful.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. gentleman opposite says "beautiful," but I can recall that he was one of those who kept the house in session day after day protesting against this reduction in the duty on agricultural implements and on dairy utensils which we were told would ruin these great industries.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the reason the treaty was made.

[Mr. Tummon.]

Mr. ROBB: The agricultural implement industry in Canada is in better shape to-day than it was when the reductions were made. If the statements presented by my hon. friends to-night had any foundation in fact we would be unanimous in a desire to find out what the trouble was and how a cure could be effected.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What does the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) say about that?

Mr. ROBB: As to the prices received for the products, I intend to show that the dairy industry is in a better position to-day than it was prior to the introduction of the Australia-New Zealand agreement. I fail to understand the logic of my hon. friends opposite. They do not want to trade with the United States because that country is placing restrictions against our products.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not quite correct; we are not allowed to trade with the United States.

Mr. ROBB: I will show my hon. friend in a moment that we are allowed to trade with the United States.

Mr. CANTLEY: Upon unequal terms.

Mr. ROBB: They do not wish to trade with the British dominions because, they say, they believe in the proper method of trading—paying with their own products. The favourable balance of trade for the years 1924 to 1929 inclusive as between Canada and Australia and New Zealand amounted to over $130,000,000.

Mr. IRVINE: What does that mean?

Mr. ROBB: That means that we had a favourable balance of trade of over $130,000,000 more than we bought from them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is that a good thing?

Mr. ROBB: Do hon. members argue that the men employed in the factories of Canada; the men employed in the woods getting out lumber and carrying it to the saw mills and to the paper mills; the men who are employed on the railways hauling to the seaboard; the men on the docks—do they say that those men and their families are not consuming our farm products? I submit that this condition has brought about a greater consumption of farm products in Canada.

My hon. friend made a comparison between the position of the Canadian farmer and that of the United States farmer, mentioning the greater advantages which the American farmer enjoys. My reading of the press within the

last few months has convinced me that the United States farmer, the man who has been enjoying the high tariff protection which hon. gentlemen opposite are preaching, is in a very much worse position than the Canadian farmer.

Mr. CANTLEY: He wants more protection.

Mr. ROBB: He wants more protection, but what he really needs is a lower cost of living. I will admit at once that the dairy farmers of Canada would be helped very materially by a lowering of the cost of the feed products required for their stock. I will admit at once that under our freight tariff arrangement we encourage the export of bran and shorts rather than their consumption in Canada. The millers prefer to export bran and shorts, not only because of the favourable freight rate but because of certain restrictions which prevent the miller from putting the mill-run screenings in the bran and shorts for local consumption while he is permitted to include them in the material exported. It is much more profitable for the miller to export, and that is a matter which might be deserving of some consideration.

Mr. BENNETT: Next year.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friends have tried to argue that the dairy industry has been ruined. I propose to offer in evidence against that argument statements which have appeared in two newspapers, both loyal supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The first statement appeared in the Montreal Gazette in connection with their annual survey of the trade of Canada. That paper has as commercial editor a gentleman who for many years has reported the dairy exchanges throughout Canada and who has been a very close observer of the conditions relevant thereto. Experts maintain that last year there was a greater production of milk and that dairy cattle have increased in value.

Mr. BENNETT: "Experts maintain"!

Mr. ROBB: This is what Mr. Bark, commercial editor of the Montreal Gazette, had to say on January 4, in his annual survey of farming conditions in Canada.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He was not acquainted with your statistics.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend say that the Montreal Gazette is not a reliable paper?

Mr. BENNETT: It is not the paper, it is Mr. Bark.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Bark said:

It is the production of milk that counts, and there is more milk produced in Canada now than ever before.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not so.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Bark continues:

On account of having no export surplus of butter, the price in Canada is not regulated by the world market, as it is when there is a surplus, and while we have been importing butter the price here has been from five to twelve cents above the price producers would have received if they had been obliged to export a surplus.

That is a statement made by a gentleman who has made a close survey of market prices prevailing throughout the world.

Mr. STEVENS: It is the opinion of one individual.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend say that the prices quoted are not correct?

Mr. BENNETT: That is inaccurate.

Mr. STEVENS: They are wholly inconsistent with the government's own statistics.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. James Newbigging, president of the Western Ontario Dairymen's Association, had the following to say at London on January 9, 1929:

The growing local trade in eastern Canada continues to absorb a greater quantity than is being produced and must for the winter season depend on imports to supplement the supply.

Mr. STEVENS: He claims the production has fallen off.

Mr. ROBB: Then there is another statement made by a gentleman who has been very prominent in the dairy industry in recent years. This gentleman is a very good personal friend of mine but he is opposed to Australia-New Zealand trade agreement. He is secretary of the National Dairy Council, and I might mention that this council does not consist of farmers, but is largely financed by the cold storage operators and not by the farmers of this country.

Mr. BENNETT: Are they any the worse for that?

Mr. ROBB: No, they are none the worse for that.

Mr. HANSON: Why say so?

Mr. ROBB: This gentleman, Mr. W. F. Stephen, speaking at the same meeting in London, made the following statement:

From the summary of trade for the twelve months ending November, 15,758,251 pounds of butter were brought into Canada.

That is for that particular twelve months. The statement continues:

It is generally conceded that 1928 has been one of the best years for the industry. Prices for dairy products have rated high, with cheese prices leading all others, running about three cents per pound over 1927.

Hon. gentlemen opposite were very much alarmed recently when the United States indicated that they were going to raise the duty on milk and cream, and we have still echoing in our ears the lamentations of hon. gentlemen opposite that this great dairy industry was going to be ruined. The answer to that from my part of the country—and I claim to represent one of the best dairy sections in the Dominion of Canada, exporting large quantities of milk and cream to the United States, as they do throughout all the eastern townships—and the answer to that right in the district surrounding the city of Montreal is to be found in what was published recently in the papers in regard to the increase in price to milk producers. I have under my hand the Ormstown Bulletin, which has great admiration for my hon. friend opposite and his party and supports them regularly. This paper is published in the county of Chateauguay, and I find this statement in the issue of May 30, 1929:

Mr. W. L. Carr, Director of the Montreal Milk Producers' Association reports that at the price conference between the milk producers' association and the Montreal dealers held on the 23rd instant, an agreement was reached that the price of milk on the Montreal market for four months, commencing June 1, will be $2.39 per 100 pounds f.o.b. railway stations Montreal.

It goes on to state:

This is three and two-thirds cents per gallon better than for the five months' period during which summer prices ran last year.

With that advance in price, surely no one will argue that the dairy industry is not receiving good prices. We are getting higher prices than if we were exporting our surplus to London, England, as we did in former years. A price of $2.10 per 100 pounds for 3½ per cent butter fat is equivalent to 52½ cents per pound for butter. When Canadian dairymen can sell their milk for $2.10 per 100 pounds, you cannot blame them very much if they are ready to buy butter anywhere they can get it for 45 cents per pound. They are getting the equivalent of 52½ cents per pound for butter and they are becoming just as good traders as any other persons in business.

Just one word more in conclusion. My hon. friends opposite who to-day are assuming interest in the dairy industry have very short memories. They forget the days not so long ago when they permitted the import free of duty of oleomargarine—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. ROBB: —and the ingredients required to manufacture it. During that period there was the competition in one year of 15,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine imported into and manufactured in Canada. I am ready to take the judgment of any dairyman throughout Canada whether he prefers competition from oleomargarine or competition from butter coming from anywhere, butter that he himself can buy for his own family. As long as he is getting from $2.10 to $2.40 per 100 pounds for his milk, he is not complaining.

I repeat that something must be done for the dairy industry of this country by way of adjustment so that they will be able to buy their feedstuffs a little cheaper. The two great factors on a dairy farm are, first, labour, and, second, feedstuffs. There has been a scarcity of labour on the dairy farms. Feedstuffs are not only high in price but in some cases unobtainable and it seems to me it would become hon. gentlemen opposite better to try to remedy that condition than to place higher tariffs against butter that is required, not only in the cities, towns and villages, but by many of the farmers throughout the country.

Mr. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): Mr. Speaker, I am not in the least surprised that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) is extremely urgent in his support of the order in council which was passed by the government and which enabled New Zealand to receive the benefits of the Australian treaty. The Australian treaty is the child of the Minister of Finance. His predecessors had failed time and time again to draw Canada and Australia nearer together on the question of a commercial treaty. The Minister of Finance succeeded. Unquestionably he obtained benefits for Canada, and the dairy farmer of the Dominion paid for those benefits in golden butter. In the session of 1925, after a very considerable debate, parliament accepted the basis of the Australian treaty. No sooner had that session ended; no sooner had hon. members returned to their ridings, than the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), speaking at Woodstock in September, pointed out that there was a method whereby Canada could be safeguarded should damage result. He pointed out that there was in the treaty a clause which would enable the government of Canada to give six months' notice

to the other contracting parties, under which notice it would be possible for Canada to draw back on the treaty. Five days later the government of Canada presented to New Zealand on a platter the terms of the Australian treaty. Whether or not it was reasonable for the Prime Minister to make any reference whatever to New Zealand when he spoke in Woodstock on the 21st of September is a matter for conjecture, but the fact remains that whether or not the government of Canada at that date realized that New Zealand would be asking for those terms, Canada gave those terms to New Zealand, and although questions have fairly often been asked in the house as to what Canada received in exchange from New Zealand, we are yet in ignorance that Canada received anything.

After that, the dairy interests of Canada approached the government on many occasions, pointing out the difficulties that the dairy farmer in this country was subjected to on account of the importations of butter from New Zealand and Australia. At first the serious matter was butter from Australia, but as Australia adopted a plan known as the Patterson scheme, which produced what one might call a fictitious price for export butter, it was open to Canada to apply her dumping duty. That was applied, and butter from Australia ceased to come in quantity. Australia, perhaps not unreasonably, regretted that Canada had adopted this method of dealing with her importations, but it was interesting to Canadians to be able to remind Australia that not very many months before, Australia herself had applied very much the same treatment to New Zealand butter entering Australia. The National Dairy Council in their annual meeting in February, 1928, drew the attention of the government to the fact that the butter coming in from New Zealand, increasing and ever increasing, was a serious menace to the dairy interests in Canada. Their delegation met the privy council. They went so far fourteen months ago as to ask the government to rescind that order in council as regards New Zealand, but the government—the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) we must presume, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) who fathered this arrangement —were of the opinion that they were better informed than the dairy men of Canada, and no action was taken to assist them. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that we have got into this difficulty primarily for the reason that we are governed in this country by a government whose fiscal policy reminds one of Nebuchadnezzar's image; for were we to describe this ministry member by member one could hardly avoid remembering that the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) prates of freer trade, that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) has achieved immortality by his accurate reference to Canada's protectionist policy, that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) has seen the light, that he would infinitely prefer his principles to override his desire for power, that he is busy day by day and week in by week out endeavouring to lead his colleagues into the paths of protection. Then we have the Minister of Agriculture, who on his arrival in Ottawa was undoubtedly a free trader from Saskatchewan. He has received a higher education in Ottawa, and he realizes to-day that there is nothing so very evil in a protectionist policy. He is assisting the Minister of National Revenue to lead the composite cabinet which governs this country into paths of protection, but unfortunately the Minister of Agriculture has been suffering from insommia. On occasion, when, unable to sleep, he rolls over and discovers a lump in his bed which on examination proves to be a pound of New Zealand butter. He examines the wrapper on that pound of New Zealand butter and finds that it is a Canadian creamery wrapper, but unfortunately when he minutely examines it he fails to discover in the most minute print the fact that the butter came from New Zealand. The Minister of Agriculture was present when the National Dairy Council met in convention in February of last year. They made their statements in his presence and they came back at him again and again endeavouring to enlist his sympathy. When his turn came to speak he spoke in these words:

> Let me draw your attention to another difficulty since we are pointing out difficulties in connection with the Australian treaty. Our western people, as you know, are preferably low tariff peaple. The moment they begin to agitate for a raising of duty, even though it is only to get it back to where it was, they are put in the embarrassing position of being high tariff on butter but low tariff on farm implements. It is no joke to take this position. I suppose it can be done, but it requires explaining. So you will sympathize with us all. I am sure you feel it yourselves.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Who was it said that?

Mr. STIRLING: The hon. Minister of Agriculture, addressing the annual convention of the National Dairy Council in 1928. That the National Dairy Council may have altered its stand to a certain extent is perhaps explainable; for I have not yet heard in this house a contradiction of the statement that I have made, somewhat in allegory, that New Zealand butter is being wrapped in Canadian

creamery wrappers and sold to the unsuspecting consumer as Canadian butter. Perhaps when the hon. minster speaks in reply, or on his estimates, he may give us some much wanted information on that subject.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Who is doing that?

Mr. STIRLING: I refer the hon. gentleman to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who knows everything connected with dairy farming in Canada.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It is not the Canadian farmer who is doing it anyway.

Mr. STIRLING: I have not suggested for one moment that the Canadian farmer is doing any such thing, because if it is being done in Canada it is being done to the detriment of the Canadian farmer, and he knows it. I do not know whether this government will consider the question of giving us any assistance in this matter, but I do know that the dairy farmer in the west and in British Columbia, which is beyond the west, is most rapidly altering his position with regard to tariff questions. He realizes that mixed farming is in a different category from wheat farming. He realizes that if he is not permitted a fair chance of selling his butter in the domestic market he has got to go out of business. The fact that the hon. Minister of Finance should use as his stock argument to-day, as heretofore, that the dairy farmer in Canada is getting more for his butter, leaves me absolutely cold. The price that the dairy farmer gets for his butter makes, I think, very little difference when you remember this fact, that the milch cows in Canada are decreasing, that the calves are being vealed, and that the hogs are not being raised in the same numbers that they were, while at the time the number of milch cows in New Zealand is increasing. If the Canadian dairy farmer were satisfied that he is getting better prices for his butter to-day, would he be selling his milch cows? Would he not rather be increasing the size of his herds, and would he not be endeavouring to keep the domestic market for his own use? Canada is ceasing to be an exporting country and is becoming year by year an importing country. Is that a safe position for our dairy industry?

Mr. WARD: If it be the case that protection would increase the dairy herds of Canada, why is it that the cattle population of the United States has decreased by something like 17,000,000 in the last fifteen years?

Mr. BENNETT: It is larger this year than it was last. Surely the hon. gentleman knows that.

[Mr. Stirling.]

Mr. STIRLING: I would suggest, in the first place, that I was not preaching protection at this moment as the panacea of this ill. I was pointing out that the government of this country four years ago put over a trade agreement with a sister dominion, to which I have no objection, but the government bought the benefits of that trade agreement at the expense of a certain industry in this country which our Dominion Department of Agriculture and the departments of agriculture in all the provinces in this country are doing their very best to build up, and the result of that trade agreement has been a millstone around the necks of the Canadian dairy farmers.

Mr. WARD: I cannot compel the hon. member to answer my question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. STEVENS: You certainly cannot.

Mr. BENNETT: Because it is not a correst question.

Mr. STIRLING: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when I am through, as I shall be in a few seconds, the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ward) should tell us his own solution for the difficulties which confront the dairy farmer to-day. It appears to me that this government, having gone into a trade agreement with a sister dominion, and having then presented the terms of that agreement to another sister dominion—with both of whom we should like to trade if it is to Canada's advantage—must find a solution for this matter. Whether it be that they must adapt the arrangements that they had in mind when they were negotiating this treaty is for them to decide; but on the decision that they make the dairy farmers of this country will decide whether or not they will support the administration.

Hon. ROBERT FORKE (Minister of Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on this question, largely to express my sympathy with agriculture and its difficulties. Perhaps I take quite a different view from that held by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the house who have given us their views. I think I mentioned some time ago that the condition of agriculture is one of the world's problems of to-day. It is not only in Canada, in the United States, in Great Britain or on the continent of Europe that the farmers are having difficulties; as I said before, the condition is world wide.

I believe that to-day the farmers of Canada are more prosperous than those of any other country on the face of the globe. I do not mean that our farmers are getting everything

they ought to get or that they are in the best position they could possibly attain. At the same time I am perfectly satisfied with the truth of that statement. In Denmark I found the farmers working on ten acres of land and making a living, but they were working from daylight to dark and were living with a frugality and working under such hard conditions as none of our western farmers would submit to. Coming over to Great Britain, I found hundreds of thousands of acres of grass land that it would not pay the British farmers to cultivate, and those Danish farmers were cultivating their small patches of land and selling their bacon and dairy products in the city of London. That is one of the conundrums that my hon. friends opposite may be able to solve.

A good deal has been said about our people going to the United States. Does any one know of any Canadians leaving Canada to farm in the United States?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Many from my county have gone over to the state of Maine. I can count them by the hundreds.

Mr. FORKE: It may be so, but I am surprised.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You are always learning.

Mr. FORKE: If hon. members on the other side are satisfied that Canadians in large numbers are leaving Canada to go over to the United States to farm I very much doubt it. I think you will find them in the larger cities working at other occupations. Hon. gentlemen opposite know perfectly well that there is no exodus of Canadians to the United States to take up farming.

The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) made a speech the other day about the large number of educated Canadians going to the United States. I once made a speech of the same kind in Montreal, and I was surprised next day to see in large headlines in the Montreal papers that the hon. member for Brandon was against education! You see how things can be twisted. I did not notice that the remarks of the hon. member for Fort William were treated in the same way. It will surprise the house to know that every year 25 per cent of the graduates of Acadia university go to the United States.

An hon. MEMBER: Why do they go?

Mr. FORKE: That is a question which perhaps some one may be able to answer.

Mr. CANTLEY: It is easily answered: you are responsible.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. FORKE: But only 5 per cent of the graduates of the university of Winnipeg go to the United States. Tell me the reason why? Tell me why the maritime provinces are importing their butter at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT: So is Ottawa.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FORKE: These are economic conditions and cannot be explained by merely laughing at my statement. To-night the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) mentioned oleomargarine. I well remember that exactly the same type of speech as hon. gentlemen opposite are making to-night was made in this house at the time—that the dairy business was being ruined by the importation of oleomargarine.

Mr. HANSON: What about processed butter?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. FORKE: My hon. friend was in the house at that time and he heard all the speeches then made.

Mr. HANSON: You voted for it too.

Mr. FORKE: Are the farmers of the United States prosperous to-day? What is the trouble with them? They are being caught in the same vicious circle. As the price of their products rises, so also does the cost of production. Our farmers will find themselves in just the same vicious circle if they think they are going to be benefited by protection. But I am not going to discuss the fiscal issue. I simply rose for the purpose of expressing my sympathy with agriculture and with our farmers in the difficulties they have to meet. I feel perfectly certain that the imposition of a duty of 2 or 3 cents per pound on butter will not solve the problem in the satisfactory way expected. There is something very subtle in the word "protection". When the farmer or any other producer has difficulty in putting his product on the market, and the word "protection" comes to his ears, it has a subtle influence over him and he thinks that such a remedy would benefit him. I do not know of anything more plausible than the argument for protection, yet every economic authority in the world has stated time and time again that the whole theory of protection is wrong in substance and in fact.

The other day I picked up a United States publication called Farm and City Life. From it I jotted down the following in connection with farm operations in the United States:

Farm population smallest in thirty years. Nearly 5,000,000 left the farm in the last 20 years. Not entirely due to hard times.

93,500,000 in the cities to-day; 75,000,000 in 1920. One person on the farm; 3.4 in the city, compared with 2.4 nine years ago. Increased production tends to balance these conditions.

Probable that increase in consumers will over-balance increase in efficiency of production, and gain will be to the farmer.

Why are people leaving the farm? Is the farm population declining in resourcefulness and ability as well as in numbers? Replies were received from 2,745 farmers. Some said it was a poor business; they could not make ends meet. One fourth were leaving the farms from physical disability—retired farmers. One in 40 had saved money to live easier and to move where more advantages could be found,—to the town or city.

The drift of young men and women to the towns is as old as time. One half were better on the farm; the cost of living consumed wages.

Advantages of country life—health; close to nature; the spacious character and independence of country life.

Upon the whole the country loses in efficiency and ability by the drift from the farm.

Mr. GUTHRIE: May I ask the minister a question? Is he in favour of continuing the present importation of butter from New Zealand?

Mr. FORKE: I do not think it will make any difference.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are you in favour of continuing it?

Mr. FORKE: I am not in favour of continuing or discontinuing it; I will leave trade to make its own balance.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FORKE: I do not see just exactly where the amusement comes in. I have listened to several speeches to-night, and listened respectfully, and I sympathize with the farmers in their difficulties. I should like to see them get the best prices possible, and if it is likely to improve the condition of the farming population by any change in economics I shall be only too glad to support such a change. But I am thoroughly convinced that putting a cent or two more on butter would not benefit the farmer in the long run, because as we can see in Australia to-day the farmers are caught in a vicious circle. The farming population in Australia at the present time is in a worse condition than the farmers of Canada, and the same is true of the farming population of the United States; and the reason is just that; they are working in a vicious circle of high production costs which more than counterbalance any increase in production which they may have.

I hope to see the day when the farmers of this country will enjoy prosperity in an increasing measure. I am one of those who believe that no country will be great unless its roots are firmly planted in the soil, and I deplore the effect of present world conditions on agriculture—not Canadian conditions but world conditions. There is a tendency for agriculture to sink lower in the scale and I deeply deplore the fact. It would be disastrous to Canada if the farming population of this country ceased to be a healthy, robust yeomanry and sank to the level of a peasantry. Our country will prosper just in proportion to the prosperity of the farming population. I wish to see industry prosper too, but unless agriculture prospers this country as a whole will not progress. I rose merely to voice my sympathy with the agricultural people. They are the people to whom I belong and whom I love.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): At the time it was introduced I opposed the Australian treaty because I believed that agriculture was sacrificed—at least it was not considered—in order that markets might be found for certain manufacturing interests in Canada. I want to support the Conservative members who have spoken, although I am not sure that I can support their remedy. They have not proposed one, but they have only one remedy for everything so I presume it is the same one. But so far as I have followed their speeches I think they have told the truth in regard to the condition of agriculture; agriculture is not in a sound condition. As regards the figures which have been given with reference to dairying, I am not sure whether I should find them the same if I looked them up; one can get figures to prove almost anything one sets out to prove. I shall not, therefore, enter into a discussion of the figures. I want to say a word or two, however, about the subject generally.

I was opposed at the time, and am still opposed, to the idea of the Australian treaty for the reason that the basic principle of that treaty was that the manufacturing industry in Canada should be considered while agriculture was not. Let me point out to the members of the opposition that I was opposed to the attitude they took on reciprocity for just the same reason. In the defeat of reciprocity the people who worked towards that end were thinking not of agriculture but of the manufacturing industry, and I think we can truth-

fully say that the policy of Canadian governments, regardless of whether the government at any time has been Liberal or Conservative in name, has been to put the good of the manufacturers and their allies first, and the good of the great and basic industry of agriculture last. To my mind that is putting the cart before the horse. We have had it that way for a long time, and that accounts for the condition in which we find agriculture to-day. Protection is only a part of the contributing cause; there are many other things involved in the question which I do not intend to go into at the present moment.

One hon. member who spoke—I do not know him and therefore I cannot name his constituency—said that the people of the Canadian cities were very much concerned about the Canadian farmer. I am sorry to disagree with him; I do not think that statement is true. Of course, I do not mean that the people of his city are not concerned; but they are far above the average in intelligence. I find that the city people to whom I talk—and I have talked with people of many cities—know very little about the condition of agriculture, for they are of the opinion, generally speaking, that agriculture is in a flourishing condition. They judge that by the prices they pay—the retail prices. If the dairy industry in Ontario could work out a cooperative system such as the wheat producers have developed, it would in some measure help to improve conditions.

I want to say only one word more. Protection, so far as the farmer is concerned, is in my opinion a snare. It may be that here and there the farmer would gain something; but I am absolutely convinced that on the whole he would lose much more than he gained, because he would then put himself in the position where he could no longer fight the protection of, for instance, the manufacturers. He would have lost the ground on which until now he has stood. So that if one could get a cent or two more per dozen for eggs, or a cent or two more per pound for butter, so far as the ordinary farm in Canada is concerned, that would have mighty little to do with the margin left over at the end of the year—if the farmer was happy enough to have one. The prices the farmers pay for the goods they consume and the prices they get for all the goods they sell are the factors that contribute to the margin when the year's business is balanced. If the Canadian farmer wants to learn about protection, let him look a little more closely into the condition of agriculture in the United States. The hon. member for York-Sunbury, (Mr. Hanson), I believe, seriously suggested that a great many farmers were going from Canada to the United States. I do not think he intends the house to believe that he really meant that statement.

Mr. HANSON: I said that in the neighbouring state of Maine, which adjoins my constituency, 25 per cent of the farmers of Aroostook county, 25 per cent of the farmers of Washington county, 25 per cent of the farmers of Somerset county, were recruited from the counties of Charlotte, York and Carleton in New Brunswick. That is the statement I made, and I can prove it.

An hon. MEMBER: Fifty years ago.

Mr. HANSON: No, within the past ten years.

Miss MACPHAIL: Then certainly the farmers in the maritime provinces must be in a bad way.

Mr. HANSON: They are, since this government came in.

Miss MACPHAIL: Anyone who thinks that one government or another is so important as to affect the condition of a basic industry like agriculture has a very childish mind. I have known of some farmers who did leave Canada to go to the United States to farm but I have not known of one who bettered his condition by so doing; and some whom I have known intimately very much regretted the change. That is all I care to say. As to the condition of agriculture as described by Conservative members who have spoken, I fully agree. The Australian treaty did not consider the agricultural industry, with that I agree. But with the proposed remedy which, though unspoken, is to be inferred from their speeches, that protection will cure the farmers' ills, I do not agree.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): It is very fitting and necessary that this house should spend some time considering the basic industry of Canada. I am sorry that the house could not have had some definite information that this matter was to have been brought before us at this time. Had that information been afforded us, we should now probably have available the material which we have collected during the years and which bears upon the subject before us. As it is, we are more or less compelled to speak on a moment's notice and to depend upon our memories for whatever facts we may bring forward.

I should like at the outset to point out that I do not think we shall solve this problem by the kind of discussion we have heard to-night and which we will doubtless con-

tinue to hear until the subject is disposed of. The element of party politics is ever present in all discussions on the floor of the house, and I presume none of us is absolutely free from that feeling in the discussion of whatever subject may be under consideration. No doubt each one is trying his best to secure some advantage for his own particular party or group. That is one of the phases of our present parliamentary system which we must grin and bear. I do hope that in the very near future, however, the government will take the necessary steps to institute a thorough inquiry into the entire agricultural industry, an inquiry which will be quite untainted with partisanship and which will be conducted with a view to obtaining the facts as to the actual economic condition of the farmer and the general outlook of the industry and discovering what can be done to improve those conditions.

I am sure most of us will be grateful to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Senn) who has brought this very important question to the attention of the house. No one will say that the agricultural industry of Canada is on a sound basis at present; in fact perhaps we must admit that agriculture does not seem to be on a very sound basis in any country. When all is said and done the agricultural problem of Canada is not peculiar to this country; there are agricultural problems of a very serious character everywhere, and perhaps one reason for this condition is that agriculture itself is passing through a phase of industrial development which perhaps we have not fully understood and to which we are not able quickly to accommodate ourselves. However, there are problems which are peculiarly Canadian, some of which might be mentioned in passing before I proceed to deal with the specific matter to which the attention of the house has been directed. I think agriculture is suffering, among other things, from over-capitalization, with regard to the high prices paid for both land and machinery; and it is also over-capitalized because in relation to the amount produced the overhead is much too great. I would say also that agriculture is suffering from having to pay a much too high rate of interest. This is one of the chief hardships of agriculture in western Canada in particular. I believe that agriculture in Canada is suffering also from a decided discrimination in taxation. The dairy branch of agriculture has been affected by the Australian treaty; I do not think anyone can seriously deny that and it is the dairy industry as affected by the Australian treaty which is before the house to-night.

[Mr. Irvine.]

I want to associate myself with the sentiments of the hon. gentleman who introduced this subject; indeed I must say that the dairymen of the riding of Wetaskiwin, which I have the honour to represent, have spoken emphatically on this issue. The Minister of Finance goes to the Montreal Gazette to find out what the cows are doing, but he should go to the farmers of Canada to get that information. I venture to say that the minister will not go to the Montreal Gazette for the cream for his porridge to-morrow morning, and I do not see why he should go to that newspaper for his information as to the economic condition of the dairymen. At any rate, I know that the dairymen of my own riding have expressed themselves in no uncertain way to the extent that the Australian treaty has hurt their business, and that is the question now before us.

The hon. member who introduced this subject quoted figures to prove at least to his satisfaction a very material decrease in the production of butter and a further decrease in the number of dairy herds, with a corresponding increase in the production of butter and in the dairy herds of New Zealand. I do not know whether or not his figures are accurate, but I noticed that the Minister of Finance produced another set of figures. I think it is to be deplored that there seems to be no way of getting accurate figures. If we cannot get them right we would be far better off to leave them out entirely, but surely there is some source to which we may go for figures which may be accepted by both sides of the house. Apparently it is the practice for one side of the house to get the facts which suit them and for the other side to disregard those facts and secure quite different information. I am not charging that the hon. gentleman who introduced the subject gave incorrect figures, but it is very strange that the Minister of Finance should find it necessary to quote another set of figures practically the opposite of those given by the first speaker.

Personally I have no doubt that there has been a decrease in the dairy herds of Canada and in the production of butter, but as to the actual number of cattle or millions of pounds of butter I do not know. I would also agree with the minister that there has been an increase in the price of dairy cattle, but there has been a greater increase in the price of beef cattle which fact has affected the price of dairy cattle, so that certainly does not prove that the dairy industry has not been affected by the Australian treaty. I want to point out to the Minister of Finance and to the gov-

ernment that discrimination has been shown against this branch of agriculture by the Australian treaty, a discrimination in the sense that the little protection which was given the farmers on the one or two items upon which a tariff is practicable was taken away and no corresponding reductions were made with regard to the articles which enter into the production of the commodities so dealt with. That is a discrimination. It has been said that the benefits to Canada of the Australian treaty were purchased and paid for by the dairy industry. I do not think there is any doubt about that; if the dairymen are to be deprived of the protection which they had on the one or two articles on which it was possible to place a tariff, then they should have a corresponding reduction in tariffs on highly protected items which enter into their business.

It does not require any statement from me to prove that the farmers of Canada generally have expressed themselves as being opposed to tariffs, but I think I am correctly interpreting the opinion of the farmers of my own province when I say that they ask for equal treatment in this regard. If it is impossible to give them the same protection which is given to everyone else, then protection should not be given to anyone. That is their challenge. If you universalize protection, then no particular class will suffer. The nation may suffer or it may gain, as the case may be, depending on which is the correct view, but if you protect every class then no class will be unduly burdened. You must do one thing or the other; you must either protect the farmers equally with all other classes or you must not protect anyone. That is the position which the farmers in the west are beginning to take. They are opposed to tariffs, but they are saying also that they should receive equal treatment. If you are going to protect the manufacturers and then take off the protection which the farmers had, conditions will be a great deal worse. Protection is not a moral issue, it is a matter of dollars and cents. It concerns the implements and other things which the farmer needs, and no farmer can afford to set himself upon a moral pedestal and say: Because I have subscribed to a so-called Liberal doctrine for twenty years, that is no reason why I should allow my business to suffer from an injustice of this kind. This is not a moral question, it is an economic one, and economic principles alone must govern. In taking this new attitude the farmers of the west cannot be said to have abandoned their principles; they stand just as ready as ever for free trade.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. FORKE: Who authorized the hon. gentleman to speak for the farmers of western Canada?

Mr. IRVINE: The same ones who authorized the hon. minister to speak for them. I should like to ask the hon. minister who authorized him to speak for them. I am speaking directly for the greatest farmers' organization in the Dominion of Canada, and he was not.

Mr. FORKE: You say so.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. minister varied from the first principles of that organization, and discarded the principle upon which he was elected. If that is not a sufficient answer for the hon. minister I can give him more information, but I think that is all I need to say now.

Mr. FORKE: Anything which the hon. member can say will not hurt; go ahead.

Mr. STEVENS: That comes well from a minister.

Mr. IRVINE: Perhaps if the hon. minister had a little more understanding it might hurt a little more; if he has not and it does not hurt, so much the better for him. I will challenge even the hon. gentleman who assumes to have the right to speak for all the farmers and say so far as I know there is no farmer organization in western Canada which has not expressed itself as being in favour of the principle of free trade, they are the only people however who do express those ideas. Nevertheless, they are saying: Since you will not give us free trade, do not protect everyone else and leave us to pay the bill. That is the position they are beginning to take, and surely it is a reasonable one.

What does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) have to say in reply to this question which has been brought to the attention of parliament, this question which is engaging the serious attention of a very important branch of the agricultural industry in Canada? What remedy does the minister offer to parliament and to the people of Canada? His first point is to attempt to prove that the Conservatives had done even worse on one occasion. Mr. Speaker, I know that that is a very common political answer, and I do not suppose the minister is open to any more severe criticism for making it than is any other minister who has adopted that attitude in past years. I suggest to the minister that it is too much of an old-fashioned argument, it is too stupid an argument for a brilliant man like himself to present. I would ask him to drop that kind of parrying and face

the question squarely. What do the farmers of western Canada care about the allegation that on one occasion the Conservative party advocated the bringing in of oleomargarine and that such is said by the Minister to be much worse than what has been brought in by the Liberal party? That is no answer to the argument; it is not even recognizing the problem, and is unworthy of the minister.

Then the minister disputes the fact that there is a problem; he says it does not exist and that the removal of protection has increased the industry, given higher profits to the farmers, and, according to the Montreal Gazette, has produced more milk and more of thing else which goes to make a flourishing industry. I hope that someone will be in a position to challenge the minister's figures. I am quite satisfied that they are incorrect, but I am not going to offer another set of figures.

Then the minister offers a solution to the dairymen of Canada. He tells them that, although they have been receiving less for their butter and have suffered a little through the reduction in the tariff, the country has been able to ship out $130,000,000 worth of goods to New Zealand more than would have been possible had this reduction not been taken away. If the minister wanted to make a donation of $130,000,000 to New Zealand, why should he ask the farmers of Canada to assume any sacrifice in order to make that possible? The donation could have been made direct without touching the tariff on butter at all. If he did not make a donation to New Zealand of $130,000,000, for which he received nothing, then what did he do? What is the meaning of this? I would say to the minister that that argument is a half-baked platitude and one which never was and never will be true in relation to international trade. There is no such thing as a favourable or adverse balance of trade. It must be built up either by debts or through making presents to the other people. Surely the time has come when the minister should stop making these meaningless statements as an excuse for having done something which he should not have done, or for not having done that which he should have done.

The minister next quotes from the newspapers and claims that the Montreal Gazette has a more accurate knowledge as regards milk than have the cows and the men who milk them. I suggest that he consult with the men in western Canada who are milking the cows and find out whether or not they agree with him that the Australian treaty has improved their industry. If it has not improved that industry, why does not the minister frankly admit it? I would not blame him for having made the experiment, but I am blaming him for denying that a certain thing has happened when those engaged in the industry concerned and best qualified to know assert that it has. I blame him for refusing to face the issue.

Then the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) rises to extend his profound sympathy to the down-trodden agriculturists of Canada. We all know that the Minister of Immigration is a very sympathetic gentlemen; he could not help but be sympathetic to anyone, and in extending sympathy to the farmers he is only extending that which he would extend to anyone else. At any rate there can be no doubt that the farmers who had to reduce their production of butter last year because of the treaty which the Minister of Immigration helped to put into effect, will be very glad of his sympathy and probably will be better with it than they would be without it. But I fail to see how it will raise the price the price of butter or improve the industry concerned.

The Minister of Immigration tells us next that conditions are not as bad as they might be. That is always one of the pleas of the Minister of Immigration. I was going to say I should like to see conditions so bad that he would not say that, but I will take that back and express it in this way—I should like to know how bad things would have to be before the minister would agree that they were bad enough. The argument of the Minister of Immigration in his concluding remarks was that protection does not protect. He did not say it in so many words, but this is the logic of his argument: that the manufacturing industry would be far better off without any protection at all, for surely it follows that if the dairymen are better off without protection the manufacturers also would be better off without protection. If the manufacturers are better off with protection, then by the same token so would the agricultural industry be better off with it.

Mr. FORKE: I would ask the hon. gentleman to continue his own speech and not to put words into my mouth.

Mr. IRVINE: I would not think of putting words into the hon. member's mouth, because they would so ill fit the reasoning of my hon. friend that they would be incongruous, and I have sufficient of the artistic in my nature to be ashamed of incongruities. I am trying to get at the reasoning of my hon. friend. Maybe there was not any, but I understood he was endeavouring to reason, and that the basis of his reasoning was that

protection did not protect. I have heard my hon. friend argue that manufacturers in Canada are a privileged class; that protection does them good; that it gives them higher profits. We have never said anything different from that. Our objection to protection is that we have to pay the price the manufacturer gets. That is the argument against the protection of the manufacturer. I never heard anyone say that the manufacturers were not protected, and that protection was not good for them, until the minister argued it to-night. The same logic must apply to agriculture or the dairy industry as to manufacturing in respect to protection. If manufacturers are benefited by protection, then to the same degree must the dairy industry be benefited by it, or there is nothing in the principle of protection. I am not arguing for protection: I am simply pointing out that it must be as true in the one case as in the other, and we get nowhere by arguing that protection does not protect. Protection does protect those who have the privilege, but other people have to pay the price.

The fact of the matter now is that under the Australian treaty the men who produce butter in Canada had their protection reduced in order that protected goods of Canadian manufacturers could find a market in New Zealand and other countries in return for the butter that was shipped into this country under the price at which the Canadian producers could afford to produce it. That is the situation. Therefore the pious wish of the Minister of Immigration that he would live to see the day when the farmers would be out of all their troubles will not avail much, if we will not face the fact, which is that the Australian treaty has been detrimental to this industry. The question is whether some other way can be found to relieve the pressure which the Australian treaty has brought to bear upon this industry. That is the problem of the government. But the solution of this question is not going to be assisted in any way by a complete denial of the fact, a denial by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) that there has been any harm at all done to the industry, an argument by the Minister of Immigration that protection does not protect, and by not facing the fact that the Australian treaty had a direct and detrimental effect upon the dairy industry.

That is the situation as I see it, and as I indicated at the outset I doubt whether a discussion of this kind, thrown as it inevitably always is upon a partisan basis, will get agriculture very far. I would suggest that at another session of parliament the government should institute a careful inquiry into the whole subject of agriculture in Canada from an economic standpoint, with a view to finding a remedy. If the United States, for instance, as some hon. gentlemen opposite would suggest, has followed the wrong course in raising the tariff on agriculture. as they may have, we will learn a lesson and will not follow their example. But certain it is that agriculture in this country requires some kind of assistance or direction, whether it be in the way the United States are doing or in some other way, and we must find our own way. We will not find it by refusing to admit the problem or in refusing to study it in a proper manner.

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, while I agree with many things which the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) has said, there are some in regard to which I feel it incumbent upon me to differ with him. I am very glad to hear him point out to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) that there is no such thing as a favourable balance of trade, and also to the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Guthrie) that there is no such thing as an adverse balance of trade. When I spoke on the budget I think I made the same remark. I took occasion afterwards to get the chief statistician of the Dominion of Canada to analyse the favourable and unfavourable balances of trade for three years, and we found exactly as my hon. friend has said, namely, that there is no such thing as an adverse or a favourable balance of trade. It is made up of either services or goods in each case. Therefore when my Liberal friends boast of having a favourable balance of trade, it is an empty boast, and if my hon. friends criticize them for having an adverse balance of trade, it is an equally futile criticism.

But when the hon. member for Wetaskiwin states that he is speaking for a large number of farmers of Alberta and that they should be equally protected along with the manufacturers—

Mr. IRVINE: I did not say that.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I understood my hon. friend to say that if the manufacturers had protection, the farmers should have equal protection.

Mr. IRVINE: Or else cut off all protection.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Exactly. I am glad to say that the farmers with whom I am associated take exactly the opposite view. In fact I stated so in my budget speech and I do not wish to rehash that again. They dealt with the Australian treaty and they passed a resolution at their meeting pointing out that

for the small increase they might get, if they got any, they would be at the mercy of the manufacturers who would demand on their manufactured products a greater increase which would entirely offset any benefit that might accrue to the farmers.

Mr. IRVINE: Has my hon. friend read the resolution passed at the last annual convention of the United Farmers of Alberta?

Mr. ADSHEAD: No.

Mr. IRVINE: That is the only body that speaks officially for the farmers of Alberta.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I am speaking for the United Farmers in my district who spoke to me. I know the resolution they passed.

Mr. KELLNER: Is the hon. member aware that the pool farmers in the three prairie provinces have before the tariff board at the moment an application for increased duties?

Mr. ADSHEAD: I am not, but I have before me the resolution of the United Farmers of Manitoba reading as follows:

Whereas, the United Farmers of Manitoba in their annual conventions have repeatedly condemned the policy of tariff protection as being an unjust method of taxation, as subsidizing the industries protected at the expense of all other industries, and as unduly raising the costs of living and production, especially for those engaged in agriculture, and have demanded its abolition,

And whereas, the farmers cannot consistently oppose protection for other industries while claiming it for their own,

Be it therefore resolved, that the executive board of the United Farmers of Manitoba protest strongly against the action of the Canadian poultry pool in asking for the increase of the duty on eggs and for the permanent maintenance of an arbitrary valuation of frozen eggs for customs purposes because such action places agriculture as a whole at a serious disadvantage in resisting the demands of other industries for increases in the tariff.

Mr. FORKE: I would suggest that the hon. member hand that resolution to the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) to read over.

Mr. IRVINE: May I suggest that there is no organized farmers' movement in Manitoba, and my hon. friend is largely responsible for it.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. gentleman states what is not true.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I wish my two hon. friends would allow me to finish my remarks.

It is perfectly true that no amount of protection would increase the farmers' production. Wheat is the greatest agricultural product of the west, its production last year amounting to about 500,000,000 bushels. Protection is merely a will-o-the-wisp for the farmers of this country. If they accepted it even as regards butter they would be placing in the hands of the implement industry and other manufacturers a lever by which the manufacturers would take out of the pockets of the farmers ten times the amount the farmers might receive from the tariff on butter.

Let me go a little further. I was very much interested in the statement of my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Stirling) that Australian butter is being wrapped in Canadian creamery wrappers and sold in Canada as Canadian butter. By whom? Certainly not by the farmers. Then it must be by the dairymen, those very gentlemen who came to the Minister of Finance and asked him for an increased tariff on butter. They must have perpetrated the fraud—for a fraud it is—if it was not the farmers; and certainly, I say, the farmers would not do it.

My hon. friend spoke of the lack of authenticity of figures, how hard it was to get accurate figures. The acting leader of the opposition, speaking on the budget quoted figures as to the imports under the Australian treaty. His figures were accurate because he got them from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, but unfortunately he quoted figures on only one side of the question. He told us at that time that the imports of Australian and New Zealand butter for the calendar year ending December 31, 1928, were close to $6,000,000, or to be exact $5,916,669. That is perfectly correct; those are the official figures. But he did not quote the figures on the other side. He did not show the amount of money that was received by the Canadian farmers for the milk which they exported to the United States. These same figures are shown also by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and they are just as reliable as the figures quoted by the acting leader of the opposition. They show that the exports of milk and its products from Canada to the United States for the calendar year 1928 amounted to $8,749,932. Of course our farmers could not both export their milk and make it into butter. Placing the two sets of figures side by side, we see that for the year 1928 butter from Australia and New Zealand came in to the amount of $5,916,669, and that in that same year our farmers exported milk and its products to the United States to the amount of $8,749,932; in other words they actually benefited to the amount of $2,833,263.

But even if the price of the Canadian farmer's butter was lowered a little by these importations from Australia and New Zealand, would my hon. friends like to ask the workingmen of their district to pay four or five

cents a pound more for their butter? I put that very question to some farmers in my constituency; for I have a mixed constituency, with several hundred workingmen working in the shops. I said to the farmers, "Because you have the opportunity of raising the price of your butter a few cents a pound, do you want me to carry the message to these workingmen that because you have that opportunity you are going to charge them four cents a pound more for their butter? Butter is now 45 to 50 cents a pound." They said, "We do not want any such thing as that. We do not want the Australian treaty to be touched." That was the advice of the farmers to whom I spoke about it. I do not know why it is, but as the lady member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) said, some hon. gentlemen seem to think that the one and only remedy for every ill in Canada is protection. If it is the dairy industry that is suffering, their remedy is to put on more duty; if it is the woollen industry, put on more duty; if it is the steel and iron industry, put on more duty. It was rather amusing to watch two hon. gentlemen who appeared before the tariff board last fall, the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell) and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley), one arguing for free coal for his industry in Hamilton and the other arguing for a duty to protect his own particular industry. While I agree that agriculture on the whole is not in a flourishing condition in Canada to-day, I do say that the panacea for all our ills is not protection.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Rosetown): This question coming up to-night is not altogether a surprise. That the industry of agriculture is in a bad way I do not think anyone on either side of the house will dispute. I want for a few minutes to go into the causes of the difficulties that are being experienced in that industry. The present situation dates very largely from the time of the war. During that period those who were conducting the affairs of this country put into force various war measures, and at that time we thought we would be patriotic in listening to them and following their advice. The farmers, being then largely unorganized, were the only class that had their produce commandeered, and their wheat was commandeered at about 50 per cent of its value, according to the price that all other producers and manufacturers were getting for what they produced. Not only that, but we were advised to borrow money and extend our farming operations; in fact, we were advised as well to go into the raising of live stock and were assured that the banks would lend us all the money we wanted. Some of us unfortunately listened to that advice, and to-day we are suffering on that account. Some of my neighbours borrowed money at the banks to purchase live stock, and in less than two years, before those animals could be matured, the banks foreclosed on them. The banks even then had hard work to clear their own by foreclosing, and the farmers to-day are out of business. These are things that we cannot overlook. We have not yet recovered from that period, and we can see no hope because both sides of this house maintain a system which makes high the cost of all our commodities. We are suffering because of protection as it is enforced to-day, and the strange thing is that while hon. gentlemen on one side of the house argue as though they were maintaining a free trade policy and the other side accuse them of being practically free traders, as a matter of fact we have very high protection; the people hardly know to what extent that tariff wall exists, or how high it is, and because of the discriminatory application of the tariff wall the whole burden to-day falls on the agriculturists. If there is one thing the matter to-day with the egg and poultry producer and the butter producer it is the high cost of all their commodities.

First of all let me deal with the distributing system which we have in Canada to-day. I go down the street in Ottawa and I look into the windows of the butchers' stores. We are sadly put to it on the farm to find a paying market for our beef. The price of beef is over 300 per cent higher in the shop windows than that which the farmer gets for his dressed carcasses. Thirty-five to forty-two cents per pound is a common price in the Ottawa butchers' stores. Thousands in this city are going hungry for beef because they cannot buy it, yet the farmer cannot sell it at a profitable price.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That would be a very good reason why a number of people in the city of Ottawa should be paid higher wages, including those in the civil service.

Mr. EVANS: The hon. gentleman still misses the mark. Because of one class being protected we have put the interests of that class entirely out of line with the interests of the whole community; and because of high prices it becomes impossible to distribute these goods at anything like a reasonable price over the cost of production. Beef is a case in point.

In this house I have often protested against some of the methods of the manufacturers

and distributors. But let me quote one of the manufacturers themselves, a vice-president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in 1927. He attributes the cause of the hard times in the maritime provinces to the "short-sighted selfishness"—I want to say that those are not my words—to the "short-sighted selfishness" of his own class. Mr. L. W. Simms—the gentleman to whom I refer—said:

> Turning to industry: the story of the maritime provinces under this head since confederation is a long series of tragedies. Some would-be comforters have tried to convince us, without knowledge of the facts, that the hard times in the maritimes were but the result of post-war depression that was common to all sections; but this industrial record belies them. You will find splendid industrial plants in many places in the maritimes standing gaunt and empty or the stark ruins of once thriving industry staring mutely in a setting of tumbling cottages, once happy homes, their owners forced to go to New England for a livelihood. Not a few of these have been bought out, closed down, and dismantled by central Canadian competitors.

The very men who were boasting about protecting the home market for agricultural produce destroyed the home market of the maritimes, bringing those provinces down to the position where they had to come to this house and ask for direct help. Then again he says:

> Prior to confederation and the building of Intercolonial, central Canadian factories, even when they could compete at all, had naturally to lay their goods down at any point in the maritimes on a basis of world competition.

That is one thing our Canadian manufacturers will not do to-day—face world competition. As I have said before in this house, the export of manufactured goods is carried on at the expense of the agriculturist, who foots all the unjust bills passed down to the point where they can go no further—to the man on the land. That alone is the cause to-day of the hardship on the farms of Canada. But let me quote from Mr. Simms a little further. He says:

> A year or so ago, a circumstance occurred—

This was in 1927.

> —which is unfortunately not an isolated instance of the nationally disruptive forces that commercial life has been guilty of. The jobbers of central Canada in a certain commodity went to the producers of this article, all of whom happened to be located in Ontario, and stipulated that no jobber in the maritimes was to get within 10 per cent of the price they received. The size of their combined business was too important to be ignored, so the manufacturers agreed. Quite by accident a maritime wholesale house discovered the discrimination and protested vigorously. One manufacturer yielded to his protest for fair play, with the result that the central Canadian jobbers punished him by depriving him of hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of business.

But let me sum up in Mr. Simms' own words:

> The government and the railway commission may do much to adjust more equitably the burden of our abnormal 3,700 mile length and one hundred mile width; but the business men of the country can, I believe, do much more by getting together and substituting broad patriotism for short-sighted selfishness.

These are the words of one of the Canadian manufacturers themselves. I have spoken already about the unjustly discriminatory way in which protection has been applied. I have a document here prepared by a tariff expert, which goes to show how utterly unfair our system of protection is. I know that our farmers cannot be protected as long as they have such an exportable surplus, for prices will be the world prices and they will have to accept them. But this unfairness in the application of the protection system is beyond our comprehension. For instance, take the importation of one class of article which every housewife must use—cooking utensils. Each importer has a certain status under the rules of the distributing combine. The importers are classified as small dealers, large dealers, departmental stores, jobbers and consumers. The small dealer gets a discount of 50, plus 15, plus 5 per cent. The rate of duty is 30 per cent. The value for duty then becomes, for the $100 worth, $40.38. This statement was prepared when the sales tax was in effect. So the duty is $12.11 and the sales tax was $2.62. The large dealer gets a discount of 50, plus 15, plus 10 per cent. The rate is 30 per cent. The value for duty is $38.25. The duty is $11.47, the sales tax $2.48. The department store gets a little better treatment still, the discount being 50, plus 15, plus 15 per cent. The value for duty is $36.13. The duty is $10.83 and the sales tax $2.40. Then I come to the jobber; he gets a discount of 50, plus 15, plus 20, per cent. The value for duty then becomes $34.01, the duty is $10.20, and the sales tax $2.21. Let us come now to the consumer. It does not matter if he does buy in foreign countries at manufacturers' prices, because there is no discount allowed under our tariff system so far as the consumer is concerned; so that his rate for duty becomes $100 in comparison with $34.01 for the jobber. In other words, his duty is $30 instead of $10.20, and his $100 worth of goods in the foreign country becomes $135.50, while for the jobber it becomes $46.42, for the department store, $49.36, for the large dealer, $52 and for the small dealer $52.51. I ask hon. gentlemen whether they can see

any fairness in that. Can they carry on a callous campaign for protection, putting the burden on the consumer in this way? How long will this system last? How long will the people stand for it? They have stood for it so long only because every journal in the country is a tied journal and the people are not getting the truth of the system as outlined and administered at Ottawa. These things are unfair.

Take the very product which the farmer raises, and the finished article therefrom, and what do we find? We find to-day that he pays for his sack of flour nearly one cent a pound on the average higher than that same Canadian made flour is sold for—flour of the same grade —on the other side in Liverpool. That also is an injustice, is it not? And then when I say that the one side of this house is maintaining exactly what the other wants, let me refer to a little incident of the budget this year—and I will name only leather. The price of hides is pretty fair at present, but we cannot always find a market for them. Let us take leather and the articles made therefrom. We find this year that the Minister of Finance put leather for mitts and gloves on the drawback list, and the importer, the manufacturer, gets one third of a rebate in duty. But what about the consumer? The whole duty of 35 per cent is maintained on the finished article. At that time, coming up to the house here one morning, I saw a man with a pair of yellow mitts on, and he told me he had paid a dollar for them. The real price of those gloves was 65 cents, but the tariff compelled him to pay 35 cents more for them—an article he needed and must use in this climate before he could do anything in the way of earning his wages. This is also an injustice, surely.

Coming again to the commodities which the farmer most needs, what do we find? Take agricultural implements, for instance—and these are last year's figures, with the duty standing as it is. I will not give the hundreds, but the value of goods made in Canada, agricultural implements, was $38,269,000 the value of implements imported was $18,946,000; the value of goods exported was $17,412,000, and the value of goods consumed in Canada $39,802,000. The amount of duty collected on the imported portion is $944,893, and the total paid in wages $10,088,000. The additional cost to the farmer, the cost of the tariff, was just exactly $2,000,000. And most or a great part of the raw material can be had in our own country.

But there are some items even worse than that. Take for example such a commodity as cotton goods. Made in Canada these goods amounted to $76,274,000; imported, $31,000,000; exported, only $410,000. Consumed in Canada were goods to the extent of $107,373,000. The amount of duty collected on imported goods was $6,612,000, while the total wages paid in the whole industry amounted to $13,860,432. The extra cost of the tariff to the consumer of Canada was over $9,000,000 more than the wages paid in the whole industry, or $22,-423,000. Is it any wonder that one company in the textile industry can boast of paying 291 per cent and can come barefacedly before the committee and say, "We are not running these mills for the glory of God"?

I thought I would give a few of these facts to show why to-day agriculture is in a bad state. I have letters coming to me every day from settlers in Saskatchewan—people who are amazed at the foreclosures that are taking place in their district. And what are the government doing? What are the opposition advocating? What are they doing to-day to keep agriculture going in Canada? Oh! a vigorous policy of immigration—but only immigration.

There must be some equity in the administration of the laws, Mr. Speaker, and some of the unjust laws must be removed from the statute books. One class must share the benefits which the others are enjoying, and if you are going to bring in immigration from central Europe—people who will be content to adopt a lower standard of living than we are accustomed to in this country—then something will have to be done. These things cannot go on unnoticed any longer by the people of western Canada, and the longer I am in this house—I say this in all seriousness—the more I am convinced that the time is coming, indeed it has already gone, when western Canada can see no use in being tied up to the east. I hate to say that, but you are creating such a sentiment throughout the west, by unjust legislation in this house, and the time will come when the test of confederation will have to be made, because we cannot go on this way. We are not inferior to any eastern manufacturer or city man. We are making our living, and if there is one class on which this country will have to depend yet more than on any other I say it is a virile, contented population on the farms of Canada.

Motion agreed to on division, and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Telegraph and telephone lines—

Prince Edward Island and mainland, $7,000.

Land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels for cable services, $218,000.

Alberta and Saskatchewan, $114,000.
British Columbia, mainland, $36,000.
British Columbia, Vancouver Island district, $132,000.
British Columbia, northern district, $88,000.
Yukon System—main line, $139,000.
Telegraph and telephone service generally, $5,000.—Total, $739,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Before this item is carried I desire to make an explanation in answer to a question asked this morning by my hon. friend from New Westminster. He was under the impression that the Okanagan Telephone Company had not been given an opportunity of tendering on the sale of telephone lines which was made last year. Since the morning session I have looked up the file and I find that there was correspondence with the Okanagan Telephone Company as far back as 1923. In one letter, which I think I showed my hon. friend, they indicated that they were interested in only two parts of the line, that is, from Enderby to Sicamous and from Enderby to Salmon Arm. The section of the line which was sold last year had been run for some time at a yearly deficit of about $30,000; before that line was sold the head of the telegraph service, Major Gobeil, got in touch with the president and manager of the Okanagan Telephone Company and was again advised by them that they were not interested in purchasing the whole section.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That was just previous to the sale?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, just previous to the sale. Negotiations were carried on and the sale was made to the British Columbia Telephone Company for $50,000. By that time this company had made arrangements to construct lines which would be operated in competition with the section sold. This year it is proposed to sell some other portions of line, including the sections from Enderby to Sicamous and from Enderby to Salmon Arm; this sale will be by public tender and will be advertised in different sections of the province so as to give every one interested an opportunity of tendering.

Mr. STIRLING: I am surprised to hear from the minister that in 1928 the superintendent of telegraphs again got in touch with the Okanagan Telephone Company.

Mr. ELLIOTT: That was in 1927.

Mr. STIRLING: Were letters exchanged or were the negotiations carried on by way of conversations?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The superintendent went out and got in touch with the officials by wire.

[Mr. Evans.]

Mr. STIRLING: And in 1928 he was told they were not interested?

Mr. ELLIOTT: In 1927.

Mr. CANTLEY: I want to call the attention of the minister to the fact that on April 29 I asked for some information in regard to the gentleman upon whose recommendation certain work was done in the maritime provinces. On that occasion the minister said that if I would allow the matter to go over he would give me an answer. I did not obtain that answer; consequently on May 8 I placed a question on the order paper as follows:

1. What is the name and the address of the gentleman recognized by the minister, resident engineer, or other officer of the Department of Public Works, as having the patronage of the county of Pictou during the year 1927 and part of 1928?
2. Who succeeded to the patronage of the county during the latter part of 1928 and 1929?

The answer given is that there is no individual so recognized. I do not think that answer is correct, and I would like to know if the minister still adheres to that as being a correct answer to my question.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes, I do adhere to that as being a correct answer.

Mr. CANTLEY: In that case I would refer the minister to the correspondence from Mr. T. J. Locke, district engineer for the province of Nova Scotia, who wrote Mr. John A. McLean that on the recommendation of Mr. A. McColl he was appointed foreman in charge of repairs to channel piers, Bailey's brook. That letter was written on May 29, 1928. Then on July 4 Mr. Bennett, assistant engineer, wrote Mr. Locke as follows:

Saw MacIsaac at noon to-day but had to leave immediately to catch Mr. McColl at Malignant Cove.

He also stated that Mr. McColl had advised him that he was going to wire the Minister that day that if he did not accept the engineer's report that the work be done by day labour, an engineer should be sent from Ottawa so that he might be assured as to the wisdom of the advice tendered. Then on July 13 I find that the same engineer, Mr. Bennett, reported that the work done at Bailey's Brook was the worst he had ever seen. The man who did that work was appointed on the nomination of Mr. McColl, and this foreman was ordered to discontinue the work; in other words he was dismissed. Then on Jply 26 I find that Isaac Arbuckle was notified that upon the recommendation of Mr. McColl he had been appointed foreman in charge of repair work to the Canadian National wharves at Pictou. Again on

September 8 I find that the district engineer writes Mr. McLean that no further work is to be done by him on the Bailey's Brook wharf, and as a matter of fact work was suspended for two months or more, at the dictation of Mr. McColl, during the best part of the season and resumed only late in the season, again upon the recommendation of Mr. McColl. Then another gentleman was appointed, and so on; I could go through page after page of this same sort of thing, but in spite of what is disclosed by this correspondence the minister tells me that the information given in reply to my question was correct. I say it was not correct, and it is for him to explain, in view of this correspondence, why he says that information was accurate.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be very glad to answer my hon. friend, to his entire satisfaction, I hope. I would say that there was considerable correspondence with my hon. friend himself. In looking over the correspondence I find that he has been fairly active in the county of Pictou. This was particularly true during the summer of 1926, when the party to which he belongs for a short time controlled matters in that and other ridings throughout the country. I would direct my hon. friend's attention to the fact that when work is to be done in any particular county or constituency, naturally some local man is consulted with regard to the local situation. If a foreman is required, the engineer of this or of any other department could not be expected blindly to engage the man without having him recommended by someone. That has not been the practice for a number of years in that riding or in any other riding. There is a great deal of difference between consulting a man as to whom he would recommend, and accepting that recomendation or continuing the man in service when he has proved to be unsatisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT: Or if his politics were bad.

Mr. ELLIOTT: When you are looking for a foreman, that question is not nearly so important as are his qualifications for that particular job.

Mr. CANTLEY: They were more important in the case of McLean; that has been abundantly proven.

Mr. ELLIOTT: When he was reported upon as not being satisfactory he was promptly dismissed.

Mr. CANTLEY: Then the department took the recommendation of the same man with regard to another appointment, and that did not turn out well either. McColl has been recognized again and again, and is still so recognized. The statement of the minister is not a fair one, nor is it a true one.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member is getting aggressive.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1929-30

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1930, was presented by Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe, the house adjourned at 10.59 p.m.

Tuesday, June 4, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS OF PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): I beg to move:

That for the remainder of the session all private bills from the senate when received from that house be read a first and second time and referred forthwith, and that standing order 105 respecting the posting of bills be suspended in reference thereto.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is only one means of evading what is a distinct responsibility of this house, and I take most decided objection to setting aside the rule in this case.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): I understand the hon. member to be giving notice of motion, Mr. Speaker, and that to move the motion now requires unanimous consent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under the rules, as no notice was given of this motion, unanimous consent is required before the motion can be put. The motion will have to stand.

Mr. BROWN: Then may I ask that the motion serve as a notice of motion?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then it goes in with the regular motions?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It goes in with the regular notices of motion?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. It goes in with the routine motions. It has to do with procedure only.

Motion stands.

POST OFFICE SIGNS

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) inquired on the orders of the day on Friday last whether or not there was any accuracy in the report that the enamelled post office signs that were formerly printed in blue on a white ground had been withdrawn and signs with red letters on a white ground substituted therefor. In reply to his inquiry, I wish to give the following details:

The enamel post office signs printed in blue on white background are still in use on about 11,000 post offices, and will continue to be issued to all post offices except those situated on main highways.

In 1923 the Post Office Department introduced a red enamel sign with the words "Post Office" and the name of the post office in white letters thereon, for use only on post office buildings situated on main highways only. Applications to tender on 731 of these signs were issued to eight firms and only three of these firms submitted quotations, namely, The W. F. Vilas Company, Cowansville, Quebec; the Thomas Davidson Manufacturing Company, Montreal, Quebec; and the McClary Manufacturing Company, Montreal, Quebec.

As the tender from the W. F. Vilas Company, Cowansville, was the lowest received, the contract was awarded to that firm. This sign, which shows the words "Post Office" and the name of the post office serves a twofold purpose:

(1) It designates a post office.

(2) It gives the name of the place, thus assisting tourists.

Since the introduction of the sign in 1923, numerous requests have been received for the extension of its use, but the department has confined the issue to post offices situated on main traffic highways only; therefore, the blue lettered white enamel sign bearing only the words "Post Office" is still being issued to all offices not situated on main tourist traffic highways. There is no contract pending for the purchase of additional signs.

Yesterday in conversation with the leader of the opposition I promised that I would have the tenders produced. The staff is now busy copying them, and I will hand them to my hon. friend as soon as they are ready, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 337, for the relief of Edward Ernest True.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 338, for the relief of Glennville Wesley Potter.—Mr. Ladner (for Mr. Boys).

Bill No. 339, for the relief of Elizabeth Mitchell.—Mr. Ladner (for Mr. Boys).

Bill No. 340, for the relief of Edith May Enfield.—Mr. Donnelly (for Mr. Howden).

Bill No. 341, for the relief of Lillian Elizabeth Barton.—Mr. Ladner (for Mr. Boys).

EIGHT HOUR DAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): I should like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) what progress, if any, has been made in connection with legislation for an eight hour day.

Hon. PETER HEENAN (Minister of Labour): The matter is still under consideration.

CANADA'S FINANCIAL POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) to an article appearing in this morning's Citizen, entitled:

Federal Reserve Board Actually upon Defensive
American banker trying to shorten sail for possible squall and Canada has interest in it.

The article is written by Mr. Paul Reading and is dated Montreal, June 3. He makes certain statements that reflect upon our general financial position, and I direct the attention of the minister to it, without at the moment going into detail, so he may, if he thinks it desirable, make such answer as he deems the gravity of those statements may warrant.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Who is the writer?

Mr. BENNETT: Paul Reading.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, I have not read the article, but from the statement made by my hon. friend I should say that Paul Reading's presentation of the Canadian financial position is like the report of Mark Twain's death—very much exaggerated.

SOCKEYE SALMON FISHERIES TREATY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this might

be a convenient moment for me to make a statement regarding the government's intention with respect to the sockeye salmon fisheries convention. I notice that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) has given notice of motion that the third report of the select standing committee on marine and fisheries be concurred in. That is the report which recommends that this convention should be approved by the house.

I might say that when the resolution respecting the convention was introduced it was the hope of the government that hon. members would feel that the convention was so much in the interests of this country that it would meet with approval on all sides of the house. However, as hon. members are aware, there appears to have been a considerable difference of opinion in the committee to which the convention was referred—a difference of opinion as to the ends which the treaty would attain and the motives of the government in having entered into it. Taking all circumstances into consideration, the government has thought it would be inadvisable to proceed to obtain approval of the treaty by parliament at this session.

I wish, however, to make perfectly clear the position of the government in the matter, so that there will be no possibility of misunderstanding. This treaty has been negotiated primarily in the interests of the province of British Columbia, and were it not that the opposition to the treaty has come almost exclusively from hon. gentlemen opposite who represent constituencies in that province, the government would not have hesitated one minute in proceeding with the treaty. The premier of the province has sent me the following message:

Victoria, B.C., May 30.

Press despatches intimate ratification of salmon treaty by Canada likely to be postponed consequent upon news from Washington that American senate may not consider question at present session. It is the earnest desire of this government and I am assured also that of the general public of this province that Canada should not by postponement jeopardize a work fraught with such vast potential importance to British Columbia and the Dominion. Canada having spent so many years of active endeavour in the first place to stop or restrict the destruction of this essential food asset and later to ensure measures for its restoration and protection, it would be a misfortune now that we are on the threshold of success if Canada hesitated to take the step which would complete the work so far as she is concerned. A postponement at the present time would be ground for belief that Canada is not in earnest on this question. It is urgently pressed that it be shown by prompt ratification that the dominion so far as it can do so has removed any objection in the American senate that Canada has stood aside. The government urgently request ratification at present session.

S. F. Tolmie.

What I wish to make quite clear, Mr. Speaker, is that any hesitation on the part of the government in submitting the treaty for approval at this time is in no way due to any delay in the expected ratification thereof on the part of the American senate. Mr. Tolmie says:

Press despatches intimate ratification of salmon treaty by Canada likely to be postponed consequent upon news from Washington that American senate may not consider question at present session.

Let me repeat, the action or possible action of the American senate has nothing whatever to do with our action in this matter. Indeed, we intend, if hon. gentlemen opposite from British Columbia after visiting their province between now and next session come to view the matter in a different light, as we believe they will, to reintroduce the resolution to approve this treaty early next session. In the meantime the American senate will have had an opportunity to pass upon the treaty. I wish to make it perfectly clear that we intend to ask parliament to approve the convention next session, if in the interval it is ratified by the American senate, and we hope that in the interim hon. gentlemen opposite will find that the government of the province of British Columbia—which entertains the same view with respect to this treaty as does our government—is right in regard to it.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think the conclusion at which the right hon. gentleman has arrived is a sound one in the premises. I do not know that that will strengthen his own opinion, but at least that is my view.

The treaty in question was signed in March last, and knowledge of it came to this house some time in April. It is well that public opinion in regard to the matter should have an opportunity to crystallize. It is a treaty for sixteen years, it involves matters which most of us think of tremendous importance, and therefore the necessity is very pressing that opportunity should be afforded to those who will be affected to decide what the treaty really does mean. I think everybody will be grateful to the Prime Minister for this opportunity for public opinion to crystallize in regard to the treaty.

I may say Mr. Speaker, that so far as we who sit to your left are concerned, with respect to all matters dealing with international relations we approach them in a spirit entirely nonpolitical, or at least we endeavour to do so. It is with us not a question of Liberal or Conservative, not a question of the opposition or the government. I think we are all agreed that a satisfactory treaty is desirable. In view

of the fact that the propagation of sockeye salmon takes place in the province of British Columbia and that the larger number of the salmon has heretofore been caught in American waters, it becomes of great importance that we should, if possible, arrive at some arrangement with our neighbours. A satisfactory treaty is therefore not only desirable, but is necessary for the preservation of the industry and the making available for food of this very valuable fish. But that a treaty is desirable does not make it imperative for a public man to accept as the last word any treaty that has been submitted; and there are acute divisions of opinion as to the desirability of this particular treaty. Some of the terms of the treaty are found upon analysis to be most undesirable from a national viewpoint.

Mr. NEILL: I rise to a point of order. If the hon. gentleman is to be allowed to discuss the treaty, shall I also be allowed to discuss it?

Mr. BENNETT: I am only endeavouring to deal with the question raised by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King); I am not going beyond that.

Mr. NEILL: I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is well known that no debate may take place on a question arising on the orders of the day. But the right hon. the Prime Minister made a statement, and it has been always customary for the leader of the opposition to reply.

Mr. NEILL: To make a statement in reply, but not a speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader of the opposition may briefly reply to the Prime Minister.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the rules provide in a case such as this, when the Prime Minister makes a statement, that whoever occupies the position I hold for the moment is entitled to make a statement in reply.

Mr. NEILL: But not a stump speech

Mr. BENNETT: The impertinence of the hon. gentleman has become so proverbial that most members in this house are unaffected by it; it is received with that disdain and contempt with which it should be treated. I was observing that, believing as we do that a treaty is desirable and necessary, we have studied this treaty from the national point of view and find that there are acute differences of opinion with respect to some features of it. I am not aware of the views entertained by the Premier of British Columbia, but when I read the record it becomes quite apparent that he at least was not conversant with the terms of the treaty as it was negotiated; and the expressions of opinion he has given in the telegram that has been read make it, I think, perfectly clear that that condition has not entirely been changed. For instance, during the last twenty-four hours, I may say to the Prime Minister, one of our members has received a communication from the fishermen themselves who think that under present conditions it is not desirable to proceed with the resolution approving of the treaty. I do not desire in any sense to discuss the merits of the resolution at the moment except to observe that there are clauses in this treaty which many of us consider inimical to the national interest, and some of which at least we are uncertain as to the jurisdiction of parliament to enact or to become a party to, in view of the provisions of section 132 of the British North America Act. We are all agreed that if possible a treaty which will be fair to all parties should be negotiated between the United States and Canada, whereby those who live to the south of us may benefit from the fact that we are entirely responsible for the propagation of the sockeye salmon, while we, by reason of our less favourable geographical situation, may receive a larger proportion of the fish so propagated when they return from the sea at the end of the third or fourth year of their life. Under these circumstances I congratulate the Prime Minister upon taking the course he has, which I think is in the public interest, wholly devoid of any political consideration, and which will enable the public, by careful study and research, to ascertain fully what is involved in this treaty at this time. In that attitude we approach the solution of the problem, and not in any narrow party sense.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is one point in my hon. friend's remarks to which I should like to refer and that is the statement that some hon. gentlemen opposite have received a communication from the fishing industry or from those interested in it, urging that the matter should not be gone on with at this stage. In the circumstances I feel I ought not to allow the attitude of the fishing industry to be in any way misrepresented so far as it is known to the government. I have received a telegram signed by Richard Gosse, representing the British Columbia Packers Limited, which is as follows:

Understand provincial government strongly pressing for ratification of Fraser River treaty this session. This request is strongly supported by entire fishing industry of British Columbia as not only does treaty give far better

proportion of catch to Canadian packers and provides for improvement of propagation but does not interfere with Canadian rights as province has jurisdiction over development of watershed and besides commission can only recommend any course they desire to the government.

Richard Gosse,
British Columbia Packers Ltd.

I think I ought to give that communication to the house as well as the one from Premier Tolmie, in order that hon. members may know that the government is fully apprised of the views of the fishing industry of British Columbia and of the British Columbia government with reference to this matter. I hope I have made it clear that our only purpose is not to proceed in the teeth of opposition on the part of members for the province which is mostly concerned.

Mr. BENNETT: The Prime Minister misunderstood me if in speaking of the fishing industry he thought I was dealing with the packing industry; I was referring to the fishermen who catch the fish. Mr. Gosse, as I know, represents the packing industry; he is, I believe, president of the British Columbia Packers Limited. The communication received by one of my friends, who is not in the house at the moment, was from the association of fishermen—those who catch the fish. It was they to whom I referred and not the packing industry. The very terms used by Mr. Gosse, as to the government having control over the commission, involve one of the points about which great uncertainty prevails, and with respect to which we are endeavouring to ascertain what is meant. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) has just come in and has handed me the telegram signed by Mr. Maiden. It reads:

At to-day's monthly meeting fishermen opposed ratification Fraser River Sockeye Treaty this year. Am going north to-night. Send further communications regarding matter to R. Marshall.

That was yesterday, and it was followed by a letter in the same sense. The Prime Minister thought I was dealing with the packing industry as distinguished from those who are engaged in catching the fish.

DURUM WHEAT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. E. KAISER (Ontario): What does the government understand by "durum" wheat, and how did that variety get its name?

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): There are a number of varieties; there is amber durum and red durum. I cannot, on a question of this nature, raised on the orders of the day, go into an explanation of all the intricacies of durum wheat. If my hon. friend cares to put a question on the order paper I shall be glad to supply him with all the details.

Mr. McGIBBON: It was introduced into Canada from the United States, to which country it came from Siberia.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONTREAL RAILWAY TERMINAL FACILITIES

Hon. J. A. ROBB (for Hon. Mr. Dunning, Minister of Railways) moved the third reading of Bill No. 254, respecting the construction by the Canadian National Railway Company of certain terminal facilities with grade separation and other works at and in the vicinity of the city of Montreal.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): In accordance with the statement which I made a few days ago, I desire to move an amendment to the motion for the third reading of this bill. I think we are all agreed that the passenger and terminal facilities in Montreal in connection with the Canadian National Railways are wholly inadequate, and that new facilities should have been provided long ago. I think, further, we are all agreed that delay in commencing the construction of such facilities should not be permitted. The only question for consideration is as to the extent to which we should commit ourselves in providing such facilities; that is all.

The measure now before the house contemplates the expenditure of $51,000,000 or $52,000,000 in addition to the sum which we have already expended, together with the incidentals that must be taken into consideration having regard to the fact that the work will not be completed for some five years. It is not too much to say that the probable expenditure will therefore be something like seventy-five or eighty million dollars, or perhaps more. That includes, of course, the fifty-one million dollars provided by the new legislation, the cost of the old terminals of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and the obligations which we are under with respect to securities in connection therewith.

Having regard to all these facts I think there is only one desire on the part of all members of this house, including the members of the government, of the opposition and of the Progressive party. That desire is to provide in the great city of Montreal, which contains practically one-tenth of our popula-

tion, such facilities as will be in keeping with our nationally owned railway and such as will meet not only the requirements of to-day but also those of many days to come. It is the duty of railway statesmen to foresee not only the requirements of to-day but those of many years hence, and the other day I ventured to point out that Mr. Hill possessed great claim to fame because he had foreseen the requirements in connection with terminal facilities on his railways with a vision such as is given to very few men.

There is no doubt that the scheme now before us may be regarded as an ambitious scheme, but any proposal which has vision as to the future may be regarded by the men of to-day as being somewhat ambitious, and therefore this is a criticism which may be passed over. However, we cannot overlook the fact that at this moment we have made commitments that are extremely heavy. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) placed upon Hansard the other evening a statement of the financial obligations of this country in connection with our national railway system, and I observe that we have maturing during the next year national obligations amounting to something like $150,000,000. This means that the Dominion of Canada must provide within the next year something like $300,000,00, and that amount will only take care of the expenditure for one year in connection with the terminals.

Now let us assume for the moment that we desire to construct terminals at Montreal in keeping with the growth and potential greatness of our national railway system, and we must realize that this will cost a very substantial sum of money. It seems to me that we must ask ourselves two questions; first, is it possible to provide facilities which may be used by both great transcontinental railway systems? In other words, is a union terminal possible? The second question is, what is the minimum sum for which we may provide facilities which will meet the necessities for the present and the immediate future? Those two questions should be studied from every angle. With respect to the first question, this is largely a matter to be settled by the railway companies themselves; the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways must determine whether or not they can provide union terminals. From the evidence now before us it would appear that the efforts which have been made in that direction have not succeeded, and therefore we may take it that while the door is not closed to further negotiations, up to this moment no arrangement has been made looking for the provision of union terminal facilities in Montreal. In my judgment it is highly desirable that such provision should be made; having regard to what I have observed in travelling over the country, it is very desirable that we should have as few passenger railway stations as possible in any one city, and that wherever feasible union facilities should be provided and utilized. I think every hon. member of this house will agree with that statement.

Leaving that point for the moment, and having regard to the fact that no arrangement as yet has been consummated between the two railway companies, we must ask the next question: Are these proposed facilities the best that can be provided having regard to the present obligations of this country, financial and otherwise, both with respect to railways and to our own national financing? Obviously I cannot answer that question; the right hon. Prime Minister should not be asked to answer it, and no member of this house is in a position to give a proper answer. That question can be answered only by experts, men who have devoted their lives to this kind of work. I am not unmindful of the fact that the president of the Canadian National railway system is himself an engineer of note and repute, and he told the committee that in his judgment this was the only feasible scheme; I am not unmindful of the fact that the engineers of the Canadian National system hold the same view nor, have I forgotten that Mr. Palmer, an English engineer, has approved of the existing plans with certain modifications. However, I do submit that when you contemplate an expenditure so vast as $50,000,000 it is the course of wisdom to have a report made to the government based upon expert opinion of such a character that it will satisfy two requirements; first, it must be disinterested, and secondly it must be of such a high reputation that it carries conviction by the conclusions at which it arrives.

As I have said, I do not for a moment underestimate the wisdom, the knowledge, the foresight, the capacity and the large experience of the president and staff of the Canadian National Railways, but it is our money that is being spent and not the money of the railway company. The company is the medium through which our money is expended, and when I submit that a report should be made by an independent body I am only stating what most business men would regard as reasonable to suggest. No captain of industry contemplating large capital expenditures ever fails to take into considera-

tion not only all the factors which he himself may know and understand or the difficulties he may himself appreciate; he always secures expert opinion, not from one source or perhaps two, but from many sources. Those of us who are familiar with the vast undertakings which have been successfully carried forward on the American continent sometimes have wondered why they have been so long in commencement and in completion. The fact is that in each case it has been thought desirable to secure expert opinion upon every phase of the matter, and that always involves time.

Therefore I think I am within the judgment of this house when I say that most of us believe that some opinion other than that of the railway company itself should be secured. As I have said, I am not for a moment lessening in any way the value of that opinion. The plans are prepared; the railway company has submitted its designs and the other day in the committee the president of the company was quite frank when he said, "I am ready to consider any alternative plans which may be submitted, but up to the moment I know of no plans that can take the place of those I now submit for your consideration." That was his position, and it may be that that is the only position it is possible to take; I do not know. I do suggest, however, that, confronted with that situation in any ordinary business, every thoughtful proprietor, every proper master of his business, would suggest that the very best expert opinion be secured that possibly could be obtained.

Therefore I proceed to the conclusion that an expert opinion is advisable, and that this opinion should be so valuable and so well supported that it would carry conviction by its very finding; also, as I have said, it should be disinterested. The difficulty with which I am now confronted is a difficulty which I am sure the Prime Minister must feel and which I know the Minister of Railways appreciates: where is that disinterested tribunal to be found? To suggest that we should set up a commission of our own choosing would be unfair to the administration and unfair to the railway companies, because we are not in a position properly to select the members of that commission. I for one feel unequal to any such responsibiliy, and I doubt not that members of the government feel very much the same with respect to this matter. Where, then, can we secure that disinterested tribunal? I have looked about this country as best I could, I told the minister what I now say publicly; I have thought a very great deal as to where we could secure this tribunal and frankly the only body I know of is the Board of Railway Commissioners That board is not entirely satisfactory but it is the only body which I know of to which this matter could be referred. Of course, within itself it is not qualified to make any finding; all it could do would be to hear the expert testimony which would be brought before it. There are many objections to the board which it is not necessary for this house to canvass, but on the other hand, it is the only body I know of in Canada to which this matter could be submitted. I presented my position the other day as clearly as I could to the Minister of Railways and I think he saw my difficulties and understood them. If the Prime Minister has any tribunal which he can name it will be quite acceptable to me if it answers the first qualification—disinterestedness. I submit with great confidence to the house and to the country that when we embark upon an expenditure as vast as this we should have the approval or disapproval of a tribunal which has been predicated upon expert testimony of such character as will carry conviction beyond peradventure.

I think it is agreed that we must rely largely upon freight earnings to defray the fixed charges upon the money invested in these terminals. It has been indicated quite clearly that the passenger traffic is not profitable nor is there any likelihood of it becoming profitable except possibly through suburban traffic. I mentioned the other day the Illinois Central terminals in Chicago, those dirty, smoky terminals along the lakefront. Those conditions have been eliminated during the last few years by the expenditure of $30,000,000 and an annual operating loss of nearly $5,000,000 has been converted into an annual profit of $1,000,000 by means of the suburban traffic. There is no such congested population on the island of Montreal which would bring about that result, because the entire population today is about one million. That may be doubled within a reasonable time and there may be some improvement in traffic receipts, but when one looks at the outer and inner circles on the plan he must realize that to make the proposition successful the electrification of this system is absolutely necessary. I asked an engineer the other day what would be involved in the electrification of a railway, including modern devices and equipment. He informed me that it would cost $100,000 per mile. That is a very large sum of money, having regard to all the circumstances and to the fact that the freight traffic must bear the burden. Are we wise in not asking for an immediate report, such as I have suggested? I know the right hon. the Prime Minister

approaches a problem of this kind with a great sense of responsibility. That sense of responsibility must necessarily follow when it is considered that a yearly fixed charge of four or five million dollars is being placed upon the country and there is a question as to whether it is to be profitable or unprofitable. In moving this amendment we have suggested that this bill should go into force through proclamation of the governor in council and after approval of the plan of the works by the Board of Railway Commissioners, but if the Prime Minister or the government of the day has some other tribunal to suggest to take the place of that body I am quite content. I am not in any sense wedded to the Board of Railway Commissioners; my difficulty has been to secure a disinterested tribunal to which this matter could be referred.

I do not want to be considered as an alarmist, but I think that a country with a population of less than ten million and which talks as glibly as we do of expenditures of ten, twenty, forty or fifty millions of dollars, fails to appreciate and understand that obligations of this character must be met. When I say that they must be met, I mean that the interest must be paid and a sinking fund must be provided to take care of those responsibilities. Fifty million dollars is a very large obligation and a tremendous liability to create at this time. We are talking to-day in much the same way as this country used to talk before 1914, when we had such a collapse of our railway undertakings other than the Canadian Pacific. It alarms me when I think of the way in which we cavalierly wave our hands and talk about $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 as though it were a mere bagatelle. I was content to be called a pessimist in those days, but we sowed the seed and we are reaping the whirlwind and are paying the shot to-day.

I ask, therefore, not from any political motive nor any other desire than that of making the best suggestion I can to the government of the day, that before we embark on an undertaking of this character we should pause and consider this matter very carefully. I do not make that suggestion in opposition to the terminals, because I have wondered why terminals were not long ago provided in Montreal. These facilities have been imperatively required by the Canadian National Railways for the last few years. The railway system must be losing money because of the inadequacy of their terminal facilities, and I have wondered just how long the Canadian people would tolerate them. But because that condition has arisen is no reason why we should not take those reasonable precautions which business men would insist upon if they were acting as a board of directors dealing with the capital of a company.

So, Mr. Speaker, without dealing with the financial features of this matter beyond what I have said, nor trespassing longer upon the time of the house, I move, seconded by Mr. Stevens:

That the bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole house with instructions that they have power to add thereto the following section:

"That this act shall come into force on proclamation by the governor in council and after approval of the plans of the said works by the Board of Railway Commissioners."

Any action which is to be taken should be taken promptly; there should be no delay and if the government has any tribunal to suggest which is independent and disinterested, I shall be quite content to substitute that tribunal for the Board of Railway Commissioners. I am not entirely satisfied that that board is the tribunal to which this matter should be submitted, but it is the only board of a public character of which I know to which this matter could be submitted for consideration.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the house regrets the unavoidable absence of my colleague the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) who is at present confined in the hospital. The Minister of Railways had given much time to a consideration of the various railway projects coming before the house this year. He had devoted special attention to a consideration of the different branch lines in various parts of the country, to the Hudson Bay railway extension and to the Montreal terminal facilities. He had studied these different questions very carefully. Indeed, all the members of the government know that the Minister of Railways, ever since he joined the cabinet, has been giving attention to such projects. Therefore, we regret he is not present to-day to reply to my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett).

My hon. friend, in presenting his amendment, was fair to this extent: he admits the need of new terminals and better and more economical switching facilities in the great city of Montreal, whence are shipped the products of a large part of the country. He admits that there should be no delay in carrying out the work; indeed, he says that already he is surprised that the people not only of Montreal, but of Canada, have tolerated this

condition of affairs so long. I am not astonished at that, because my hon. friend, having had a good deal of experience before the railway commission and, perhaps, knowing that commission as well as or better than many others in the house, realizes the switching charges, for the moving of freight particularly, in Montreal, are very high and he knows that it is the man back home who pays those switching charges. But, having made that statement as to the imperative necessity of the work, my hon. friend suggests that before going on with it, we should refer it to a board in which he frankly tells us that he has not as much confidence as he would like to have. I repeat that he is in a position to know, because he has appeared before the railway commission many times.

Mr. BENNETT: Not as it is at present constituted.

Mr. ROBB: What does my hon. friend mean by that?

Mr. BENNETT: I mean that it is not the board it once was.

Mr. ROBB: That is another admission that my hon. friend is asking us to refer the consideration of this great problem to a board in which he himself has—I will not say no confidence, but little confidence. This project of the Montreal terminals is, so far as the railway is concerned, not a matter of hasty conclusions. The Canadian National railway management have been considering this problem for more than six years. Not only have they been looking into it very carefully through their own engineers, but they have brought to Canada an independent engineer, a recognized and most capable terminal engineer, who has had experience not only in the mother country but in other parts of the world. I understand they have had the advantage of the experience of eminent railway engineers connected with other vast railway transportation systems on this continent. They have examined carefully the terminal facilities in other cities and after all this examination and study have reached the conclusion that the plan now presented to parliament is one that will take care of the necessities of the great port of Montreal not only for the immediate present but for years to come.

What does this terminal plan as presented accomplish? It solves three problems. It solves the grade problem, the crossing problem of the different grades. Everyone admits that with the congested condition now existing in our cities, that is important, and eighty-one grade crossings are taken care of by this readjustment. Is it not important that that work should be proceeded with without delay? It also takes care of the readjustment and coordination of the present transportation facilities and reduces to a considerable extent the cost of switching. It provides for a belt line for freight and passengers right around the city of Montreal and also, unlike the situation that exists in other railway stations in Montreal, where the lines come to dead ends, it provides for a continuation of the system through the city, so that trains coming from the west proceed through to the east and trains coming from the east are able to proceed west. It is not proposed to spend this $51,000,000 immediately because the bill specifically states that the management may take seven years to do the work. I imagine that the people of Montreal and, indeed, the people of all Canada will want this work completed as soon as possible.

Mr. BENNETT: The bill provides for a period of five years.

Mr. ROBB: I thought it was seven. The expenditure covering that period of five years, as stated by my hon. friend, is not unreasonable. In the bill before parliament, the same precautions are taken in regard to the Montreal terminals as were taken in connection with the various branch line bills that parliament has passed. It is subject to the same examination and conforms in every respect to the general Railway Act.

As regards the expenditure, I take issue at once with the leader of the opposition. The people of Canada are not disposed to be governed by commissions. The government of the day are responsible for the spending of the people's money. If the people of Canada decide that the government are unwisely spending the public money, we shall be put out of office and my hon. friend will be put in. But the people will have an opportunity to judge us. Will they have such an opportunity if we turn over to the Board of Railway Commissioners, a board in which my hon. friend has just said he has little confidence, the decision as to whether or not the Canadian National railway management is going to spend this $50,000,000 or $51,000,000? If we do so, what chance have the taxpayers of Canada to turn them out if they are not satisfied with them? So I say to my friend that it is better that a government responsible to the people should be charged with the responsibility of making this decision. Even assuming that we adopt the suggestion of my

hon. friend and refer those plans to another board for consideration, how is that other board going to secure the desired information? Have we no confidence in the management of the Canadian National Railways? If we have no confidence in them, the proper amendment to bring in would be that we change the situation and turn over the management of the railway to the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend is a business man. Did he ever know of a business man who was engaging in large capital expenditures not calling in experts for their opinions, while at the same time not dispensing with the reports of his own managers and engineers?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has just told us that he questions whether the Board of Railway Commissioners are experts. The Canadian National railway board, through its chairman and directors, responsible to the people through the government of Canada, have not brought this measure to parliament without first taking expert advice. They have not come here hastily, for they have been considering this project for six years. Is it necessary that I should repeat to my hon. friend that they have obtained the advice of an independent expert terminal engineer? They brought to this country Mr. Palmer, who is regarded as one of the best railway terminal engineers in the old world.

There is another railway terminal engineer whose opinion has also been given in favour of this project, a man in whom the country had some confidence a few years ago, and in whom I believe they have confidence yet. I remember that when the government was looking about for a suitable man to take charge of this great national railway system that we had on our hands, there was some criticism of the selection of Sir Henry Thornton. It was recognized that he was an excellent railway terminal engineer and that he had had great experience in providing terminal facilities for railways in large cities, but some questioned very much whether he was a good traffic manager. They said they were not very sure as to that. We know, they said, that the government have selected a good railway terminal engineer, but we are not sure that he is a good traffic manager.

Mr. BENNETT: Who said that?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend recalls that that was the criticism at that time.

Mr. BENNETT: I am frank to say that I never heard it.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: I leave it to the Canadian people to decide whether or not Sir Henry Thornton has proven himself a good traffic manager. I submit that if Sir Henry Thornton was a good railway terminal engineer when he was engaged as president and chairman of the board of directors of the Canadian National railway, he has not lost anything by the experience of the past six years and by the exchange of opinions that he has had with other eminent railway engineers.

We entrust to the chairman and board of directors of the Canadian National railway, which is owned by the people of Canada, the expenditure of about $245,000,000 every year, and no one has suggested that before the management spend part of this money they should consult the Board of Railway Commissioners, a board in which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has but doubtful confidence. If the chairman and the board of directors of the Canadian National railway are to be entrusted with the building of branch lines throughout the country, with the extension of the Hudson Bay railway, and the operation of the vessels that we have on the ocean, surely they are to be entrusted with the expenditure of the money that parliament is voting for the Montreal railway terminals.

I repeat again that it is the government of the day that is responsible. The government must pass on all this expenditure and the government would not pass on any of this expenditure unless it was satisfied, as it is satisfied now after examination, that the railway has obtained the best expert engineering advice and that the terminals proposed are suitable to the requirements of the great port and city of Montreal. The bill provides that the expenditure shall not be more than $10,000,000 in any one year. I repeat that it is the governor in council that must authorize the expenditure of this money. The government of the day is responsible and so I ask parliament, admitting with my hon. friend that there is necessity and immediate necessity for improved railway terminal facilities in Montreal, why we should delay the passing of this measure by referring it to a board in which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has just said that he has but little confidence.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking entirely unexpectedly because I had no knowledge that this amendment would be proposed to-day. The greater part of this work will be carried on in the constituency which I have

the honour to represent in the city of Montreal. I have taken particular pains during the last fortnight to ascertain what the general public opinion is in Montreal with regard to the extension of these terminal facilities. Montreal, it is impossible to disguise the fact, is proud of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has brought great credit to the city of Montreal during the last fifty years, and Montreal has always had faith and confidence in the management of that great undertaking. Public opinion, as I understand it, in the city of Montreal is most desirous that there should be a clear and amicable understanding between the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways with regard to terminal facilities; but apparently up to the present time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not prepared to enter into a joint undertaking for the construction of terminal facilities, believing, as is undoubtedly the fact, that its present terminal facilities and the splendid station and equipment, which it now has, will be quite adequate to the requirements of its own undertaking for a number of years to come, and therefore public opinion, as I understand it, is that the way should be left open, as the development of the terminal facilities of the Canadian National Railways proceeds, for an amicable understanding, if one may be reached, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway may come in and share in those facilities. The door should be left open.

Apart from that, public opinion in the city of Montreal, as I understand it, is so thoroughly dissatisfied with the present terminal facilities of the Canadian National Railways in that city that, so far as it may give expression to the public opinion of this country, so far as it can exercise any influence on the government of this country, it will insist that there shall be no delay in proceeding to remedy the existing distressing and deplorable conditions. Therefore, representing that city, it is necessary, I think, for me to say that the general opinion of the city as a whole is that the work should proceed rapidly and that there should be no unnecessary delay in its commencement.

I have been accustomed to examining engineering plans for a number of years, and I am thoroughly convinced that so far as the engineering problems are concerned, there are no great engineering difficulties to be overcome in carrying out the undertaking for the proposed construction of these terminal facilities in the city of Montreal. So far as construction is concerned, I have no doubt that there will be no difficulty in finding not only in Canada but among the officials of the two great railways men who are thoroughly competent to carry out this great enterprise.

So far as the traffic necessities are concerned, I know nothing about the matter; that necessarily must be left to the management of the railway particularly and peculiarly affected. I entirely agree that the government of this country in carrying through this work must take all the responsibility—and perhaps a large part of the credit. I do urge upon the government that every necessary engineering advice and assistance should be made available to the management of the Canadian National Railways in carrying out this enterprise. But I am not in favour of delay, and I am certainly not in favour of any delay for the purpose of putting before the Board of Railway Commissioners this entire undertaking for its approval, because I believe that board is incompetent to give any better opinion upon it than I am able to give myself. But I did ask the other day that insofar as questions of law and of fact may arise between the Canadian National Railways and other public bodies, those issues should be submitted to the railway commission for decision. But if this entire project is referred to the railway commission for its approval, who are to bring the facts and produce the experts before the commission, unless the Canadian National Railways do so? I regard the suggestion that we should await the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners as one that will be interpreted and understood throughout the length and breadth of the city of Montreal as a means for delay. Consequently I cannot vote for the amendment.

Mr. J. ARTHUR DENIS (St. Denis) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, as representative of one of the constituencies of the city of Montreal, I deem it my duty to make a few comments with reference to the amendement which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has just moved to bill No. 254, in connection with the construction of a terminal station in the Metropolis of Canada. The citizens of Montreal are anxious to see the completion of these Canadian National Railway terminals and they are opposed—the majority of them at least—to any delay in this matter.

I therefore ask the house to concur in the views expressed by the citizens of Montreal who, for a number of years past, desire these improvements. Moreover, I see no reason why the government should not take the re-

sponsibility of having the representatives of the people vote the sum of $51,000,000 for the construction of these terminal facilities.

I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) as well as with those of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). We should therefore, without further delay, vote in favour of the third reading of this bill, and thereby, prove to the citizens of Montreal that the government acknowledges its responsibilities and is ready to grant their legitimate claims.

Amendment (Mr. Bennett) negatived.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS' ACT AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 170 respecting juvenile delinquents.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the senate has amended this bill by adding two or three subsections which were suggested by the child welfare organizations, and which really improve the bill. There is no objection to them on the part of the Department of Justice.

To section 17 the senate has added subsection (5), providing that when a child has been placed under the surveillance of a foster home outside the jurisdiction of the court, the court may issue a warrant or any other process outside of its jurisdiction for the purpose of reaching such child.

Subsection (3) of section 22 has been amended to read:

(3) Where, under the provisions of this section or of section 20, a sum of money is ordered to be paid, the court may adjudge, either by the order respecting the payment of such sum or by an order made subsequently, that the same shall be recoverable by distress and sale of the goods and chattels of the party and in default of such distress by imprisonment.

That follows a similar provision in the Criminal Code.

Section 36 has been amended to read in this form:

36. (1) Every juvenile court shall have such and like powers and authority to preserve order in court during the sittings thereof and by the like ways and means as now by law are or may be exercised and used in like cases and for the like purposes by any court in Canada and by the judges thereof, during the sittings thereof.

(2) Every judge of a juvenile court, whenever any resistance is offered to the execution of any summons, warrant of execution or other process issued by him, may enforce the due execution of the same by the means provided by the law for enforcing the execution of the process of other courts in like cases.

There are no other amendments.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Public Works—Asoka column for Canada at Delhi, India, $3,000.

Mr. BRADY: Will the minister explain this?

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): This has been requested by the Under Secretary of State for External Affairs. The amount is asked for to provide for the erection of a column, after the style of the ancient Asoka columns, to be placed in front of the new government buildings at Delhi. Four of the dominions were asked to contribute the price of one column.

Item agreed to.

To assist in the suppression of the white slave traffic, $1,500.

Mr. SPENCER: This seems a particularly small grant for the purpose. Surely there is more money spent in this regard.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I did not intend the chairman to call this vote; it is not under this department.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SPENCER: No; I want the particulars.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We might as well dispose of this item. It appears from year to year and is assistance for which the Department of Health takes responsibility in connection with the suppressing of the traffic.

Mr. SPENCER: But what is being done by Canada to suppress the traffic?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall have to get the particulars from the department. I understand that we cooperate with other countries and this is largely in the nature of a contribution to organizations that have this work in hand.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers, $3,079,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister will remember that I asked for a certain letter which was sent to the United States government. It should be on the file.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The letter in question relates to correspondence with regard to the lower lakes terminals. There would be no objection to my hon. friend seeing it; it is in the possession of the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I will not enter into a discussion of the matter, but I should like to see the letter.

Mr. PECK: I understand that all these works are done under contract.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Which works?

Mr. PECK: The work under these items generally.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes; there is no exception in the vote here.

Mr. PECK: The work is let to contractors—all these improvements which are proposed?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. PECK: Do those contracts contain what is usually spoken of as the fair wage agreement?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. PECK: What practical steps does the department take to see that the agreement is carried out?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Whenever there is complaint that it is not being observed, such complaint is investigated. The complaint goes first of all to the Minister of Labour, who guards very jealously the strict observance of the terms of the fair wage clauses.

Mr. PECK: The contract is one with the government and not with the men who are employed in connection with the work. The government is very careful to have proper inspection of the materials, of the mode of construction, and so forth, made by its own engineers. Surely, therefore, it is important that the workmen should be protected by a similar inspection with a view to insuring that they are paid a fair wage for the work they do. It would be a simple matter for some inspector, representing either the Department of Labour or the Department of Public Works, to see that the wages paid from time to time by the contractors to the workmen represent a reasonable return for their labour. If you wait until some complaint comes from the workmen themselves you may wait a long time, because the men who are employed on this work are probably afraid to complain for fear of being marked as labour agitators. I do think that the government should take more active steps than to wait until a complaint is made before investigating. It would be quite possible to insist upon duplicate pay lists being filed with the department, so that if any question came up after the contract was completed an opportunity could be had for investigation. The other day I asked a question of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) with reference to a contract that had gone through his department in connection with some improvements in the Lindsay arsenal, and to my surprise he told me he had no information as to the amount which had been paid the various workmen employed in that work. The result is that now that the work is completed it is absolutely impossible to ascertain whether the suggestion made to me, that fair wages were not paid these employees, is justified; the matter cannot be examined into. This question is one of considerable importance to the workmen of the country, and further steps should be taken to see that they are properly paid.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There is an official known as the fair wage officer, whose duty it is to make the very investigation to which my hon. friend has referred, and to see that the clauses are strictly observed.

Mr. PECK: Is there just one officer for the department, and does he examine carefully into all contracts?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I believe there is more than one officer and I understand that close supervision is maintained over the different contracts.

Mr. PECK: Would it be possible to get from that officer a report, annually or otherwise, as to what he actually does for the salary he receives?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Certainly.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend asked for a return the other day which he said had been delayed. I took up the matter in my department and while I have not seen the return myself I understood from my deputy that it had been sent forward to the Secretary of State. I do not know whether or not it has been tabled, but I believe it will give my hon. friend the information he desires.

Mr. PECK: I just want to point out that at present it is impossible to find out how this work was carried on and whether proper payments were made to the working men. The minister stated he was unable to furnish the information.

Mr. RALSTON: I think the answer was that he had not the information at hand here, but I think my hon. friend will find that the additional return will give him the information he desires.

Mr. GEARY: Does every contract contain a fair wage clause, and if so, does the minister remember offhand how it reads?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot say offhand; I know the clause is submitted by the Department of Labour before it is included.

Mr. GEARY: Is there a clause regulating the number of hours also?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not in a position to say offhand as to that.

Mr. GEARY: It seems to me that is an important point; the eight hour day, or so many hours a week, is a matter of some importance to the men, and if there is such a clause in government contracts it seems to me the government in employing men themselves might very well insist upon similar conditions being adhered to. I understand that in the Hudson bay work the men are working ten hours a day and there is nothing to show that they are not working ten hours a day on other government work, which is against the spirit of the fair wage clause.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The other day the minister furnished me with copies of the fair wage clauses, the one providing for a specific wage and the other for the fair wage prevailing in the locality. I suppose the government sees that these fair wage clauses are enforced.

Mr. GEARY: There is no doubt that sometimes the men are imposed upon by the contractor.

Mr. ROBINSON: I would like to inquire as to whether the granting of the franchise to the Detroit and Windsor Ferry Company, and also the franchise for the service from Detroit to Amherstburg and Bois Blanc island, come under this department?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I cannot say definitely but I am under the impression that they do.

Mr. ROBINSON: I would like to know definitely, because there is a matter I would like to bring up under the supplementary estimates.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa—second new departmental building, $200,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The supplementary estimates of this department, tabled yesterday, with the exception of an item for messing accommodation at Kingston and one or two other exceptions, are practically all for works under contract or for repairs which have been necessitated since the main estimates were tabled.

Mr. GARDINER: I notice that this item is for a new departmental building; would the minister give us some information in this regard?

Mr. ELLIOTT: This amount is to provide for the preparation of plans, the calling for tenders and so on for the second of the group of departmental buildings. This is only intended to provide for getting things ready to let the contract next year, after the completion of the building now in process of construction.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Where does the minister propose to put this second building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That is a matter for the architects to work out as to the details, but it is intended to be in the immediate vicinity of the present building.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is the Confederation building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Surely the minister will allow plenty of space between these buildings? A good deal of ground was purchased there for the purpose of making a second parliament hill, as it were, and surely the minister will not put this second building too close to the one now being constructed. Personally I think the present building is altogether too near Wellington street, as I have said before; some space should have been left between the street and the building. That cannot be helped now, but surely there should be quite a space left between the first and the second buildings, in order to make a beauty spot of that district. Can we get an assurance from the minister that this will be done?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I think my hon. friend may rest assured that the second building will not be put so close to the building now under construction as to interfere in any way with the harmony of the architecture of the two buildings. However, the details as to the exact location must be settled by the architects. The general plan is part of the scheme worked out years ago, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. HEAPS: But surely it is impossible for an architect to get out plans and specifi-

cations for a building until he knows where the building is to be situated. I had thought perhaps the minister might have some information to give the house indicating almost the exact location of the second building.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is in the immediate vicinity of the building now being erected, but this vote of $200,000 is to provide for a study of the site, the preparing of plans and specifications and so on.

Mr. HEAPS: There has been some talk of having a proper layout of the city so that these buildings might be given a proper setting; I understood that the federal commission had some plan in mind. Personally I do not like the location on Wellington street; I think it is a mistake to put these expensive government buildings in a row on that street. I believe some comprehensive plan should be developed whereby these buildings might be located in such a way as will not interfere with the future development of the city as a whole.

Mr. ELLIOTT: This location was decided upon by a committee after a very careful study extending over a number of years. The plan of the construction of the building to be erected on the area was canvassed and laid out after a lengthy study by a committee, such as the hon. member has in mind, and that committee decided upon the general layout of the buildings.

Mr. HEAPS: And they chose Wellington street as the site for the additional public buildings?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. HEAPS: There is a building on Elgin street, the customs building, which I think could well be torn down and a new building erected in its place. A very fine structure could be erected on the new park and additional space would be provided. Has the department considered that angle of the matter at all?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That would come within the area under the control of the federal commission and I have no doubt it will receive the most serious consideration.

Mr. HEAPS: In my opinion, Wellington street is not the most suitable location for these new government buildings. It is only possible to erect the buildings along one side of the street and the result will be that we will have fine, imposing government buildings on one side and a bunch of shacks on the other. I do not think that is a proper setting for the city of Ottawa, and I think a proper scheme should be devised by competent persons to develop the city of Ottawa in the proper manner rather than in a haphazard sort of way.

Mr. McGIBBON: I will take this opportunity of asking the Prime Minister if he has given any consideration to the matter of making the city of Ottawa a federal district where he would have control of everything in the line of architecture?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is a question which is under consideration all the time. I am not in a position to make any announcement at the moment but I hope that that may be brought about in the course of a short time.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand that the government is now renting offices in about forty different buildings in Ottawa; is it the intention of the government to erect buildings from time to time as finances permit which will take care of the entire civil service?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The intention is to proceed with reasonable expedition in the erection of buildings to house the different government services now located in a large number of buildings for which the government has to pay rent.

Mr. FANSHER (East Lambton): What departments of the government will be housed in this new building?

Mr. ELLIOTT: That matter has not been decided as yet.

Item agreed to.

Ontario

Barrie public building—improvements and repairs, $4,000.
Hamilton—tractor for postal purposes, $1,300.
Kingston R.M.C.—messing accommodation—further amount required, $55,000.
Oshawa public building—installation of elevator and improvements, etc.—further amount required, $1,000.
Ottawa—government's share of cost of local improvements, $38,000.
Ottawa West Block—elevator, $8,500.
Ottawa Printing Bureau—improvements to heating, $6,300.
Ottawa departmental buildings—fittings, etc.—further amount required, $25,000.
Stratford public building—improvements and repairs, $4,000.
Sudbury public building—addition and alterations—further amount required, $2,000.
St. Mary's public building—improvements and repairs, $5,000.
Walkerville public building—improvements and repairs, $4,500.—Total, $154,600.

Mr. ROBINSON: The minister has stated that his department grants the license to the Detroit and Windsor Ferry Company, and I would like to inquire when that license will expire?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have not the data relating to that, but I will be very glad to obtain the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. ROBINSON: This ferry company has a very valuable franchise. The island of Bois Blanc, a Canadian island, opposite the town of Amherstburg belongs to Canada but the ferry company operates a boat from Amherstburg to the island. Two American immigration officers are stationed there and when a British-born family of recent residence in Canada desire to go to the island for picnicking purposes they are not permitted to do so by these immigration officers. I feel certain that if the general manager of the ferry company were not so stubborn some arrangement could be made whereby British-born subjects would have the privilege of going to the island. The ferry company take the view that passengers from Detroit to Bois Blanc, or Bob Lo as it is called, are not questioned when they return to Detroit, and also claim that it would offer a sort of roundabout way in which undesirables or those not on the quota list could get into Detroit without being questioned. I think this matter could be overcome by the assurance of the chief of police, the mayor or some other responsible party in Amherstburg, that the British-born citizen had no intention of landing in the United States, but would return to Amherstburg. This is a humiliating position, and I have received many complaints about it. I do not think the United States would tolerate a similar condition on their side, and I feel sure that the matter can be amicably adjusted by the department.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The department grants the license for the ferries, but has no control over the regulations of the immigration department of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON: The ferry company operates a boat called The Papoose, which runs only from Amherstburg to the island. I do not think it is right that American immigration officers are permitted to station themselves at a Canadian port and prevent British subjects from going from one part of Canada to another.

Mr. HEAPS: I would like to direct the attention of the minister to a matter which I think can be remedied very quickly; I refer to the sidewalks around the parliament buildings. Sidewalks as a rule are made to walk on, but it is impossible to walk on these. They have been in a bad state for some time and I should like to know whether the department is going to take measures to see that they are repaired. Is any action going to be taken against the contractor who built these sidewalks?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It was not thought advisable to do anything to them while the house was in session; that is, to start tearing up the sidewalks or effecting repairs. The contractors to whom my hon. friend refers have undertaken to resurface the portion that was laid by them and which is unsatisfactory. That will be done just as soon as parliament prorogues.

Mr. HEAPS: I hope the department will see that the contractors put on a proper surface, different from what they put on before.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I see under this item an amount for Ottawa departmental buildings, and I should like to say a word as to the location of the second departmental building. The Prime Minister has taken a great interest in the beautification of Ottawa and is causing a good deal of money to be spent in that regard. The location of the new buildings will make a tremendous difference in the appearance of the city. I am rising simply to ask him personally to look into the plan and see whether he thinks the location is all right. We have bought a large piece of land all the way along Wellington street and it should be made a beauty spot. I do not want to insist upon this because I may be wrong, but I think the present building has been put altogether too near the street. This is not necessary, because there is plenty of land to give more room and there should be at least space for a driveway in front of the building. I know it has been stated that the reason the first building was located where it is, was so that it would be in line with the Chateau Laurier, but after all, the whole section in that part of Wellington street should be a new feature by itself, like a second parliament square, though not exactly the same as ours, but with plenty of open spaces, grass and so forth to make it a thing of beauty. I simply appeal to the Prime Minister to give the matter of the location of the second building his personal attention.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend can rest assured that no building will be located without the Prime Minister's most serious consideration being requested, and, I know, being very freely given.

Mr. BENNETT: I was rather interested in what the hon. member for West Essex said. Certainly it seems to me to be improper that, because a foreign company owns a Canadian island in Canadian waters passengers running from a Canadian port to that island should be subjected to almost the indignities to which he referred. I think the minister has it in his power to put a stop to that sort of thing.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I shall be glad to look into the matter and to do whatever can be done.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. SPENCER: No.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Hudson Bay railway and terminals: construction and betterments, including E. B. Jost at $2,500, $6,500,000.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. leader of the opposition asked certain questions in regard to the engineers and the engineers' certificates, and with regard to the Stewart and Cameron contract. The amount paid to Stewart and Cameron by the department to March 31, 1929, was $1,025,578; the amount required to complete the contract is $974.422. The total estimated amount to be paid to Stewart and Cameron is in round figures $2,000,000. The reasons for the increase are an increased quantity of material above that estimated. The original engineer's estimate of the work covered by the Stewart and Cameron contract was $1,907,000.

My hon. friend also asked with regard to classification. Strictly speaking there has been no change in the classification from the four original classes of material: (1) solid rock; (2) loose rock; (3) hardpan; (4) earth and other materials. There were, however, four extraordinary orders issued under the provisions of the contract: (1) for excavating frozen material; (2) for excavating ditches in winter, as it was deemed necessary for such work to be done in the winter in order to facilitate drainage when the spring thaw came; (3) erection of eight engineers' camps, not included in the original contract; (4) brushing on top grade, which brushing was found necessary on account of the muskeg embankments, the embankments being too soft to bear track being laid, which was given to the contractor to be done ahead of the track, as he had men in camps in advance of the tracklaying.

My hon. friend also asked something as to the engineers. The chief engineer under the contract was the chief engineer of the construction department of the Canadian National Railways, Mr. Gzowski, who as such has the final say as to classification, work orders and price fixing orders. Such action, however, is taken on the advice and after consultation with the other engineers down the ladder, particularly the district engineer, Mr. J. G. MacLachlan, who in turn was continuously on the work and in touch with the resident engineers. Mr. Gzowski, Mr. Dixon and Mr. Burns made many trips over the line, and Mr. J. G. MacLachlan was practically continuously on the job with the exception of necessary trips to Winnipeg, and on one occasion he had to go out for medical treatment in Winnipeg, but not during the progress of the work.

My hon. friend also wished to know whether the deputy Minister, Major Graham Bell, had sent any telegram or other communication to Mr. MacLachlan, the district engineer in connection with the classification under the Stewart and Cameron contract. The answer is that there is no record on the departmental files of any such telegram or communication.

Mr. BENNETT: There were a number of questions which arose out of that, but in view of the absence of the minister, who is unfortunately ill, I think I shall have to let them stand. I thank the acting minister for the information that he has been able to secure under great difficulties. Before I leave that, I should like to put on record, so that the attention of the minister will be called to it, a telegram that came to me from Mr. W. J. James, of Prince Albert, and I am sure that the hon. member for Prince Albert will be greatly interested in this:

Have read press report of discussion in house regarding Churchill terminal and Beach subdivision in 1908 and following two years. I bought several lots in Beach subdivision paying three hundred dollars each knowing that some day it would be a port. As yet received no notice of expropriation or offer in connection therewith. I know of twenty-five others at this place that bought lots and obtained title and are in same position as myself. Would like to know if our rights are to be taken away without notice or compensation.

I merely put that upon the record in view of the discussion the other day, so that it may be brought to the attention of the

minister when the opportunity comes later. In any event the deputy minister will take notice of it.

I suppose the acting minister has no figures in connection with the Flin-Flon branch of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. BENNETT: I will leave that, in the absence of the minister.

Item agreed to.

Loans to Canadian National Railway Company

Amount not exceeding $53,750,000 to meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred (where amounts available from net operating income or investments may be insufficient) by or on behalf of the Canadian National Railway Company, herein called "The Company," or any company specified or referred to in chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, and chapter 13 of the Statutes of 1920, or now or hereafter comprised in the Canadian National Railways or by the company in respect of any railways, properties and works entrusted to it from time to time under the provisions of section 19 of chapter 172 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, or any one or more of such companies, on any or all of the following accounts, such expenditures or indebtedness being herein called authorized expenditures:—

(a) Interest on securities, notes and other obligations; rentals for lease of lines and equipment;

(b) Equipment principal payments; sinking funds; miscellaneous maturing or matured notes and other obligations secured or unsecured;

(c) Operating income deficit, whenever incurred or ascertained;

(d) Construction and betterments, including coordinations; acquisition of real or personal property and working capital.

The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time to meet authorized expenditures, in the discretion of the governor in council:—

(a) In respect of railways, properties and works entrusted to the company as aforesaid;

(b) In respect of railways, properties and works not so entrusted by way of loans in cash, or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other, subject, however, as follows:—

If by way of loans from His Majesty, the amount or amounts advanced to any one or more of the said companies shall be repayable on demand, with interest payable half-yearly at the rate fixed from time to time by the governor in council, secured if and when directed by the governor in council by mortgage or mortgages upon such properties, in such form and containing such terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as the governor in council may approve.

If by way of loans from persons other than His Majesty (without the guarantee of His Majesty) the amounts, terms and conditions of such loans shall be such as the governor in council may from time to time approve.

If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be either a general guarantee covering the total amount of the issue, or by a separate guarantee endorsed on each obligation, and may be of the principal, interest and sinking funds (if any) of the notes, obligations or securities of one or more of the said companies specified by the governor in council, which notes, obligations or securities the companies so specified are hereby authorized to make and issue from time to time, provided that the total principal amount thereof at any one time outstanding shall not, together with any part of the loans represented by cash, exceed the total amount mentioned in this vote, namely $53,750,000; and any such guarantee may be signed by the Minister of Finance, or such other person as the governor in council may authorize, on behalf of His Majesty, in such form and on such terms and conditions as the governor in council may determine to be appropriate and applicable thereto. Any guarantee so signed shall be conclusive evidence for all purposes of the validity of the guarantee and that the provisions of this enactment have been complied with.

Should temporary loans be made or negotiated before the lapse of this appropriation either from His Majesty or other persons, guaranteed notes, obligations or securities may subsequently be issued under the provisions of the preceding paragraph of this enactment to renew, refund or adjust such loans, or any part thereof.

Each company herein mentioned or referred to is hereby authorized to aid and assist, in any manner any other or others of the said companies, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may for its own requirements and also for the requirements of any or all of such other companies from time to time:—

(a) Issue notes, obligations or other securities, joint or several, at discretion, for the purpose of any guarantee made or to be made under the provisions of this enactment;

(b) Apply the proceeds of any such guaranteed issue, or the amount of loans received by virtue of this enactment, in meeting authorized expenditures on its own account or on account of any or all of such other companies;

(c) Make advances for the purpose of meeting authorized expenditures to any or all of such other companies, upon or without any security, at discretion.

No purchaser of such guaranteed notes, securities or obligations shall be under any obligation to inquire into the application of the proceeds of any guaranteed issue, $53,750,000.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps it will facilitate matters if I state to the committee that all these railway estimates were referred to the railway and shipping committee, where they were very carefully reviewed, and the report of the committee I believe was unanimous.

Item agreed to.

Maritime Freight Rates Act

Amount required to provide for payment from time to time during the fiscal year 1929-30 of the difference, estimated by the Board of Railway Commissioners and certified by the said Board to the Minister of Railways and Canals, as and when required by him, occurring on account of the application of the Maritime Freight Rates Act, between the tariff tolls and the normal tolls (referred to in section 9 of the

said Act) on all traffic moved during 1929, under the tariffs approved, by the following companies:—

Atlantic Quebec and Western Railway.
Canada and Gulf Terminal Railway.
Canadian Pacific Railway, including Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Railway Co.
New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company.
Cumberland Railway and Coal Co.
Dominion Atlantic Railway.
Maritime Coal Railway and Power Co.
Quebec Oriental Railway Co.
Sydney and Louisburg Railway.
Temiscouata Railway, $1,050,000.

Mr. POWER: I desire to inquire of the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Robb), as I would have inquired of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning)—whose absence I in common with all other members of the house deeply deplore—if any steps have been taken by the government to remedy the situation which has arisen in Quebec, a situation created by the application of the Maritime Freight Rates Act to the city of Quebec and the surrounding country. It would appear that owing to that legislation the city and port of Quebec have been seriously discriminated against. The Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General and members from the district of Quebec have received memorials in protest, and it has been quite conclusively shown to the Minister of Railways and others that owing to the application of this legislation the harbour of Quebec is, so to speak, divided into two: freight shipped from Levis, which is in the harbour boundaries of Quebec, obtains considerable advantage over freight shipped from the city of Quebec, so much so that at the present time the merchants of the city of Quebec meet competition from the maritime provinces almost at their door. Within 50 or 60 miles of the city of Quebec the freight rates are on a par with those from Halifax; whereas the merchants of Levis have received benefits which even they did not anticipate.

I submit that this was on oversight at the time the legislation was passed. For many years Quebec and Levis were in the same rate zone. Serious injury has been occasioned to the merchants and the shippers of the city of Quebec, and they have protested vigorously. They have taken their protests to the proper authorities here. Moreover, they went down to the maritime provinces and explained their case to the boards of trade of Halifax and St. John. Not having anticipated that this matter would come up for discussion this afternoon, I have not the documents at hand which I should have, but I believe their representations received not only a sympathetic hearing, but I am under the impression that resolutions of these boards of trade were passed favourable to the contention of the representatives of the port of Quebec. Under the circumstances I would urge that some action be taken without delay in order to remove the discrimination which exists against the city of Quebec.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. POWER: I should like to hear from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Thank you for your inquisitiveness.

Mr. ROBB: I know the Minister of Justice is in sympathy with anything that concerns the city and port of Quebec. As the house knows, a delegation from the city of Quebec recently presented to the Minister of Railways the case which has been so well presented this afternoon by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). I am advised by the officers of the Department of Railways that the minister promised to urge upon the traffic department of the railways the necessity of reviewing the case fully. Beyond that I am quite sure my hon. friend does not expect me to go to-day.

Mr. POWER: I should like some further assurance that if the traffic department cannot make that arrangement the government will amend the Maritime Freight Rates Act at the next session of parliament. In fact it should have been amended this session. I think the government should consider seriously such an amendment. I do not think the people of Quebec city will be satisfied with the minister's assurance that representations have been made to the traffic department. We can make those representations ourselves, and probably we shall get just as far. It should be the duty of the government to remove any injustice that has been created by a mere oversight—on the part of whom I do not know.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend as a good lawyer would scarcely expect the government to pronounce upon the matter until it has heard the evidence from the officers of the department.

Mr. CANTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it would appear that the member for Quebec South is under the impression that the Maritime Freight Rates Act was intended to bring redress to the province of Quebec. I would remind him that that legislation was enacted to give relief to the people of the maritime provinces. So far as the city of Quebec is concerned we are not very much interested. But we are interested in getting our products

into the city of Montreal. To cut us off—as we are cut off—several hundred miles from Montreal, means that we get only about five-eighths of what we should have got by way of relief. Montreal is the gateway, the first point in the upper province, so-called, where we can find a market or get in touch with Ontario. It was understood thoroughly that we were to be given special rates to enable us to enter that territory. As I say, that has not been done. I have not the slightest objection to Quebec participating in the rate referred to by the member from Quebec South, but I think he totally misapprehends, as I stated in my opening remarks, the object of the Maritime Freight Rates Act. If he will join with me and other members from the maritimes to have the Maritime Freight Rates Act extended to Montreal, I am with him.

Mr. POWER: In reply to the unselfish remarks of my hon. friend, I shall be glad to join with him in any way—

Mr. CANTLEY: Then start on the right track.

Mr. POWER: I never claimed, nor did anybody else in the city of Quebec, that the Maritime Freight Rates Act was intended for our relief; but I did wish to make it clear that that legislation was not intended unjustly to discriminate against the port and city of Quebec. The effect of the introduction of those rates has been to deprive the merchants of Quebec of the opportunity to sell their goods in territory which from the earliest days has been recognized as their own. Anyone who is familiar with the geographical situation of the province of Quebec will know that almost all the territory between Montreal and Three Rivers on both the north and the south shore of the St. Lawrence river is fully covered by the business people of Montreal; whereas the territory below the city of Quebec, between it and the New Brunswick border, has been for years that in which the Quebec merchants were able to carry on their business.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton): You are referring to the city of Quebec?

Mr. POWERS: Yes. The effect of these rates is that we are no longer able to carry on business there.

Mr. HANSON: Will the hon. member go ahead and prove his proposition? I am sympathetic, but I should like to hear from him something more than a mere assertion.

Mr. POWER: My hon. friend's point is absolutely well taken. Unfortunately I did not expect this matter to be brought up to-

day and I have not with me the memorial of the Quebec board of trade. It is quite clearly stated that on certain articles the rate from Quebec to Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, eighty miles below Quebec, is about equal to that from St. John to the same point, which is about four hundred miles. I do not remember all the details, but if that is the case, and if it can be shown, then there is an unjust discrimination. No favouritism should be shown in that territory. That is the point, and it should be the duty of the government to make a more serious investigation into the matter than has so far been made.

Mr. PARENT: I am glad the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has brought this matter to the attention of the committee. I for one, as a member from Quebec, have had occasion more than once to meet representatives of the various commercial interests of that city with a view to bringing to the attention of the government the discrimination under which the city of Quebec is labouring by reason of the freight rates consequent upon the Duncan report and the act based thereon. As stated by the hon. member, it is well known that the city of Quebec has always been regarded as a part of the maritime provinces so far as traffic is concerned. Everyone who has spent a few years in Quebec will remember the time when we had a ferry which often carried full trains across from Levis to Quebec and from Quebec to Levis, in the traffic between the maritime provinces and that city. Knowing all the circumstances, and being under no doubt at all as to the city of Quebec having been all along regarded as a part of the maritime provinces in the matter of freight rates, we were very much surprised to learn that in the Duncan report only the city of Levis was mentioned; and no one at the time protested, for the simple reason that it was inconceivable to the people of Quebec that the mention of the word Levis alone could be taken to mean anything else than the inclusion of Quebec city itself. The city of Levis is, of course, a splendid place but it is not to be compared in importance to the city of Quebec; everyone will concede that. It is well known that our commercial people have long done business with the maritime provinces, carrying on a considerable trade with them. When the word Quebec was omitted from the timetable the officials of the department and of the railways concluded that the special freight rates did not apply to that city. It is then that the question began to attract attention, and as soon as the discrimination was realized the members representing that city, the board of trade and the

various interests of Quebec took action to bring the matter to the notice of the government. I may say that so far we have received a very sympathetic hearing, but that is about all that we have obtained. I am glad that the members from the maritime provinces appear to be in sympathy with our claim in this matter, and I sincerely trust that as a result of these combined efforts the government will see its way clear to giving the city of Quebec the freight rates which the maritime provinces enjoy under present conditions.

Mr. MacLAREN: It may be true, and I think it is, that we are sympathetic with the desires of the people of the city of Quebec, but I cannot say that we are sympathetic to the point of wishing them to get what they ask for in this particular case. The minister will no doubt give due consideration to all the representations submitted to parliament, but he will find that there is a very strong and widespread objection to this application from the city of Quebec. There is one way that is suggested of helping to meet the situation and that is, instead of having the point fixed at Levis, that it be extended back some miles to St. Charles or some station nearer the maritime provinces. In that way there might be eliminated any difficulty arising between Levis and Quebec. In the meantime, while we wish our friends in Quebec every consideration, we do not propose that anything shall be done which will interfere with the Maritime Freight Rates Act as passed by parliament. There may be some way by which to meet the situation so far as Quebec is concerned without disturbing the maritime rates. But what is proposed just now by hon. members from Quebec we consider to be very injurious to the act which gives us the 20 per cent reduction.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I assure my hon. friend that the matter has been submitted to the various maritime boards of trade and as recently as last week ten of them out of twelve had approved of the demand made by Quebec in this respect. It is really as much in the interests of the maritime provinces as of Quebec itself that this request is being made. As the hon. member for Quebec South had said, it seems anomalous that part of Quebec harbour should be subject to the preferential rate while the other part of the harbour is not. May I say—and I am surprised that my hon. friend from Quebec South forgot to say it—that when the delegation came to submit this request the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) recognized that the grievance existed, stating that the officers of the department would try to find a means of remedying it, perhaps without the necessity of having recourse to legislation. But he added that if legislation were necessary it would be considered prior to the next session of parliament. I may tell my hon. friend that we are far from trying to hurt or in any way impair the charter which has been given the maritime provinces; far from it. The demand made by Quebec, if opposed by those interested in maritime matters, such as the boards of trade, would not be entertained, I am quite sure. But it is with the consent and the approval of our friends from the maritime provinces that the subject has been brought to the attention of the government.

Mr. MacLAREN: If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) will carefully and judicially read the resolution prepared by the maritime boards of trade, I do not think he will be able to put upon it the interpretation which he has now given to the house.

Mr. RALSTON: I have heard of the representations which have been made but I have not had an opportunity to listen to them directly nor have I been able to consider them fully. I feel, however, that the hon. member for Quebec South ought to accept the assurance that these representations will be considered. Speaking for myself, I do not feel that I should bind myself, or consider myself bound by these representations until all sides have been heard and everyone who is interested has had a chance to present his case. I am not sure that it is enough that the Quebec representatives have waited upon the maritime boards of trade and discussed the matter with them. Until the views on all sides have been formally put on record and considered, I think judgment should be reserved. In my opinion, the present moment is not opportune to make a declaration; we should wait until everyone has had an opportunity to present the matter. I am not sure that there is a clear view in the maritime provinces as to just what is implied in regard to the question of implementing the Duncan report or carrying out the principle contained therein with regard to special provision for freight rates.

Mr. MacLAREN: Nor is there a general consent of the boards of trade. I think the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) will agree to that.

Mr. CANNON: As one of the representatives of the section of Quebec which might be affected by the matter brought up by the hon. member for Quebec South, I may say that this matter offers first of all

some local difficulties as between the people of Quebec and the people of Levis, which must be settled, and other difficulties as between the people of Quebec and the people of the maritime provinces which also must be adjusted. This is a matter which certainly cannot be settled by simply bringing it up in this house and asking the government immediately to bring about a settlement. Only recently the government has been called upon to give its attention to this matter; the Minister of Railways received a delegation; the board of trade of the city of Quebec is now in touch with the boards of trade of the maritime provinces, and I have no doubt that everyone interested will be satisfied when it is stated that the government is giving the matter serious attention. Pending the outcome of the negotiations now going on between the different commercial interests it would be useless for us in this House of Commons to attempt to bring about a settlement. This is a matter which will have to be examined very carefully and I have no doubt that in conjunction with our friends from the maritime provinces, next year we might be in a position to reach a satisfactory adjustment.

Mr. POWER: I am afraid I must take issue with the Solicitor General as to the date at which this matter was brought to the attention of the government. It is all very well for my hon. friend to say that this is an occurrence of only recent date, but after all four months surely is a sufficiently long time even for this government. The Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice will recollect that shortly before the beginning of this session they were interviewed in Quebec by a delegation from the board of trade and by the members for the Quebec district, and when the necessity and urgency of the matter was presented to them they said they would take action as soon as it was convenient to do so.

Mr. CANNON: And they recommended to our Quebec friends that they get in touch with our friends from the maritimes and try to reach a settlement, and that is what is going on now. I do not think we are helping to bring about a settlement by this present discussion.

Mr. POWER: I am not prepared to agree with my friend the Solicitor General; I am one of those who believe with President Wilson in the principles of open covenants, openly arrived at. I would much prefer to discuss this matter fairly and openly on the floor of the house with my hon. friends from the maritimes in order that we may be able to come to some settlement. Had we continued to agitate in the Quebec papers I am afraid those papers would have been read by very few of the hon. gentlemen opposite; some of them would not be able to read those papers, so I thought it best to bring the matter before the members of the house in this way as we brought it to the attention of the members of the government four months ago and again one month ago, at which time we were told that our request was receiving the consideration and sympathy of the government.

Mr. STEVENS: Serious consideration.

Mr. POWER: Yes, serious consideration. Now I suggest that we might be told that some steps are being taken, at any rate, to put an end to this situation, and it is not sufficient to tell us that because the hon. member for Quebec South rises in his place and draws the attention of the house to a matter affecting his constituency and his city he is probably disrupting certain negotiations of which he at any rate knows nothing. If I had been informed that negotiations were going on or that the work was progressing favourably possibly I might have been able to return to my constituents and tell them to be patient a little longer, but they are tired of being patient and they would like to have some assurance from the government that their claims will be dealt with.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder if I caught the language of the Minister of Justice correctly; sometimes I do not hear very well, but I thought I heard him mutter the words, "Et tu Brute."

Mr. LAPOINTE: I beg your pardon; was my hon. friend asking me something?

Mr. BENNETT: I was asking the Minister of Justice if I was right in thinking I heard him say, "Et tu Brute."

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, that is a language I do not usually use.

Mr. CANTLEY: It is rather amusing to find some of our friends from Quebec apparently now of the opinion that the Maritime Freight Rates Act was passed for the benefit of the central provinces. My understanding is that the Maritime Freight Rates Act arose out of a recommendation of the Duncan commission, which pointed out that we in the maritimes were handicapped by 250 miles of railway built or diverted for strategic purposes, and to overcome that extra mileage we were to be given a preferred rate.

My contention is that when the western point to which those rates should apply was determined that was not done fairly; that point should have been Montreal, because as I stated before, Montreal is the gateway through which we can or must distribute our products throughout the central and western provinces, since we have practically no trade east of Montreal. I have not the slightest objection to getting into Quebec on the same terms, but our trade with the city of Quebec and that part of the province of Quebec east of Montreal is comparatively slight. At Montreal we practically encounter the inflow from the foreign markets of Great Britain, Belgium, Germany and Europe generally and there we also meet the Ontario producers of iron and steel who ship by water. Unless we can get fair rates to the city of Montreal we will derive very little benefit from the Maritime Freight Rates Act. We are interested not at all in the traffic going east; that is not the important matter. What we are interested in is the opportunity to get into the markets of these central provinces; the eastern traffic affects us very little. I am content that we should pay any reasonable rates as far as the trade going east is concerned, but we must have an opportunity to get into the central markets.

Mr. POWER: I can hardly be under any misapprehension as to the purpose of the Maritime Freight Rates Act; for two or three years we heard nothing but appeals from the maritime members for relief and justice. I may say, however, that the members from Quebec never opposed this legislation on that ground; on the contrary, all the members from Quebec were only too glad to help relieve the maritime situation in every possible way. We were quite willing to be of assistance to the maritimes; we were glad to help them in any way, but I do not think we should be called upon to ruin ourselves for the sake of helping our neighbours. That is the position.

Item agreed to.

Department of National Defence—militia services—administration, $317,000.

Miss MACPHAIL: What explanation has the minister to offer for the general increase in the militia estimates over last year, particularly in view of the fact that this year the Paris pact was signed?

An hon. MEMBER: This is a Liberal government.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I do not think the question is quite justified by the estimates as they appear on page 26 of the main estimates. My hon. friend will see that there is no increase in the military estimates. There is an increase in connection with the naval vote, and there is another increase in connection with civil air operations. The increase in the naval estimates is brought about by the purchase of two destroyers to replace the Patriot and the Patrician which, it will be remembered, were presented to Canada in 1920 by the British government along with the cruiser Aurora. Although this item appears to be increased this year I would point out that in fact it is not an increase over last year. There was an increase last year of $900,000 to take care of the first payment on account of these two destroyers, but this amount was not used. Had it been used the vote this year would have been the same as it was last year, but in view of the fact that it was not used it was necessary to revote that amount plus the amount of the second instalment which will be due this year.

I have the details of the civil air operations if they are desired by my hon. friend, but I can assure her that they are not military in any sense of the word but are connected with the increased service which the civil government branch of the department is providing, particularly for the Department of the Interior.

Miss MACPHAIL: If they are not military in character why do they come under the Department of National Defence?

Mr. RALSTON: As my hon. friend knows, that is a matter of organization. The air board which was formed some years ago was put under the Department of National Defence, and it has remained there. In view of the representations which were made two years ago it was thought advisable to divorce completely the civil government operations from the so-called military operations—I will explain that when we reach the particular items—and a distinct civil government branch was formed. This branch is in the same position as other administering services which perhaps have nothing to do with the particular name of the department.

Mr. GEARY: Are the civil pilots trained by the military personnel?

Mr. RALSTON: The camp at Borden trains civil pilots, as well as military pilots. It may be some relief to some of the members of the committee, whose views I know very

well, to learn that in view of the increase in civil aviation and in the demands made, not only for the government services but to assist in connection with aviation in Canada, that the camp at Borden is being used principally as a training ground for civilian work. Perhaps that may be regarded with something of a shock by some members of the committee who may feel that we are going back on military training, but it was felt that the training which we could give at Camp Borden was necessary and essential for the promotion of civil aviation in this country where aviation is so beneficial.

Mr. GEARY: Are the pilots technically trained at Camp Borden?

Mr. RALSTON: We require that those accepted for training shall have undergone a course of applied science at some university. This technical training is being given by universities throughout the country. We do not take a man in off the street, so to speak, and try to make a pilot out of him; we ask that he have some preliminary training. We have neither the force nor the facilities to conduct an elementary school, and therefore the student must have already the theoretical training before he is admitted. We believe that the success of aviation depends very largely upon the safety with which it can be carried on, and safety, after all, is made up of ground organization as well as the actual flying ability.

Mr. SPENCER: Is there any lack of men applying for training in the civil air service?

Mr. RALSTON: There is no lack of men applying, but I must say that none too many meet our qualifications. In that regard, I would say to the committee that a number of provisional pilot officers were required this year. We circularized the flying clubs and schools but we have not been able to find the required number of partially trained men. I do not intend that as an invitation to members of the committee to recommend various gentlemen. We have been very careful in our selections, believing, as I said a moment ago, that the very foundation of aviation in this country requires that the men be thoroughly trained.

Mr. GEARY: Instruction is being carried on at various places and one hears of many bad accidents where a lad, probably on his first solo flight, has crashed. At times these men have been seriously injured, and at other times the crash has resulted in death. I do not say for a moment that that is brought about through insufficient training or anything of that sort, but I would like to ask the minister what steps are being taken to make certain that there is that degree of instruction received and ability shown before the men are given a flying license.

Mr. RALSTON: Without casting any reflections upon the organizations, I think the accidents to which my hon. friend refers have occurred mainly in flying clubs, especially those occurring this year. The service this year has been singularly free from accidents, although we had one bad accident last year in the west. These flying clubs are purely civilian organizations and the department assumes no responsibility for their maintenance, upkeep or supervision except that which would be taken in connection with a commercial organization such as, for instance, the Western Canada Airways. The department requires that the pilots shall pass our tests, and they are medically examined every six months. The machines are inspected before a license is issued, and are inspected each year before the new license is given out. In addition to that we are constantly in touch with these clubs. In connection with the accident which occurred the other day, while the department was under no obligation we immediately conducted an inquiry in an endeavour to find out the cause of the accident in order that we might take steps to prevent a recurrence of such an accident. Where lack of judgment has been shown or anything else brought to light which would indicate that something was wrong with the machine, we immediately advise these clubs to that effect. These flying clubs are generally managed by groups of enthusiastic men who are keen on aviation, and we are always afraid that familiarity will breed contempt. We are endeavouring to get them to see that what I said a minute ago is absolutely essential, namely, ground organization. That means inspection every morning of the machines and every part which may be frail or give way; that they must observe regulations which we lay down in regard to these flying clubs; that the instructors must be passed as medically fit, because in no branch of activity in Canada is it so necessary that men shall be medically fit and that certain disabilities shall be absent as it is in connection with flying.

Mr. LUCAS: Does the department give any supervision to these flying clubs and the instructors to see that the proper training is given?

Mr. RALSTON: The general answer is no; that is to say, except to examine the instructors whom the flying clubs use and

see that they are licensed pilots and pass our regulations. We examine the machines and see that they comply with the necessities for a license. Then we examine the so-called pupils to see whether they are fit to receive either a private or a commercial license as the case may be.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the usual length of time for an applicant to receive his certificate under the department's training?

Mr. RALSTON: Fifty flying hours for a commercial pilot and ten flying hours for a private license. A private license means that one cannot carry passengers.

Mr. LUCAS: But how long does he usually have to spend at the training course in order to secure that certificate—six months or a year?

Mr. RALSTON: Anything from a month up. It depends upon the man. As regards our own pilots, these young pilot officers whom we are training, they spend three vacations, sometimes four. That is to say, in order to get their full training for both ground instruction and flying, they have to spend a year or so. For the pupils in the flying clubs a month would be the very minimum, but the course usually takes a great deal longer than that. A man will be in the air for perhaps a few minutes only the first day, and I think from a month to six months would be the minimum.

Mr. IRVINE: I should like to know whether non-commissioned officers and men disabled in the air service receive a pension, whether in case of their being killed, their dependents receive a pension, and if so, how much.

Mr. RALSTON: I think I furnished my hon. friend with information along that line last year. I do not have it in my mind at the minute, because it involves amounts and regulations, but I shall be glad to give the information before the committee rises. Is my hon. friend dealing with the members of the department? Of course, my hon. friend knows that no pensions are paid in respect of those who are pupils in flying clubs.

Mr. IRVINE: I have tried to get the information from the regulations and have absolutely failed. Perhaps the minister could tell me in a general way whether the non-commissioned officers and men in his department who are engaged in flying, receive a pension in case of disability or death.

Mr. RALSTON: In a general way I may say yes, they do.

Mr. IRVINE: I think there are some peculiarities about this.

Mr. RALSTON: If there are any jokers and if my hon. friend will point them out, I shall be glad to see that they are remedied.

Mr. IRVINE: I cannot find any jokers because they are so wrapped up in the regulations.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend knows of any case where there has been some reservation or condition and if he will bring it to my attention, I will take it up at once. If men are hurt while they are engaged in the service, it is the intention that they shall be pensioned.

Mr. BRADY: I was not in the chamber when this item was brought up and perhaps the minister has already replied to the question I am going to propound. In view of the great number of young Canadians who are very anxious to enter the Royal Air Force, I should like to know what are the essential educational qualifications.

Mr. RALSTON: Speaking of the position of a pilot officer, let me say that generally the educational qualifications required are graduation from a university or from the Royal Military College, or that a man is actually attending a class in applied science at a recognized university and undertakes to finish his course in that respect. Hon. members will understand that applied science, physics, dynamics and aeronautics, is essential in connection with the care and handling of the machine. If such an undertaking is given, the applicant will be considered for training, as I indicated a little while ago, during his vacation for the three or four years that he is attending a university. Therefore the issuing of his pilot's license will probably be coincident with his graduation from the university.

In connection with airmen, that is, those who are not pilot officers, we do not insist on educational qualifications. We have no definite standard. We would like them to have matriculation qualifications, but what we insist on is either that they shall be students at a technical college for two or three years or that they shall have worked for, say a year or two in connection with gas engines and machinery of that sort. Many of our airmen are mechanics, men who have been connected with garages, who have had to do with automobile engines for a substantial period of time. We do not take a man off the street, for instance, out of a grocery store, and make him an airman, because we have not the facilities nor the personnel for giving him elementary training.

Mr. BRADY: As this is a very important question and as I said, so many young Canadians are ambitious to enter the Royal Air Force of Canada, it is evident from what the minister has said that nothing is definitely stated regarding the qualifications, say of cadets. As regards age, boys of eighteen years are ambitious to enter the Royal Air Force. What is the minimum age at which a young Canadian is allowed to enter that force? If there is any rule I should like to know it, because I know many young men to-day who have matriculated from the various high schools into the different universities and who are now engaged, just as my hon. friend has said, in grocery stores and other lines of business, but who are not engaged in what we call technical industries. I would like to have that point cleared up because I have on my file over sixteen letters of inquiry regarding it, and when the minister gives me the information I shall be able to inform my correspondents.

Mr. RALSTON: He must be over the age of eighteen years and under the age of twenty-one when he commences his course. The case to which my hon. friend refers I understand is that of a university graduate in applied science who has gone into some other vocation. If he is physically fit, is within the age limit and complies with all the other requirements, he would be eligible for consideration.

Mr. BRADY: Thank you.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I have a complaint to make in regard to the civil air operations. Perhaps it does not come under this vote, but if the minister will give me the information I can report back later. A young man named Keeley in my constituency entered for a course of civil air training. At that time the department recognized these commercial companies which had been formed for the training of aviators for commercial flying. The young man entered the service of a company which was recommended by the department. That company very soon afterwards became bankrupt, and the young man then entered two or three other companies, but for one reason or another his training was deferred. Finally he came to the stage when he was to make his solo test flights. Everything had been satisfactory up to that time. He had been examined by medical officers and had been seen by the officer in charge, but when he came to take his solo trial flights it was found that he had one defect, that he was wearing glasses. I am not going to justify the acceptance for the service of any man with a defect, but it does appear to me that some person up to that time should have noticed that he was wearing glasses. He had taken this course with the intention of receiving a certificate for commercial flying and his people had spent $2,000 on his training, but after the expenditure of that amount and the failure of two or three of these guaranteed commercial companies, it was ruled that he could not take his solo test flights because he was wearing glasses. I am behind the department's examination. I have seen it, and I think the requirements are pretty nearly perfect, but I do think that in this case someone made a mistake, and that this young man should not have been allowed to go on with his training to the point where it has now become burdensome to his people, if he is not to be granted a certificate. He entered the service of one company after another and had passed every test up to the time of his solo flights. He had made a landing or two perfectly. The minister kindly took the matter up and said that he would give him a certificate, but it would not be a commercial certificate. Of course that is what the young man was training for, and that is what his people spent the $2,000 for. But through a defect which some person should have noticed this young man is not allowed to take his final tests, although he could really qualify, and he cannot in consequence get his certificate.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is quite right in saying that he brought the matter to my personal attention some time ago and I was trying to get into my head as he was speaking the exact facts. As I remember it, this student was examined by outside medical men, I think, on two different occasions.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): If the minister will remember, these two men who examined him were the department's own accepted examiners.

Mr. RALSTON: Right, but I mean they were not men in the service. My hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that this young man's father was an oculist himself.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: And the application which the young man signed set out the physical requirements for a pilot, but in some way or other he missed that. The file came into the head office and he went on with his training. He was not actually turned down. He was allowed to see if he could qualify. The point in that case was this: I said that if he could qualify, pass our tests and make successful landings without his glasses, he would re-

ceive his certificate. It seemed to me that that was a case in which the young man took that risk when he went into training. If he could make successful landings without glasses, he would be granted a certificate. If he could not, then in the interests of the safety of his passengers and for his own safety he should not have a certificate. That was the ground I took. I think the young man took his risk in that respect. He was not turned down because of the fact that he wore glasses, but because he did not pass a test which he must pass without glasses. We have to provide for the case where a man in an accident may lose his glasses and be compelled to land either alone or with passengers without glasses.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I can only speak from the information I got from the young man and his father. I do not think that at that time it was absolutely necessary that a man should not wear glasses, because certain ones did wear glasses. I do not think he was refused the certificate because he did not make a landing without glasses, because I think he could do so. I do not know that he has ever been given the opportunity.

Mr. RALSTON: I think so.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think not, because just recently I received a letter from him. I am not going to defend the passing of any person with a defect, but I say that this man entered when the restrictions were not so rigid as they became later, and I do not think he knew at the time he entered that wearing glasses would prevent him from getting a certificate. I am absolutely certain of that.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is mistaken as to the regulations. They have always been the same; the restrictions were not made any more rigid after the young man came in. As a matter of fact, as I understand the general regulations, those wearing glasses are not taken, but this was a case where a young man had been allowed to train with glasses, and while we take this extraordinary precaution of saying that a man who wears glasses had better not be allowed to become a pilot at all, we did say in this case that if this young man could make successful landings passed by the officers of the department we saw no reason why a special exception should not be made in his case. My hon. friend may be right in saying that he has never tried to land without glasses, but I am quite positive that I wrote to my hon. friend and told him that the young man would be given the opportunity to pass the test without glasses if he cared to do so. It is a case perhaps of being over-strict in connection with a matter where we would rather be over-strict than otherwise.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Surely the minister must admit that the requirements with regard to eyesight are much more strict than they were three years ago. I can prove that. Three or four years ago you had not a man who could make the eye tests that they are making to-day. Am I right or wrong in that?

Mr. RALSTON: I could not tell my hon. friend that. All I can say is that the regulations have not changed.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Two or three years ago, when this young man began his training, there were none qualified to make such an examination. Since then you have had men taking a course in the old country, and they can now make the tests. They are extending their experience and teaching others, but at the beginning, three years ago, you did not have a man who could do it. I do not think you had at that time two men in Canada who could make the examination they are making to-day, and I will stand by that.

Mr. RALSTON: I speak with the greatest deference in the presence of my hon. friend who, of course, understands thoroughly the service requirements of any man, particularly with regard to medical qualifications; but I am instructed that my hon. friend is wrong, that we have medical men who had, as my hon. friend had, to do with war service, and who were qualified and so regarded, and that the inspections were made by men who were acknowledged then, and are still, as qualified. My hon. friend is quite right that in this as in any other science we are seeking further information and are endeavouring to perfect it but I would not want to admit either on behalf of the department or of those officers, that they were not qualified to make the examinations.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I should like to know the names of the men who could make those examinations three years ago as they are making them now.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know whether it is fair to discuss the names of individual men across the floor. May I send over a name to my hon. friend?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Yes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is the minister sure that there is no condition, expressed or understood, that in the granting of a commercial license the pilot shall be in any way whatsoever connected with the reserve military forces?

Mr. RALSTON: It is unconditional in that respect.

Mr. GEARY: If a man learns to fly can he take a machine into the air without a license?

Mr. RALSTON: The only man who can go into the air without a license is a pupil who is recognized as such. The requirements are that he shall not go three miles beyond a licensed airdrome. The individual who takes his examination somewhere else must come to us for a license.

Mr. GEARY: The license is granted under dominion auspices?

Mr. RALSTON: That is correct.

Mr. GEARY: Does any province grant flying licenses?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. GEARY: In the case of automobiles each of the provinces naturally issues its own license. Is there any difference in regard to flying; is it regarded as a dominion or as a provincial matter?

Mr. RALSTON: It has been considered by the federal authorities to be a dominion matter. Perhaps my hon. friend knows that a reference has been prepared and probably will be submitted to the courts with regard to the relative jurisdiction of the federal and provincial authorities in that respect.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no reason why a province could not license a flyer who did not go outside the provincial boundaries.

Mr. RALSTON: We are contending further than that, I may tell my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Miss MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, the estimates of the Department of National Defence are to me more significant this year than in any former years in view of the fact that this session the house has listened to a very excellent debate upon the Kellogg pact or the pact of Paris. The need of renouncing war as an instrument of national policy was felt by all hon. members, since that pact passed the house unanimously, and Canada is now a party to it. While the explanation of the minister as to why the estimates have increased sounds plausible enough, it is rather difficult for any minister of national defence, even the clever gentleman who now occupies the position, to explain why the estimates have been increased from $11,000,000 in 1922 to a bit better than $20,000,000 in 1929,—

[Mr. Adshead.]

and all the time we have talked about how much we love peace. It does not sound consistent. I should like to see Canada take the stand that we actually mean that we will not consider war as an instrument of national policy, that we will not continue to waste this amount of money on military affairs.

I should like to see the cadet vote struck out altogether. I think that the expenditure on the non-permanent active militia is an absolute waste of money; it is no good either from a military or a non-military point of view. I can see no reason why the Royal Military College should be given a grant when we have declared ourselves to be a peaceful people, searching for new and peaceful methods of settling disputes. I can see no reason why—and I should like the minister to give the reason, if there is any—civil aviation should be under the Department of National Defence. Why it is not under the department of transportation where quite naturally it belongs? Let us reorganize and keep civil aviation away from the military authorities, so that there cannot be the slightest suspicion of any relationship between civil aviation and the military authorities.

Not only the people of Canada but the people of the world, particularly the common people—and I am one of them—have eagerly been waiting for relief from the cost of armaments. Disarmament was promised at Versailles in 1919, just ten years ago, and yet nothing substantial has been done to bring it about. On the contrary most of the nations have done just what we have done, increased rather than decreased their expenditures for things military. While this has been going on the really great men of the world, the outstanding statement and thinkers and writers, have been saying again and again that if we keep on the way we are going nothing but another international conflict can be the result.

Sitting in the chamber this afternoon I have been reading a book by Lord Robert Cecil in which he points this out in the most pessimistic vein. It is well known that he is devoting his life in trying to prevent the happening of that which he thinks is ahead of us unless we change our methods. He is one of very many outstanding men who have said again and again that unless we disarm —and of course as well try to eradicate the economic causes of war—that unless we go to the root causes of war we will continue to have war. We cannot possibly wait until we have security before we disarm. It is my opinion that armaments do not bring security, but quite the reverse. Therefore we must

start to disarm sometime, and to me now is just as good a time as any other, and just a little bit better. Possibly it would have been better if we had done so before, but from new on there is no time so good as the present for bringing about disarmament.

I know the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) is very much interested in this subject, and he very well voiced the change of opinion of the people in the following words:

> The world has moved forward. A new psychology of peace is gradually replacing the war psycology of the past.

That is very true indeed. The Prime Minister used equally clear words on this subject, saying:

> War will annihilate civilization unless civilization undertakes to annihilate war.

Indeed, though we are not willing to do much more than talk about it, still the mere talking about it has made peace so popular a subject that even the Minister of National Defence has referred to himself, more or less jokingly, as the Minister of Peace. I recall that to his mind at the moment.

Mr. RALSTON: Not as a joke.

Miss MACPHAIL: Then that makes it even more essential that he should make his department look as though it were a department of peace. The Prime Minister will remember that last year, in reply to my suggestion that we have a peace bureau, he said that every department of his government was a department of peace. One would think that with so many departments all working towards peace we should have absolute security without spending $20,000,000 to insure it by war-like means. The Prime Minister of Canada also said in relation to the pact of Paris—and I believe this has been quoted in papers throughout Canada:

> We should make the principle underlying this treaty a basis of consideration in all matters of foreign policy.

I think we should go further than that and make it a basis of consideration in all matters of domestic policy, to which the work of this department belongs. Everyone says that we want peace, and excellent speeches have been made in this house upholding that idea. I am thankful for that much advance. But that in itself is not enough. Mr. Briand, speaking of the pact of Paris, said of it:

> Such a treaty means a beginning and not an end.

That is something which members of this committee should remember: the treaty is a beginning and not an end. Having declared that we believe in peace and that we are renouncing war as an instrument in the settlement of international disputes, we need to go further and act as though we really meant the words we used. I think the leader of the opposition made possibly the clearest contribution to the idea of the need of further action. Speaking in the debate on the pact of Paris, he said:

> The first step to be taken if this treaty is to be maintained and enforced by the Canadian people is to bring about disarmament.

He is absolutely right. And we cannot bring about disarmament in another country; we can bring it about only in our own country, and I know of no country which is in such an excellent position as Canada to begin and to set an example which I am sure would be gladly followed by all other countries in the world.

The amount of armament we have is after all useless if we really intend to go out and use it in aggression or even in defence. Our geographical situation leaves us in an excellent position. We have no one who could be regarded as an enemy except the United States of America, and we are in no position, seeing that we have a very much smaller population, to arm ourselves sufficiently well to contend with that great republic.

Some nation will have to take the lead in disarmament and I covet for Canada the honour of leading. Recently I read that a group of ministers—not government ministers but ministers of the gospel—in the little state of Denmark were asking their people to create a public opinion strong enough to persuade the government of Denmark to lead the world in this great work of disarmament. They see clearly that to the nation that leads in this respect great honour will in future be due. I see no reason why Canada should not take the lead. Moreover, Canada and the United States have experimented in disarmament and have found the results to be entirely good. We have a very long history associated with disarmament, a history going back over one hundred years. A Quaker in the United States named Henry Rush decided after the war of 1812-13-14 that it would be better for both his country and Canada if they disarmed. He talked about the matter sufficiently, and was influential enough to get the idea accepted by the administration of his time. The Rush-Bagot treaty was the result. What that treaty has saved us in the actual expenditure of dollars and cents, and possibly in life, no one can estimate. No country has felt more secure than Canada has as the neighbour of a powerful and very rich country, the United States. Neither country is in the least afraid of the

other because both are friends. Our long border line of some three thousand miles is the most secure in the world because on either side there are friends who wish only good to the country that lies beyond. Our two countries went further; we have carried out what must be the work which will follow the pact of Paris. The pact of Paris is simply the enunciation of a principle, and in working out a peaceful method of settling disputes means must be found either of giving to the League of Nations more power, and supporting it with a stronger public opinion or setting up new courts of settlement. In the case of Canada and the United States, this house is familiar with the machinery which was set up and is known as the International Joint Commission, which followed on the Waterways Commission. The Waterways Commission was instituted in 1902; the International Joint Commission followed and was founded in 1909. This body has been able to settle all disputes which, without its intervention, would have been irritating and troublesome. With the experience we have had, and with the confidence we have gained in the principle of disarmament and of arbitration, there is no reason why we should not give a lead to the world—a lead which the world stands in great need of. If little countries in Europe—and we can think of ourselves as little for the moment, seeing that we have a small population—felt in relation to their neighbours, as as secure as we do, Europe would not be in the turmoil in which it finds itself at the moment.

Within recent weeks some encouraging things have happened. I consider that the advent to power of Ramsay MacDonald—it looks as though he will be Prime Minister of Great Britain—is a great step towards world peace. I am convinced that Ramsay MacDonald will put the peace of the world first and will shape his policies, national and international to that end. Coming almost on the same day is the report of a speech made by President Hoover on the occasion of the decoration of civil war veterans' graves on memorial day. President Hoover made a splendid speech. I am sure hon. members have read it and so I will not weary the house by quoting from it, except a very brief passage. Referring to the pact of Paris, he said:

> The pact. . . . implies that nations will conduct their daily intercourse in keeping with the purpose of the agreement, and that they shall endeavour to develop instrumentalities of peaceful adjustment to remove disputes from the field of emotion to the field of judicial consideration.

[Miss Macphail.]

We have done this in other things. While we have not attempted it internationally, we have applied the principle to the relations of individuals within the nation. We will no longer put up with two individuals or two groups of individuals flying at each other's throats when they want to settled their disputes; they must carry every argument to the courts and have it decided there. There is no reason why we should not do this this in international matters; logically it is the next step to take, and again I seriously urge that Canada could do a great service to the world by saying, "We are not a military people; we do believe in peace, and we have no enemies." It is nonsense to spend $20,000,000 in order to keep up what is really only a parade stunt, which is of no use and which has a bad effect on our mentality. Let us get rid of it. Put aviation under transportation, where it belongs, and if you really feel more secure and sleep better at night by retaining the permanent force, personally I have no objection to doing so. Then something would be required for administration, for general supplies and so on, but I would like to see the rest of this expenditure absolutely done away with. I think the common people of Canada are heartily sick of military things, and in keeping up this department in this way the government is out of accord with the sentiment of the people.

I hope the Minister of National Defence and, indeed, all members of the government, will take this question into their very serious consideration. A great power such as Great Britain or the United States cannot disarm as easily as we can; we are a young and virile people without very many fears or race prejudices. We have not very much to be afraid of; we are in the position of an interpreter between the two great powers, Great Britain and United States. We love them both; we have much in common with each and I can think of no better way of cementing that friendship which has been slightly strained during the past year than by disarming at least in part; and personally I would be quite willing to go all the way. I think we are working towards the time when we will have an international police force for the protection of the world rather than separate forces in each country. I would be quite willing that we should contribute to such a force. For the present I think a move toward disarmament would be our best contribution to the peace of the world.

Mr. CAYLEY: May I ask the hon. member a question? She suggested striking out the

item for the Royal Military College. Would she also suggest that the same action should be taken if a similar sum were given to a royal peace college or something like that?

Miss MACPHAIL: There are two schools of thought in Canada; one, security through peace, and the other, security through armaments. If the government would set up an international college of peace and give an equal amount to such a college I would be content to have them run a race and see what would happen, but now the government is backing one school and doing nothing for the other. The students at the Royal Military College usually come from wealthy families; if these families cannot afford to educate their sons elsewhere that is their own lookout.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is not my intention to go into the details of this expenditure of $20,000,000, or almost $21,000,000 with the supplementary estimates, which we are proposing to spend this year on national defence, but at the very beginning of this discussion I should like to back up, if that is at all necessary, the remarks of the hon. member for Southeast Grey.

I do not think we need to say very much about the evils of war; almost everyone is willing now to admit these. Only a few reckless adventurers or a few ruthless profiteers, of whom I do not think we have very many in Canada, would deliberately attempt to foster another war or would rejoice in any friction which might occasion war. However, we must face the fact that another war is quite possible so long as conditions remain as they are. While perhaps we are making no particular effort to prepare for the chemical warfare which undoubtedly will be of the most disastrous character, at the same time no one can read what scientists are saying without realizing that in another war we shall undoubtedly run the risk of wiping out civilization itself. As it is, the piled-up debts of the past war constitute all the memorials we need, and I think it should be emphasized that about half the revenues which are obtained in this country go to pay the interest on the money we spent in the last war. We do not need anything to remind us of the ravages of war; if anything were needed, that reminder would be furnished by the poor wrecks of men with whom we have to deal and with whose cases we have dealt in a very inadequate way.

The point which does arise is this: Is the maintenance of a military force an insurance against war? I am inclined to think that the Minister of National Defence and the members of the government generally take that position, but as I look at the Prime Minister, at the Minister of Justice or at the other members of the government whose private opinions I know, I can hardly believe that with their knowledge of world affairs and of world history they should continue to maintain that position. The reason, I suppose, is simply that changes in policy are so hard to make, and since there is a general tradition which has been built up through hundreds of years that the only way we can protect ourselves is by force of arms. It is hard to substitute a new idea. Surely, however, the last war demonstrated the futility of armaments; even our newspapers are beginning to recognize that fact. I read an editorial in the Ottawa Journal, of April 20, 1929, as follows:

> The truth—all that has happened since 1918 bears testimony to it—is that war is a game in which both sides always lose. That being so, the lessons of the last great war having been brought home with such terrible poignancy, it is up to all of us to try to do something to prevent the recurrence of such another catastrophe.

I might also refer to Earl Grey, in whose book, Twenty-five Years, I find the following:

> The military power in Germany chose the time and precipitated the war; but that is not the real and final account of its origins. The enormous growth of armaments, the sense of insecurity and fear caused by them, it was these that made war inevitable.

If I may comment on that statement I would point out that in Europe to-day that sense of insecurity undoubtedly persists, especially in France and some allied countries, and it is responsible for the forces of these countries being maintained on a war footing—a condition which tends to produce more wars. We in this country have an opportunity to get away from some of those old world evils if we only have sufficient courage, imagination and originality to branch out along new lines.

Undoubtedly we are in a different position this year to that which we occupied last year; it will be remembered that a year ago the Prime Minister emphasized the importance of peace and insisted that his was a peace government. The Minister of National Defence urged that he was at the head of a peace department, and to-day he says he was not joking. I do not think he intended that statement as a joke, but I would say that as long as the instruments of war are maintained we are tending to maintain the possibilities of war. That is my opinion at least; others may take a different point of view. The Kellogg peace pact surely places those

who signed it in an altogether different position from that which they occupied a year ago. In the words of an American appeal which went forth a little while ago:

> To increase armaments now is inconsistent with the spirit of the peace pact, an insinuation that we do not trust the nations that have sworn never to attack us.

Surely it is nonsense to prepare for war if we really believe that the nations are going to be true to their pact. Why should we maintain an army when we say that we will not go to war except in self-defence, and when the others affirm the same thing? Surely, if we trust the other nations as we hope they trust us, we ought not to have any army at all. The very maintenance of the Department of National Defence is an insinuation that other people are not going to be as true to their word as we are. The minister shakes his head, but I would like him to take an early opportunity of explaining his position in this regard. I think he will give me credit for having stated my position as I see it, and I think I am stating, as did the hon. member for Southeast Grey, the convictions of a very large number of people throughout Canada. I do not think the situation could have been stated better than it was by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). The hon. member for Southeast Grey has referred already to his speech, but I should like to quote a few sentences. Referring to the peace pact, he said:

> The very essence of this instrument—is that those who sign it. . . . begin at once to destroy by peaceful means those instruments by which peace is rendered impossible. . . . We must, therefore, destroy the instruments that make for war so that when such appeals are made to the emotions there will be no response—no cannon, no navy, no troops. That is the only way by which peace can be made lasting in this world.

I do not know that I would go quite so far as has the hon. leader of the opposition. I am inclined to stress the economic causes of war. I think they are the fundamental causes, and so long as there are economic maladjustments in the world, so long as there is fierce competition between individuals, between groups, between nations and between empires, then so long shall we have war. But undoubtedly another cause which lies side by side with the economic cause is the fact that we are prepared for war, and when there is economic friction the tendency is for us to plunge into war before the people have had time to bring themselves under control.

Mr. BENNETT: There would be no war if there was nothing to go to war with.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Miss MACPHAIL: I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As the hon. leader of the opposition has said, if there were no instruments of war we could not very well conduct a war. On the other hand, as long as we have even ordinary machinery, as long as we have the ordinary chemical establishments, I suppose if it came to a pinch we could transform our ordinary factories into munition plants and convert our ordinary chemical establishments into plants which would be capable of manufacturing chemicals for war purposes. I wish however that we could implement the statements of the hon. leader of the opposition, for I do not believe that we in Canada would be liable to go to war if we had not the instruments by which war is waged.

We have been placed in a position which is different from that in which we were in last year, through our having signed a peace pact with most of the nations of the world. Further, as the hon. member for Southeast Grey has said, another factor must be considered—the probable coming into office in Great Britain of the Labour government. It may be that the Labour government will not have the power which a great many of us would like them to have; it may be that the Liberals will occupy a strategic position, but it is not so long ago that Mr. Lloyd George made the most searching criticism of the present policy, pointing out the futility of war and urging disarmament. There is a larger number of people in Great Britain than many imagine who have signed statements that under no circumstances whatever will they participate in another war, and a very large and influential section of the Labour party in Great Britain has definitely instructed their representatives to refuse to vote war credits.

The position in Great Britain, considered in connection with the general adherence to the Kellogg peace pact, would seem to indicate that it is high time we reconsidered our position and drafted another policy rather than continue this traditional idea of keeping up a department of national defence. Our attitude is something like that taken by the other nations: We want disarmament, but let the other nations do it first. Some of us are inclined to say that Great Britain is too large an empire to risk disarmament; she has too many causes at stake; the empire is too far-flung and there are too many races of an inferior order to permit of this step being taken. On the other hand, we urge that Canada is too small a nation so far as population is concerned to risk disarmament.

Surely Canada is in a peculiarly favourable position; I do not think this can be stressed too strongly. We are side by side with this great nation to the south, a nation which speaks the same language and which has very largely the same British traditions. Her interests are similar to ours at least to a very large extent. Millions of native-born Canadians or their descendants now reside in that country. If the Americans wanted to invade us I fancy that they have a better way of accomplishing that purpose, that is by means of the economic penetration which is going on. If the United States ever conquers Canada it will be in that way rather than by the use of physical force. We need then have no fear of an invading army from the south. Why do we need to maintain ours?

I have asked the minister of this department again and again, year after year, to give the information which is required of any other department—the reason for the expenditure. If large expenditures are to be made in the Department of Railways the minister is required to say that a railway is needed from a certain point to another point. If we are considering expenditures for the Department of Agriculture the minister rises and tells us what situation precisely makes that expenditure necessary. Let the Minister of National Defence tell us whom we are going to fight; against whom we are preparing. Surely, when an expenditure of over $20,000,000 is to be made, we have the right to know who the probable enemy is, especially when we have signed treaties with almost every nation in which we all state that we are not going to go to war. We are signing treaties and at the same time increasing our expenditures for war purposes, is that consistent?

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that we need a police force. In that case, is our present standing army necessary? I do not believe that we will ever need all the soldiers we maintain at the present time in order to quell any little riot which may arise. What about the numerous officers that we have today? I believe one of the great disadvantages in maintaining our standing army is the fact that we have a great many officers running around this country, and because they have no strictly military duty to perform they spend their time at banquets making speeches and attempting to encourage the military spirit. I recall not very long ago the leader of the opposition saying some strong things because the chairman of the Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation made a speech in which, perhaps, he encroached a little on the realm of the politician or, at least, may have been in danger of so doing. I should like to know why it is we permit military officers to go up and down this country advocating certain military programs. Surely they are, or should be, as much under discipline as any civil official; they have no right to discuss policy and to tell us whether we should have a larger equipment or not. I noticed only last week in the Montreal Standard of June 2, 1929, an article by Captain H. C. Howard of the Royal School of Infantry, whoever he may be and whatever that may be. The heading of the article is "Could Canada successfully repel an invader?" He disguises the point of his argument somewhat by suggesting that the United States is a very peaceful neighbour and would never invade us; but he asks: supposing she were different; supposing she wanted to invade us, could we repel her attack? I submit that articles of that kind are most mischievous in character. Why should we now be speculating whether or not we could repel an attack? If it is necessary to do that within the confines of some officers' messroom, why is it necessary to write public articles to the illustrated journals and suggest to the general public that one of these days we may be having trouble with the United States; that we would be in a very fair position to repel them, and that they could not accomplish their purpose?

Mr. RALSTON: Was the name Howard?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Captain H. C. Howard, Royal School of Infantry.

Mr. RALSTON: He is not a Canadian officer. We have no Royal School of Infantry.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am very glad of that. That is how the article is signed and it is evidently written from a Canadian standpoint. Obviously the only point of the article would be the case of a possible invasion from the United States.

Mr. GEARY: Was it not the hon. gentleman who, a short time ago, gave the house in detail particulars of how easily the United States could invade Canada?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, and my reason for doing so was this: I am not a military man and further my contention was that in such a contingency all our armaments would be perfectly useless and that the only thing for us to do was to act decently so that we might have no such trouble. The military article to which I refer suggests that we have it quite within our power to repel such an

invasion, and the inference is that if the people of the United States should undertake to invade Canada, we should stiffen our backs and would be able to stand them off.

Mr. GEARY: Is it not the other way round?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so. But the other way around makes it quite a different proposal. I have been told by those closely in touch with military affairs that our militia with the very short training which they have, is of very little value in case of emergency. I am not prepared to corroborate or to question that statement, but I remember a long debate we had on that subject five or six years ago and I know many people are of the opinion that the greatest purpose that is served by our maintaining a militia is that of keeping alive the military spirit in the minds of the young people who go out to the camps.

As regards the navy, I ask again: Is this expenditure justified? We are told that these new ships that are being built are going to be patrol boats. I am not at all sure whether they are fitted for that purpose. We have not had any clear evidence of that. In the past our ships have been used, more or less as training ships and to no small extent for social functions. I sometimes feel thankful that we have not a waterfront all around Canada or else we would become very quickly militarized by the social functions connected with the visits of these naval crews to the different ports.

With regard to the air force, again I should like to ask a question and I hope the minister will attempt to answer it: Why should our civil aviation department be kept under the Department of National Defence? This is an article which I read in the Ottawa Citizen of March 16 of this year:

> The numerical strength of Canada's fighting aircraft will be raised to nine pursuit planes and six army cooperation machines through delivery of five Siskin and two Atlas all-metal aircraft. . . . The institution of a peace time air force using highly specialized military machines took place last year when four Siskins and four Atlases were purchased by the Department of National Defence. . . . The machines are used in training permanent force officers on war type craft, teaching them aerobatics, bombing, gunnery and the other maneouvres which got to make first-class fighting pilots who can be called upon to act as instructors at a moment's notice should an emergency arise.

My colleague from Calgary asked the minister whether the civil pilots were entirely free from possible military control. The answer of the minister may be technically correct, but I venture to say that if any war broke out, it would not take very long to transform at least a portion of our civil air force into a military force.

Mr. RALSTON: I know my hon. friend wants to deal with this matter fairly. Does he think it would take any longer if the civil air force of Canada were under the department of transportation, the Department of the Interior or the Post Office department? That is the whole point made at the disarmament conference, that if a country has a civil air force, it does not make any difference what department it is under, it is in a better position should war break out than a nation that is not equipped with that craft.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That only confirms my position.

Mr. RALSTON: It does not confirm the position with regard to its being under one department rather than under another.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think it does. My idea is that there is always present in the minds of those who are directing this force the view that one of these days the force may have to be transformed. My point just now was that the very character and build of the aircraft were such that they could be readily converted. The whole idea of possible war is kept to the forefront.

Mr. RALSTON: That is not so. The build of the civilian aircraft is exactly what is required for civilian work. There is no special adaptability, nor are any fittings of any kind put on that aircraft other than what are usually used for that purpose.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This is quite contrary, then, to the statement which went out at the time of the purchase of these new air craft. This is the statement as I read it just now:

> The institution of a peace-time air force using highly specialized military machines took place last year when four Siskins and four Atlases were purchased by the Department of National Defence.

Surely that is an indication that this is the very definite policy of the department.

Mr. RALSTON: It is not an indication that civilian aircraft are being used for war purposes.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: These are not civilian?

Mr. RALSTON: I am not saying that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But I said: further than that, the very fact that they are under the control of the department tends to keep them all in such a condition that they can be readily converted.

Mr. RALSTON: That was the point with which I was dealing.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Let me quote this from The Times' correspondent in Brussels:

The committee of experts in civil aviation appointed by the league preparatory commission for the disarmament conference adopted the following resolutions:

It is desirable that the development of civil aviation should be directed solely towards economic ends and should be independent of military interests. Civil aviation should be organized on autonomous lines and every effort should be made to keep it separate from military aviation. If states interevene in any capacity whether directly or indirectly, in civil aviation undertakings, private or state-owned, it is desirable that the state departments dealing with the matter should be independent of the departments dealing with military aviation.

I would call that clause to the attention of the minister. Here we have the preparatory commission on disarmament definitely stating that the policy should be different from the policy that is now being pursued by this government. Let me read that again:

It is desirable that the state departments dealing with the matter should be independent of the departments dealing with military aviation.

The memorandum goes on:

It is desirable that governments should refrain from prescribing the use of military features in civil aircraft material, so that this material may be constructed for providing the greatest possible measure of security and most economic return. In this connection and with a view to differentiating still further between material of civil and that of military aviation, it is considered particularly desirable that as far as possible the use of military aviation material in civil aviation undertakings and in the operations of air transport lines should be avoided.

I suggest that that is a very different policy from that which is being pursued by this government. The Ottawa Citizen, commenting on the present situation, in its issue of February 19, 1927, says:

There is no particularly sound reason for employing the military air forces to observe the movement of mackerel off the Nova Scotia coast, or for attacking an insect pest in western Canada. It is more or less by accident that such work has been allowed to pass under military control.

Quoting from another editorial in the same paper under date of March 30, 1927:

It is important, however, to have the Canadian air policy straightened out, to put the development of civil aviation first, under civil control; otherwise progress is liable to be retarded. Nobody would think of advocating that automobiles should be controlled in Canada primarily for military purposes, although some cars may quite legitimately be designed and employed for training soldiers. When agreements have to be made between provinces concerning reciprocity in automobile licenses, or between Canada and the United States concerning tourist travel across the international boundary line, no one would approve of calling in the military staff organization to conduct negotiations. So long as Canadian aviation is left under military control, however, that is exactly what has to be done.

I pass to one other matter, and that is to the cadet services. A number of us have been urging that cadet training is not necessary here in Canada especially under the conditions that now prevail, and further that cadet training is not in the best interests of education itself. We are witnessing at the present time a curious situation under which officials of this government, military officials, are scattering themselves throughout the country and trying to force their military ideas, their unwelcome ideas, upon an unwilling people. For example, one paper in my own city had this to say recently with regard to an outlying suburb, St. James:

St. James school board is to be heartily congratulated on having rejected the blandishments of Colonel Gillespie, representative of the Strathcona Trust when he came to them last week bearing gifts.

Colonel Gillespie wanted the St. James board to introduce cadet training in its schools. The trust, he said, would pay the board $2 per annum per pupil.

Suspecting that the pill would not prove any too palatable, the Winnipeg school board having refused the advances of the Strathcona trust, the colonel proceeded to coat it. The board could, he said, also have folk dances for the girls. But when asked whether the board could have the folk dances without the cadet training he said he did not think so.

Is not this a most peculiar situation, an undignified position for the department to send its officials out trying to coax the various school boards to take up cadet training, and if possible to sugarcoat the pill by suggesting that certain little privileges would be granted to the girls in the school. I quote again:

Unanimously the St. James school board turned down the proposal to allow this wedge of militarism to enter their schools.

Mr. RALSTON: What paper is my hon. friend quoting from?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: From a Winnipeg paper, the Weekly News of the date of Feb-

ruary 8, 1929. The Weekly News is, I am proud to say, a Labour paper. The article goes on:

> Five of the St. James school principals were present at the meeting and every one of them advised against the training...
> With telling effect councillor Hooper quoted no less an authority than Sir Robert Baden Powell against military training for boys.

I cannot do better than quote Baden Powell's statement:

> I find that it has been largely but quite erroneously believed that the boy scout movement is a military one, or at least has militarist tendencies. The mistake is natural, since its figure head holds the rank of general. But it is those who have personally seen something of war who most desire to avert its recurrence on the future generation; it is those who have seen the good and the bad of military training and discipline who can best realize its advantages or disadvantages for educative purposes. Under both these heads I am against using military training for boys. . . .

So much for Baden Powell. Before I close what I have to say on this question of cadet training I should like to quote what may be considered a fair statement of the labour position. Speaking before the Dominion government, when he presented the legislative program of organized labour this year, Mr. Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, said on the subject of cadet training:

> This matter was again under discussion at our last convention, when it was resolved to request that legislation be enacted to provide for the abolition of all money grants for cadet training and other military activites in schools, and that grants be given for the purpose of physical training instead.
> We desire to emphasize our beliefs that it is in the best interests of the youth that every encouragement should be given to the development of their physical condition instead of instilling into their minds militaristic ideas by the continuance of the cadet system.
> It is our sincere belief that if grants are to be made by the federal government to educational authorities, such grants should be for technical education or purely physical development and not for military training.

What could we do at the present time? We are proposing to spend some $20,000,000 for so-called national defence. There was a resolution on the order paper in the name of my hon. friend from Southeast Grey which I hoped would be discussed, but unfortunately it was not reached. It was the suggestion that for every $100 spent on war preparation, we should spend $1 in encouraging peace. If we spend $20,000,000 on war preparation that would mean that we would spend $200,000 on peace propaganda. Is it too much to ask to spend only $1 on peace for every $100 that is spent on war preparation? Some of us figured out the other day what that $200,000 would provide. It would provide a chair for the study of international relationships in every university in Canada. Does that not appeal to the Prime Minister—a chair in international relationships in every university in Canada? Further, it would provide three or four scholarships in every Canadian university for students from other countries who would care to come here and study our Canadian and British institutions. Could we imagine anything that would advertise Canada more widely throughout the world than having a number of foreign students coming to our various universities, spending two or three years here, and then scattering back to their home countries carrying the good wishes of Canada and some knowledge of things Canadian? On the other hand, that same amount would provide for the sending of three or four students from each university in Canada into different foreign countries to study foreign affairs. To-day we are requiring a certain number of men trained in foreign affairs to be ambassadors, to be trade representatives, and so on. In the future where are these men to come from? I would hope that they would be men of wide experience, men of special training. I would hope that such positions would be open to all. How are those men to be trained? I can conceive of no better way than sending some of our brighter men abroad—

Miss MACPHAIL: And women.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I beg the pardon of our one woman member. I can conceive of no better way than sending some of our brightest men and women abroad to study various languages, various cultures, and international affairs, as seen from other angles than our own, and then have them come back to this country. Such students would wonderfully enrich our life, and from them we would be able to pick certain men and women who, as the representatives of this country, would fill official posts abroad in the days to come.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have long recognized the principle that if we are to have war we must make preparation for war. We have not yet come to recognize the principle that if we are to have peace we must make some special preparation for peace, and must be willing to spend something on inculcating peace and training people for a peace program. I say that that $200,000—anyone can figure it out for himself—would be a sort of glorified international Rhodes scholarship fund, and I can conceive of nothing of which I would be prouder, and that I think would produce a greater moral effect in the world,

than that Canada should take the lead in some such scheme. It would put Canada in the very forefront of the nations. To-day the trouble is that we are feebly copying Europe and the outgrown policies of Europe instead of striking out along our own lines in this new world. We are at a period of great industrial expansion. We all recognize that. The victories of the future will be won not by force of arms, but in the economic and social realms. To-day we are carrying forward the old world traditions, spending our millions on outgrown policies, on policies that can only be inimical to the future welfare of the world. In this young country, so full of the sense of the security, we have the opportunity of adopting some of these new policies which I have had time only to indicate.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Chairman, I think I ought to deal with what my hon. friends from Southeast Grey and Winnipeg North Centre have spoken of. I am familiar with their views, and they are familiar with mine, but at the same time I feel it is only due to them and to the public of Canada that I should deal with those matters which they have so ably put before the house.

Let me first remove one or two misapprehensions. They have consistently said that we are voting $20,000,000. We are dealing now with the whole vote. Let me point out that that is not quite accurate. It is true that practically $20,000,000 is being voted altogether for the department over which I preside, but the actual vote for militia services, with which I think they have both largely dealt—I will turn to the air services in a moment—is $11,065,000. Right here may I point out that the comparison between that sum and the vote away back before the war is significant. I made the comparison last year and I think it well that the committee should bear it in mind. In 1913-14 we voted for the militia services, not $11,065,000, but $11,273,540. In other words, to-day we are voting substantially less money, nearly a quarter of a million dollars, notwithstanding the fact that a dollar to-day will not purchase anything near what it would purchase in 1913-14.

We are voting $3,600,000, for the naval services. I have explained to the committee how that arises. Last year there was $900,000 that we did not spend; it is included in the present vote. I do not think it should be regarded as a charge this year.

The next item is $1,697,000 for the Royal Canadian Air Force. That is exactly the same as the vote last year. I might as well repeat it now, that the vote for the Royal Canadian Air Force is essential for the benefit of civil government operations and civil aviation in this country. I know my hon. friends will be glad to hear that the Siskins army pursuit planes which we bought last year are the only exclusively military equipment we have, and that we are not buying any more this year. We are buying Moths and planes of that kind for the purpose of civil operations and to teach men in such operations.

As I said to the committee at the outset, we figured that we should turn our attention for the present entirely to civil government operations and civil aviation. We feel there is need for it in this country. Let me deal with what my hon. friends from Southeast Grey and Winnipeg North Centre have said with regard to these services being under the Department of National Defence. We have a military air force; that is to say, it is part of any department of defence. The air force years ago was put under the Department of National Defence. To-day we have many items in the Royal Canadian Air Force which, as I said a moment ago, are purely for the purposes of civil aviation and civil government operations. I do not complain of anybody who wants to argue that the present administration of the department is not satisfactory so far as civil aviation is concerned. That is a matter of opinion. But if we placed civil aviation under another department we would be doubling our overhead. Then the Department of the Interior would want an air force, as would also the Post Office Department and the Department of Railways, each with its own organization, and we would be trebling or quadrupling the overhead in that connection, and would not have uniformity of training. Another drawback would be this, and I cannot stress it too strongly. I had it in mind when I spoke a moment or two ago in regard to the necessity of ground organization. There is no other activity in which you need more, not the sort of discipline known as parade discipline, saluting and things of that sort, but the sort of discipline which will make men follow a certain line of routine day after day and month after month, in order that they may recognize, for instance the necessity of inspecting a certain part of the machine every morning, whether they think it necessary or not. That condition is more easily attained when you have the men doing those things because they are so ordered rather than leaving it to them to decide whether they will do it or not. For instance, they might get the view that "We do not have to inspect the machine this

morning, we inspected it yesterday." When I spoke of flying clubs a little while ago it was with that idea in the back of my mind, to see that civilian clubs automatically carried out these regulations. To me it seems to be necessary for the sound foundation of civil aviation in this country to develop that care and caution and ceaseless attention to these matters of detail, which, if not necessary, it is at least desirable that they should be taught by the influence of discipline and routine.

Miss MACPHAIL: Our railway engineers and other railway men who are charged with great responsibilities are not under military discipline, and yet they always have their engines in order and are always ready promptly to respond to the call of duty.

Mr. RALSTON: That is quite so. But I stated that in my opinion there is no activity where the simple failure to carry out a particular order will lead to such disastrous results as the activity of aviation. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Why should we not conform to the recommendations of the disarmament preparatory commission?

Mr. RALSTON: I heard my hon. friend quote the recommendations of the disarmament preparatory commission, but I think that commission is a long way from having come to any definite conclusion. That commission has been engaged since 1925 in working out schemes for disarmament but up to the moment they have not arrived at any conclusions, and they adjourned a short time ago with, I am sorry to say, not too bright prospects of a hopeful outcome of their deliberations for the conference of 1931. I am putting up these considerations against the considerations which my hon. friend has mentioned. Let me deal now with the point he made in regard to civilian aviation, and the statement that such aviation is in itself an incentive to war. He suggested that civilian planes and personnel could be easily adapted to the purposes of war. Now as I mentioned the other day, that is the greatest difficulty which the preparatory commission is finding. This difficulty was expressed by the Spanish represntative before the commission, better, perhaps, than by anyone else. It is found that the nation which has the biggest industrial organization; the nation which has the biggest transport organization, purely civilian; the nation which has the biggest aircraft organization; the nation which has the biggest and most efficient chemical organization and the best systems of railways and docks and communications; the best system of scientific research; the best agricultural resources—the nation which is best equipped in all these departments of civil life is the nation which can best afford to disarm, for the simple reason that it can arm sooner than any other, using these very resources for military purposes. We cannot ignore the possibility of these resources being used for the purposes of war. But that, as I was trying to point out to my hon. friend, is far from suggesting that we are adopting these things, or utilising them, or developing our resources chemically, or industrially or agriculturally, or maintaining our railways for the purpose of war. We are not doing anything of the sort. It is apparent, however, that the nation which is best equipped in all these directions can automatically arm itself soonest for war. And so the representative from Spain—he was dealing with the Russian proposals—expressed the view that general disarmament would result in this, that the nation with the greatest industrial resources would find itself just that much further ahead of the small nation which was not so equipped; because every nation at the present time has at least a small defence force, and if each nation abandoned its armaments, and later an emergency arose, the nation with the small force would be much slower in bringing its force back to the status which it held before disarmament.

Miss MACPHAIL: It is all relative anyway.

Mr. HEAPS: Is it not true that the small nations wanted disarmament? What bearing, then, has my hon. friend's statement on such nations?

Mr. RALSTON: I am afraid the question is based on a false hypothesis. That statement is not correct.

Mr. HEAPS: My understanding is that the small nations were disappointed in the attitude of the larger countries.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think my hon. friend's hypothesis is correct. Now let me come to another point. Hon. members are right in stating that our geographical position is advantageous. But when they are discussing disarmament, I really do not think they give us credit for the position in which we find ourselves. No nation could be more disarmed than Canada; we have only to compare this country with others in the matter of expenditure. Canada spends $1.59 per head on national defence; the next country is Germany, with $2.60; next comes Russia, with $3; next, New Zealand, with $3.10; next, South Africa, with $3.19; then even Denmark

with $3.50, and Norway, $3.84. In other words, we spend much less per capita on national defence than any other country in the world.

Another point made by my hon. friend from Southeast Grey is our geographical position. We are fortunate in this, that we have on either side of us a wide ocean so that we have ample warning of any possible aggression. We are in a position where we may prepare for such aggression.

Answering the comment in regard to the size of the force which we maintain, let me remind the committee that the permanent force consists of one man for every three thousand individuals in Canada—not a very large force; it is not even a decent police force. I wish to say here that I do not, nor does the defence department, regard it as a defence force or a standing army in any sense of the word; it is simply an instructional cadre. Our real defence consists in the non-permanent active militia, which is far from approaching the maximum numerical strength we might maintain on a three year basis, namely, some 240,000 men. Let me give the figures with regard to the militia. In 1914 we had 55,282 men as against 240,000, which would be our possible force, and in 1928, 51,575, or a reduction of nearly 4,000. Take the numbers training. In 1913-14 we gave twelve days' training to 58,563, and in 1928 —disarmament has progressed at least to this extent—we provided twelve days' training for 33,581. In view of these figures, our friends ought to give us credit, in the matter of military expenditures, at least for limiting our activities to a very modest extent, the extent which we are advised is necessary as a minimum.

This brings me to the question asked by my hon. friend: against whom are we preparing? Let me set his mind at rest with regard to the United States. I do not think I can do better than read a statement which was made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) not long ago. Speaking at the Assembly of the League of Nations on September 7, 1928, the Prime Minister said:

> The Canadian Minister of Finance, in presenting the budget, does not so much as suggest the expenditure of a single dollar through fear of American aggression. Public moneys are saved and utilised for the purposes of productive industry.

So that my hon. friends may set their minds at rest on that score.

Miss MACPHAIL: I had no fear at all in regard to the United States: I was merely trying to reassure the rest of you.

Mr. RALSTON: I am endeavouring to answer the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Do I understand that the standing force exists for the purpose of keeping down any section of our own people who might give trouble?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend misunderstands me.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then it exists in case of aggression?

Mr. RALSTON: I said there was no fear of aggression from the United States. I am very glad I can assure the committee that I am unable to say against whom we are preparing, and I hope I shall never be able to tell. You might as well ask me to state what burglar will break into my house at night and why there is a policeman on the beat near the flat where I happen to live. It is regarded as part of the national equipment to have a defence force, and our defence force is down to the very minimum—less than a quarter of what it might be. We are maintaining a force which amounts to but one out of every three thousand of the population, and we are training 33,000 men in the camps. I do not think we could carry disarmament much further, and we are advised that, because of the wide oceans that separate us from other countries, we can reasonably prepare for self defence if that should ever become necessary.

Let me point out to my hon. friend with regard to the covenant of the League of Nations and the Kellogg peace pact, that both these documents expressly provide for self-defence. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said it was a sort of insinuation against the good faith of other countries to provide a defence force and at the same time sign these documents, but I would point out that the covenant of the League of Nations provides in the first paragraph against resort to war, yet in article 8 it is provided that the members of the league recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety, and so on.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But the situation is different when we all signed.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think there have been any additional signatures.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The United States was brought in by the Kellogg peace pact.

Mr. RALSTON: We are not worrying about the United States, but some other nations are not bound by the terms of these documents. In connection with the Kellogg peace pact let me point out further that while it denounces war as an instrument

of national policy, at the same time Mr. Kellogg made an express declaration with regard to self-defence, as follows:

> There is nothing in the American draft of an anti-war treaty which restricts or impairs in any way the right of self-defence. That right is inherent in every sovereign state and is implicit in every treaty. Every nation is free at all times and regardless of treaty provisions to defend its territory from attack or invasion and it alone is competent to decide whether circumstances require recourse to war in self-defence.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will we not have to abandon the idea of a sovereign state?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not understand my hon. friend's question; I am dealing with the point of whether or not a country which provides for self-defence is acting at all contrary to the treaties which have been signed, and I have endeavoured to point out that the convenant of the League of Nations expressly provides for self-defence and that Mr. Kellogg, one of the moving parties in connection with the Briand-Kellogg pact, laid down as a principle that self-defence was always excepted. The question is whether or not we are providing too much in that respect; I have submitted some figures to the house and I think they indicate only a very modest preparation.

I would like to give a few more figures. With regard to the training allotment, for this purpose we spent $1,930,000 in 1913, while in 1928 we spent $1,639,000; in 1922 we had 4,099 men of all ranks in the permanent force, but to-day we have only 3,264, a decrease of over 800; in 1922 the permanent force vote was $6,255,000, while to-day there is only $4,950,000. In discussing this question, which was done by both my hon. friends very fairly and logically, I think they both admitted that there was some necessity for a police force, and my hon. friend from Southeast Grey mentioned that she had no particular objection to retaining the permanent force. Allow me to point out that the permanent force accounts for nearly half this vote of $11,000,000, so at least I feel that I have some support from my hon. friends for these estimates.

Mr. CLARK: How many civilians are employed and paid out of the permanent force vote?

Mr. RALSTON: None; they come under the civil government vote.

Miss MACPHAIL: Then I would ask the minister if he would be willing to cut his estimate in half; if so, I will support him.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. RALSTON: That is a very sporting offer, but I cannot accept it. I was endeavouring to point out that the permanent force is only an instructional cadre for the purpose of training the non-permanent active militia.

Mr. CLARK: Did I understand the minister to say that the salaries of civilian employees do not come out of this vote?

Mr. RALSTON: There is quite a large amount in the civil government vote for the pay of civilians, but the actual permanent force vote covers no civilian salaries. I am instructed that 1,671 civilians are employed.

Mr. CLARK: Can the minister state how much they are paid in a year?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot say exactly, but it might be estimated at $1,500 a year, which is perhaps a low average. That would give a total of about $2,500,000.

Mr. BOYS: I would like to ask the minister if any portion of this item or the items contained in the supplementary estimates, where there is an additional amount of $250,000 for the Royal Canadian Air Force and $315,000 for civil air operations, provides for the removal of Camp Borden. The minister will recall that early in January a rather large deputation, representing all parts of the county of Simcoe and including various county officials, waited upon him and discussed this matter and from time to time there have been references in the press to the possible moving of Camp Borden. When the delegation waited upon the minister the question was fully discussed and many reasons were advanced why no such steps should be taken, and I should like to know now whether any estimate, either main or supplementary, is for that purpose. If there is no such estimate I would like to know if the government has reached any decision with regard to this matter.

Mr. RALSTON: I can say to my hon. friend that the item of $250,000 in the supplementary estimates is for the preliminary work in connection with the establishment of an air base at Trenton, Ontario. The plan is to maintain and utilize Camp Borden at least for some time to come; according to the information I have that period will amount to two or three years at least, and on that account we are making certain permanent improvements at Camp Borden. It will be necessary to use both stations at least for a

time; this $250,000 will purchase the land and provide for the preliminary work in connection with the provision of certain accommodation for the air force at Trenton.

Mr. BOYS: Then I am to understand that the department has reached a definite decision ultimately to abandon Camp Borden and move the equipment to Trenton?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think I can answer that leading question in that way; I can only say that for the present at least both bases will be used, and whether or not Camp Borden will continue to be used will depend upon the needs of the service. I am instructed that for summer training Camp Borden is at least very desirable and that a great deal of use can be made of it, but I cannot say whether or not it will be abandoned ultimately.

Mr. BOYS: The minister does not suggest that there is need for two camps in Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: I am instructed that eventually this might be possible in the summer.

Mr. BOYS: There might be a necessity for a base for hydroplanes which would have to be located near the water.

Mr. RALSTON: My information has come from the officers of the department.

Mr. BOYS: If there is any thought of the abandonment of the extensive plant at Camp Borden, I would like to know the reason why. The minister intimates that it may be used, but I gathered from what the minister told the deputation that if Trenton is being selected it is with the intention of the abandonment of Camp Borden. If that is to be the case the house is entitled to know of the tremendous financial sacrifice which would have to be made in that connection. It would not be a matter of hundreds of thousands of dollars, it would run into the milions; I think I am quite safe in saying that it would involve a sacrifice of at least $2,500,000 to $3,000,000. If that is the intention I do not want to allow this opportunity to pass without putting upon Hansard some of the figures which the deputation gave to the minister. I suppose the minister has told me all that he feels free to admit, but I can only say that the conclusion I am forced to is that Camp Borden is to be abandoned.

Mr. RALSTON: The officers of the department advise that for the next two or three years at least Camp Borden will be needed, and it is possible that that camp may be needed later, in connection with summer training. As my hon. friend knows, the necessity for a combined sea and land training base makes it very desirable that Trenton should be used. That decision was arrived at after an investigation lasting nearly two years during which over twenty-five different locations were considered by the officers of the department. If my hon. friend desires it, I shall be glad to discuss the financial items with him, but I would say that I have been advised by the officers of the department that it would cost just as much to make Camp Borden a proper base for aviation as it will cost to put Trenton into shape, and we would have the added advantage of a combined base. My hon. friend says that he has figures which show a loss of some millions of dollars, but I do not think that those figures are quite correct. I listened to the discussion which took place when this delegation was here, and I went over the matter very thoroughly with my officers. We came to the conclusion that the expenditures which would be involved in fitting up the base at Trenton would amount to about the same, and I think a little less, than would be required to provide permanent quarters at Camp Borden. We will have the added advantage of the combined base at Trenton and would be overcoming some of the natural difficulties which exist at Camp Borden.

Mr. BOYS: What part of the estimates have to do with the establishment of the base at Trenton?

Mr. RALSTON: None of the main estimates, but the item of $250,000 in the supplementary estimates is to be used for that purpose.

Mr. KAISER: Would the minister give us some of the points which were considered in selecting Trenton as against other points, say Oshawa or Whitby?

Mr. RALSTON: As between Trenton and Camp Borden?

Sir EUGENE FISET: Oshawa.

Mr. KAISER: No, Whitby; why select Trenton instead of Whitby?

Mr. RALSTON: I will look up the reports. I would suggest that this matter can be fully discussed when we come to the supplementary estimates.

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, if there is one respect more than another in which value results from the vote for national defence, I would say it is from the vote of $2,315,000

for the non-permanent active militia. But in this connection, the minister has stated that the civilians employed in the department were paid $2,500,000, or approximately $200,000 in excess of the total amount appropriated for the non-permanent active militia. It was that militia which made it possible for Canada to recruit 500,000 men during the great war and to send the Canadian corps to France, yet we find that there are civilians employed in the department who cost the country more than is spent upon the non-permanent active militia from one coast to the other. It seems to me that this is a matter which calls for a very careful investigation and some readjustments, because every one who served with the Canadian corps realizes that clerical help, such as is being employed in this department at an average of $1,500 per head, could be secured from the permanent force at salaries of approximately one-third of the amount now being paid. In my opinion, anyone who secures a position in the department should be sworn in as a member of the permanent forces of Canada and should be paid according to the rank held.

An hon. MEMBER: How about the girls?

Mr. CLARK: The minister knows of his own personal knowledge that there never was a more efficient body of clerks than those which we had and trained overseas, and the same class of men could be found to-day in the permanent force. It is a shocking thing that the civilians in the department should be paid $200,000 more than is spent upon the whole non-permanent active militia. The officers, men and certain civilians are spending more money on the militia than is the country, and yet we must tell these people who are supporting the militia that while there is no money for them there is plenty of money to employ civilians within the department. Personally, I am very much opposed to this practice and I think an investigation should be carried on to see that everyone employed is sworn in as a member of the forces and not retained as a civilian.

Mr. RALSTON: The figures I gave to my hon. friend were a pure guess, and my attention has just been called to the fact that the figure of 1,671 included permanent and seasonal employees. For instance we have 429 men who receive $377,900 altogether or something less than $1,000 each.

Mr. BENNETT: Those are all civilians?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. Again one would only have to guess, but the amount is, I think, very much less than that which my hon. friend assumes from the figure.

[Mr. Clark.]

Mr. CLARK: I am not assuming. My hon. friend told me it was $2,500,000.

Mr. RALSTON: Well, I will accept the responsibility for assuming that. I said $1,500, just averaging the salaries. I thought they were all full-time employees. The only way to deal with the matter would be to make up an exact statement. If my hon. friend wants another estimate I might suggest $1,000 as liberal which would mean $1,671,000. I agree absolutely with my hon. friend as to the contribution which is made by the non-commissioned officers and men to the non-permanent active militia. Two years ago I gave figures showing that in nearly 50 per cent of the units either the whole or a portion of the pay is pooled by officers or men or both, this showing a pretty generous contribution to the non-permanent active militia, but my hon. friend will admit that all these other votes for contingencies, engineer services and works, general stores, manufacturing establishments, topographic survey and transport and freight are partly non-permanent active militia and partly permanent force, and very much more for the former than for the latter. So in estimating the amount expended on the non-permanent active militia, one would have to consider the payments under these items as well as the actual non-permanent active militia vote, which really represents only pay and allowances together with expenses in connection with training.

Mr. CLARK: The minister's correction does not alter the principle. The principle of employing civilians in this department is, in my opinion, wrong and ought to be corrected. The country could be saved several hundreds of thousands of dollars if these men were enlisted and given the pay of the ranks they hold. The minister shakes his head. I have heard over a period of years, on I think excellent authority, that the department could be reorganized and that civilians could be eliminated. I believe this, because it agrees with my personal experience. We did not need any civilians overseas in clerical positions and the minister knows that as well as anybody else. The same thing can be done in this case.

Item agreed to.

Cadet services, $500,000.

Mr. SPENCER: How many cadets are there in Canada to-day?

Mr. RALSTON: 133,403.

Mr. SPENCER: Is there any increase over last year?

Mr. RALSTON: There is an increase of 10,000 over last year.

Mr. SPENCER: What provinces does that increase come from?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry I cannot give the increase by provinces.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the number by provinces?

Mr. RALSTON: It is as follows:

Nova Scotia	3,548
Prince Edward Island	810
New Brunswick	2,900
Quebec	66,045
Ontario	39,990
Manitoba	3,725
Saskatchewan	4,500
Alberta	5,974
British Columbia	5,911

Mr. EVANS: I look upon this appropriation for the cadets as probably the worst item in the militia estimates. This is in my estimation just so much money used to brutalize the feelings of too many of our young people.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. EVANS: Hon. gentlemen may laugh at that, but that is almost a necessity of war and preparedness for war. If we are going to attain the end of peace for which so many efforts are being made throughout the world at this time, we must create an attitude for peace. Instead of that, we are inculcating in our young people the idea that war is the most glorious thing on earth. This is not as it should be. While I am not going to make a speech, I want to emphasize the fact that we are travelling along the wrong road and every dollar that we are spending under this item is making it harder for us to retrace our steps. This is a useless expenditure. While I do not expect the minister to cut it out, he should answer the question why he considers it necessary, and why, year after year, we are spending this money to train these young people in the way we do.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister state to the committee why he thinks the cadet service is necessary?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friends base their argument upon a wrong assumption. I have endeavoured to point out previously that the item covers very largely physical training and not military service or the brutalizing process to which the hon. member for Rosetown has referred. Probably $300,000 of this appropriation goes for actual physical training. The only cadet service and the only cadet corps which are established are those which are expressly authorized by the school districts or the school authorities themselves.

Miss MACPHAIL: On the instigation of the department.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has said that before. I have told my hon. friend from Calgary and I say to the hon. member for Southeast Grey very sincerely: if they can show any case in which there has been instigation on the part of officers, I will deal with it promptly. The whole principle of this is that it is optional with the school authorities. There are about 7,000 teachers who are instructed this year in physical training, who are not cadet instructors, but who are giving their classes the benefit of physical training and whose instruction is being paid for out of this appropriation.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will the minister look into the matter of which I spoke?

Mr. RALSTON: I will. I think Colonel Gillespie was the name he mentioned.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the minister taken into consideration the question of taking away the military part of the service and viewing it from the purely physical standpoint?

Mr. RALSTON: Not if the school authorities desire cadet training. It is all left to the school and provincial authorities.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

RUTH LEONARD WISER

The house in committee on Bill No. 306, for the relief of Ruth Leonard Wiser—Mr. Rowe—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask if there are any children involved?

Mr. CASSELMAN: There is one child, which is being amply provided for by its mother, who is in a position to look after it.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, on division, read the third time and passed.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 316, for the relief of Catherine McRae Beattie McRae—Mr. Casselman.

WILLIAM JOHN BLIGHT

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni) moved the second reading of Bill No. 336, for the relief of William John Blight.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have read the evidence in this case, which seems to me to be one that is somewhat extraordinary in character. It involves, I think, an altogether new principle. The evidence in this case just happened to come to me in a separate envelope, and I suppose that led to my reading it. I have no doubt that there are many other bills that could bear equally careful scrutiny. So far as I can read the evidence in this case, there is nothing in it whatever to prove the charges alleged. It may be that I have not the legal mind, and that my conclusions are not warranted, which just illustrates, if that be the case, that matters of this kind ought to come before a judge rather than before those who are not so well qualified to deal with evidence, but in so far as I have had any experience at all in judging evidence, I think that the findings of the senate committee should not go unchallenged.

We were told the other day when we discussed a divorce bill in the committee stage that we ought to have discussed it earlier and not to have allowed it to pass through the private bills committee and come back to this house before challenging it. I am therefore challenging this bill at this stage.

This is not one of the worst cases that we have. Some of the cases that come before us are absolutely unfit to be discussed in public. I should like to be able to discuss the evidence in this case, but I notice strangers in the gallery. I think on general principles it has been conceded that it is not well that the details in such cases be known to the general public. In our divorce courts generally there is a good deal of reticence about giving details to the public, and I do not want to be in the position of having to discuss details that may not be appreciated at all by those who happen to be in the galleries. On the other hand, the presence of people in the galleries would make it more difficult for those in the house frankly to discuss a matter of this kind. So, Mr. Speaker, before going on to the details of the case, I would suggest that you consider the advisability of asking strangers to retire from the gallery so that we may have absolute freedom of discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the old days of parliamentary practice and custom, in the event of a member noticing the presence of strangers the speaker would order the galleries to be cleared That custom was followed for many years in the British house, and then under Mr. Disraeli—later Lord Beaconsfield—a rule was framed and embalmed in the procedure. This rule is practically copied in our own standing order No. 13, which reads as follows:

> If any member takes notice that strangers are present, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman (as the case may be), shall forthwith put the question, that strangers be ordered to withdraw, without permitting any debate or amendment: Provided that Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman, may, whenever he thinks proper, order the withdrawal of strangers.

It follows that no member by himself can order the clearance of the galleries; but the Speaker is obliged to put the question which I would put: It is moved by Mr. Woodsworth, seconded by Mr. Evans, that strangers in the galleries do withdraw forthwith.

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion will kindly say "aye."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those opposed will kindly say "nay."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my humble opinion the "nays" have it. Therefore I declare the motion lost.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to give some of the details in this case, and I shall do so with the least offence possible. I am very glad indeed that this case does not involve what I might term the obscene details that frequently appear in the evidence as presented to the Senate divorce committee. Perhaps it is just as well that the house has decided on this course, for in any case we must bear in mind that now we have with us one woman member, who perhaps has not only a perfect right but a duty to consider matters of this kind; and also we have our Hansard, which in any case gives a report of what takes place in this chamber.

First of all, let me say that, as in most bills of this character, we find a statement of this kind:

Whereas the said marriage and adultery have been proved by the evidence adduced.

I take the ground that the "evidence adduced" is not sufficient to prove the charge of adultery. In this case there are six children. The petitioner was asked whether he had in any way connived at or condoned adultery, and whether there was any collusion.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? He has indicated that this is a case which is not fit to be publicly discussed. We have a parliamentary committee—the private bills committee—which is charged with the responsibility of reviewing the evidence that he is now going to review on the second reading of this bill. Would he not so far consider both public feeling and, as he has often described it, the decencies of the house by permitting the bill to go to the private bills committee, where he or anyone else may be heard, and this case, unfortunate and salacious in some respects as it may be, may there be discussed in much less public manner than in this house. I think I am expressing the wishes of a great many members when I make this appeal to him as a matter of fairness from one member to another.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the way in which the appeal is made, and perhaps that may lead me to leave out a great many of the details. However, I have given the house the opportunity of clearing the galleries. The house has refused to do so, and must take the responsibility for that action. Further than that, as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Boys) will recall, when the other day we let one of these bills go back to the private bills committee we were censured in this house for not having taken action earlier. I am now taking the matter up on the first opportunity presented, and when I think we have the right to discuss the principle involved. I shall cut down the details to the very limit as—

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is a motion for the second reading of the bill. Its principle may be discussed. The evidence given before a committee in another house cannot be the subject matter of discussion until the bill comes back from our own private bills committee. The hon. gentleman may gratify his desire if and when our committee reports that a case has been made out; but at the moment the discussion of evidence taken before a committee in another house has nothing whatever to do with the principle of the bill, which is this, that on allegations of misconduct the petitioner claims to be entitled to a divorce. That case must be proven before our private bills committee. They may or may not accept the evidence given before another committee. Therefore I submit, sir, that discussion of the evidence at this point is entirely out of order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I submit that the principle underlying the bill is that of unfaithfulness, and that such unfaithfulness in this case has not been proved. Essentially the divorce is being granted on the ground of desertion, not on the ground of adultery, and therefore I have the right at this time to challenge the passage of this stage of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The principle of the bill is divorce of the parties named therein. It is true that in the other house the evidence adduced in support of the petition has been found sufficient, but that evidence does not govern the decision to be made by the House of Commons. Any member is at liberty to discuss the principle involved in the bill; but the evidence is a matter for the private bills committee, which will duly report to the house. Therefore in my view the point is well taken.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then, Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the committee to which this bill is referred shall give it their most serious consideration? There will be no respondent present. The respondent is not to be found. There will be no one to represent the respondent. That is the situation. Again, in view of the statements that I have submitted tonight, I would urgently request the private bills committee to give the bill their very serious consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, the hon member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) has raised a rather interesting point. In some other cases it was said that in dealing with any of these bills the principle of divorce must not be considered. That objection has been made to myself by several members of the house and in several instances. It has been said that the principle of each bill was the ground upon which the

divorce was granted to the parties mentioned in that bill. Now what is the situation? What is the principle of each bill? I am not discussing the decision of the Chair; I am considering the various aspects of the bill—

Mr. SPEAKER: May I assure the hon. member that I have never ruled as he suggests; I have never ruled that the principle of divorce could not be debated on the second reading. On the contrary, it is essentially the principle that must be discussed. But my point is that the House of Commons is not governed, in any decision it may render on a particular divorce bill, by evidence taken in another place. The bill is referred to the committee on miscellaneous private bills, from which a report is submitted to this house, and then the house pronounces on the bill in accordance with the evidence accompanying it. I repeat once more that I have never ruled that the principle of divorce could not be debated on the second reading; on the contrary, it is the very principle to be debated.

Mr. BOURASSA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I am very glad that you have given a general ruling which will govern all these cases, especially in the future if the government does not make up its mind to put a stop to this procedure which, under the present system, is degrading both chambers.

There is another point. I suppose it will be admitted that the principle involved in each of these bills is also the ground for divorce. Divorce cannot be granted indiscriminately for any reason whatever; the senate is supposed to have adopted a rule, by which presumably it abides in accepting or refusing petitions brought before it—although I do not think it refuses many. It has been said time and again in this house that the only ground upon which the senate committee grants a divorce is adultery, which has been called the statutory ground. As a matter of fact, as has been previously pointed out, there is no statute defining the grounds upon which divorce is granted by this parliament. There is no law whatever governing the question. In a case like this, or in any other divorce case, I contend that there is first the general principle of divorce and, secondly, the special cause for which the divorce is granted in the particular bill. Now if, as claimed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), this divorce is not granted for the cause supposedly admitted to be the only one for which divorce is granted, then a new aspect of the matter presents itself. Suppose, for example, this case went to the court: the petitioner would have to allege and prove as a cause for divorce the ground which would be stated in the act defining the reasons for which that tribunal can grant divorce. It would form part of the law, and the evidence would have to square with it. When a bill comes before us copies of the evidence are distributed; and if a member of this house who happens to be a member of the court of review passing on the adjudication of the other house finds that the evidence does not corroborate the petition, but that it practically discloses a new ground, then I submit that there is a second principle involved in the bill. Some time ago there passed through both houses a bill granting a divorce for impotency, which at least in the Quebec law is a cause for the declaration of nullity of marriage—not divorce. In this instance, if, as claimed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the evidence establishes not adultery but desertion, then we are granting the divorce for a cause other than that generally alleged to be the only one for which this parliament grants divorce; and it seems to me that this aspect of the case must be examined before the bill passes. If we agree to this, and the evidence is such as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has found it, then a second principle is raised. There is the general principle governing all these bills, and there is the particular principle on which the divorce is granted in the bill before the committee. Suppose, for example, a divorce bill came before us based upon the assertion that the petitioner had been insulted by his or her consort; then it would mean that we should be granting a divorce on an entirely different ground. It seems to me, therefore, that on the second reading of any bill the house must consider the basis on which the divorce is granted.

So far as the evidence in this case is concerned, I have not read it sufficiently to form a decided opinion upon it. I merely wanted to emphasize the point made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that before granting any bill we should examine the cause for which it is being passed. With regard to the evidence, if we give the bill the second reading it goes straight to the special committee; and when it comes back from that committee—I do not suppose in this instance Your Honour would so rule—it is contended, as we have frequently heard, that this is not the place, in committee of the whole, to review that evidence, that having been done by the special committee on private bills. I hold, however, that the committee of the whole has not only the right but the duty to review the whole of the evidence; therefore if the com-

mittee of the whole find that the special committee either has not taken cognizance of all phases of the evidence, or has given a decision based upon something which in the opinion of the committee of the whole is not warranted by the evidence, then it should be the duty of the committee of the whole to report accordingly to the special committee. I wish to make that point clear before allowing it to be said that we are surrendering our full responsibility to the special committee.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): I think it might be well for you, Mr. Speaker, to give us a further instruction after the ruling we have received. As I understand it, the only thing that the committee will have before it when it comes to examine the bill will be evidence which is ruled out of discussion to-night. If that is not the case, then it is well that the committee understand now that it will have to take steps to secure new evidence and to make a new examination of the case. I cannot see that we have no right to deal with the evidence in the committee in any other way than we deal with it in this house. In the second place, I agree entirely with the point emphasized by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I have not read the evidence, but according to the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre the petition in this case is based, not on the usual ground, but rather on the ground of desertion, which is an entirely different principle.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The ground alleged, adultery, I did not consider proved, but there is also the ground of desertion.

Mr. IRVINE: It is the only ground I am dealing with. If there is no evidence on one ground we must consider the other ground. I think for that reason the house should pass upon that principle; then, when we vote on this bill, we will understand that that is the principle upon which we are voting.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Both hon. gentlemen who preceded me concluded their remarks by saying they had not read the evidence, and I would submit that reading the evidence should be a preliminary to talking about the bill; at all events it would be a useful adjunct. I have been led into sponsoring a bill of this kind for the first time in eight years, and I cannot think why the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) should pick upon my little ewe lamb out of all the hundreds which have been before us this session. I do not take it as a friendly act at all either to myself or to my unhappy client, if I may use the term.

The only thing required on the second reading of this bill is that a prima facie case be made out; we are not acting as judges now. That procedure is gone through before the private bills committee, and I believe a prima facie case is easily made out by this evidence. The suggestion has been made that this divorce is being asked on the ground of desertion, but that is not so; the word "desertion" or the suggestion does not enter into the case at all. This divorce is asked on the statutory ground of adultery.

To put it briefly, this couple separated, the date of the separation being sworn to, and six months later the woman admitted to her husband that she was about to become a mother. Perhaps I might read a letter, which is not at all improper.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. NEILL: There is nothing improper about this letter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I rise to a point of order. If it was not permissible to read the evidence when I desired to do so, I think it hardly fair that it should be read now. There was nothing improper either about the evidence I desired to read.

Mr. NEILL: Then I will not read the evidence; I will state the case in general terms. The woman wrote a letter admitting the reasons why she was leaving her husband.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to the hon. gentleman that he would facilitate the procedure if he would respect the ruling I gave a moment ago and let the bill go to the private bills committee after second reading. Then when it comes back from the committee, where new evidence may be heard and the old evidence considered, it will be time to examine that evidence and pass upon it.

Motion agreed to, on division; bill read the second time and referred to the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

INVESTIGATION OF SUBSIDIARY OF TELEPHONE OR TELEGRAPH COMPANIES

Upon the order being called for the house to go into committee on Bill No. 6, to amend the Railway Act (investigation of subsidiary of telephone or telegraph companies)—Mr. Geary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the railway committee has recommended the withdrawal of this bill.

Mr. GEARY: I would prefer to have this bill stand until the government measure, which contains a provision similar to that contained in the bill, passes the house.

Bill stands.

PRECIOUS METALS MARKING ACT AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Mr. J. ETIENNE LETELLIER DE ST. JUST (Compton) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 24, to amend the Precious Metals Marking Act, 1928.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for private and public bills and orders being exhausted, the house will now revert to committee of supply.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Cadet services, $500,000.

Miss MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, I am more opposed to this vote than to any other under the heading of national defence; I think it is the most vicious of all. I am very sorry that it always comes up at the end of the session when hon. members are tired and certainly do not want to hear a speech on the subject, but I feel impelled to make a few remarks once again in connection with this matter. I wish more members of the house would take an interest in this matter and I can promise that if someone else would speak on cadet training I would refrain from doing so.

I believe that cadet training is military and not physical training, as is often claimed by the Department of National Defence. In physical training the health of the individual being trained is the central idea, while in cadet training the protection of the state is the central idea, so that these two are quite different and should not be confused. I think we may conclude that cadet training is military training. Each cadet instructor holding a certificate from the department and possessing the necessary qualification receives an annual grant of $2 per cadet. If I am incorrectly informed I should be glad to have the minister correct me.

Mr. RALSTON: Up to a certain number.

Miss MACPHAIL: Up to fifty cadets, and he receives $1 per cadet in excess of that number. This being the case, we can be sure that if the instructor has a bias on the subject at all it will be in favour of cadet training and the tendency will be for all the teachers who are cadet instructors to go in for cadet training. In addition to this, in the province of Ontario the Department of Education makes a grant of $50 to each school board having an organized cadet corps of not less than 20 cadets.

There came to my hand recently the 1929 year book of the Glebe Collegiate Institute, on page 29 of which I find the following:

> The annual cadet dance of the 94th and 1070th cadet corps was held at the Glebe gymnasium on May 18th. The dance was a colorful event with the brilliant uniforms of our guests from the different military units of the city.

So that is at least one use for the permanent force; they supplied the colour at the cadet dance. There is a very close connection between the military units and the cadet corps. The minister cannot claim that the number of cadets has not increased. This afternoon he claimed that the department is not as military as it was some years ago, but the figures with reference to cadets show a rapid and steady increase. In the year 1909 the number of cadets in Canada was 9,000—again, if I am wrong, I shall be glad to be corrected—and the total expenditure for that year is not recorded. In 1914, the year of the outbreak of the war, the number was 47,000 and the cost amounted to $392,000; the year after the war closed, 1919-20, the number of cadets had jumped to 65,000, and the cost had amounted to $374,000; last year, 1927-28, the cadets had increased to 130,000 and the cost—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Miss MACPHAIL: The applause shows more of the old-time patriotism rather than good sense. The cost had increased to $500,000. According to the statistics of 1926, the number of cadets in Great Britain and northern Ireland was only 34,156, as compared to 112,463 in Canada for the same year. To put it in another way, the province of Ontario had only 1,000 less cadets than Great Britain and northern Ireland. According to the 1921 census, the population of Great Britain was 42,767,530, while the population of Canada in the same year was 8,788,481. If that is patriotism, which I doubt very much, then we are much more patriotic than is the mother country.

In the past war has been glorified, not only in Canada but throughout the world. It had to be glorified to keep it going, because it was a business which necessitated the killing

of a lot of people; it caused tremendous misery, and unless some sort of halo was thrown around it, it could never have gone on as long as it has. The schools have been used as the medium for this glorification of war, but public opinion throughout the world has changed and they have denounced and claim to have renounced war. How can we expect to evolve new and peaceful means of settling international disputes and expect them to succeed if we do not give the youth of our country new ideals. Do we expect that these things will come of themselves? Do we think that peace requires no effort, no expenditure and no organization? Apparently the government does, although I know that some of the individuals composing the government do not. However, judging from their actions as a government I can only conclude that they think that peace is a thing which will come of its own volition and is not something which has to be worked for.

Supposing we did not use the schools to bring forth these new ideals, but left the youth of the country free to think the thing out for themselves, then we would be on fairly safe ground. But we do not do that; we superimpose upon the youth ideas which have proved to be worthless and we use the military department to do that at a cost of half a million dollars per year. I think—perhaps I had better not say that; I will go on.

An hon. MEMBER: Say it.

Miss MACPHAIL: The very fact that we have military training in our schools causes the boys who take the training, as well as the girls who do not, to think of war as the one and only means of settling international disputes. They have not been taught any other means of settlement, and so they think that the means which they have been taught is the one to take. As Lord Roberts said: The possession of an art stimulates the wish to practise that art; it is the law of human nature.

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), speaking in the Kellogg pact debate, quoted Shakespeare as follows: The sight of means to do ill deeds makes deeds ill done.

Both those sayings are very true and they certainly apply to this case. When difficulties arise the student who has been military trained naturally thinks of brute force as the one and only method of settling disputes and does not think of calling upon the resources of the mind and spirit as a means of settlement. In other words, his mind is biased on the subject and he is prevented from reaching higher ground by the very ideas we have superimposed upon him.

I do not think that anyone will deny that teachings in the schools can change the thoughts of a people on any subject in little more than a generation. We have some remarkable examples of that. The military teaching in the schools of Germany changed that country from a peaceful to a military one. The glorifying of commerce in the schools of Japan made that country a great commercial country within a very short time. Through their teaching of goodwill and the spirit of fellowship and brotherhood, the schools of Denmark within a generation made that country one of the outstanding countries in cooperation and peace. I think our schools should be used to develop the idea that no one can be an efficient citizen who has not an international outlook. Our schools should seek to develop the international mind, and we should try to get away from the old days when it was thought: "They should take who have the power, and they should keep who can." That is not so universally the spirit to-day as it was a few years ago. We do not so firmly believe that the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong; we are emerging from a competitive age into a cooperative age. I do not think I need to point out the trends because I am addressing intelligent people who have noted them here and there. To my mind the schools at least should be left free to give the lead on this great subject of reaching higher moral ground; in showing the people that after all the world is a community in which we all live, and that the good of one is the good of all. This afternoon I quoted the right hon. the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition to show that they thought that we had left the old methods behind and were taking up new ways of settling international disputes, and I will not repeat the quotations.

Those who support military training for the youth of this country say that it is a splendid means of instilling discipline. I think it was Brigadier-General MacBrien or Major-General MacBrien—I would not get the titles mixed for anything in the world, as I do not want to take any glory away from him—who, speaking in Montreal on this subject, took great trouble to point out the benefit of the discipline that came through cadet training. I think those who make that claim confuse self-control with regimentation. There is a great difference between discipline as an aid to education and education as an aid to disciplined manhood and womanhood.

The one is force; the other is character. I believe that a cadet is trained not to order his own affairs, but to be an efficient instrument in the hands of his superiors, doing the things that they command for the purposes they desire.

Another great argument that is advanced in favour of cadet training and keeping everybody ready for a world scrap all the time is that, with human nature as it is, we need always to be prepared, going on the assumption that human nature is a very low thing and that it never changes. I was interested in reading what Tagore, the great Indian poet, had to say on this subject. Hon. members will have noticed that Tagore visited Canada, and while he was in the city of Vancouver he addressed the International Educational Conference there. He has this to say about human nature:

> In prehistoric age man ate man. Any claiming it an anti-social or immoral practice would be told it was human nature, but human instinct of cannibalism changed its physical character and took an economic aspect. I know the spirit of fight is ingrained in man, but the urging is also inherent in him to transmute its nature from the brutal to the human. When he has passed through his present state of physical ferocity he will, no doubt, have more than enough to fight about, but on a higher plane, intellectual, moral and spiritual.

I think human nature does change and I do not think the argument that has been advanced is any argument in favour of cadet training.

But probably the strongest argument against it is that it is contrary to the true spirit of education. The purpose of education is to develop the full rounded powers of the individual, to develop initiative, the power of selection of action, the will to act. Education should enlarge the vision of the student and prepare him to live in an ever-widening community.

Mr. SPENCER: Could we have a little more order?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Miss MACPHAIL: It is quite time there were more women in the House of Commons. Women consider the things that affect boys and girls as being of very great importance. Men are too prone to think that only things that concern dollars and cents are important. In any worthwhile educational system the child and the interests of the child, and not the state and the interests of the state, should be the centre. In true education the child would be the centre of interest and everything would revolve around that idea. This would in the long run be better for the state.

[Miss Macphail.]

Military training subordinates the will of the individual, and that certainly is contrary to true education. It kills initiative. An old poem, familiar to us all, describes very aptly what it does:

> Their's not to reason why,
> Their's but to do and die.

There is no selection for the individual and he becomes a machine. I think I put on Hansard three or four years ago a quotation from Bertrand Russell on the Principles of Social Reconstruction. Let me quote three or four lines from John Langdon Daines, a well known English educator. He says:

> The result—

Of cadet training, to which he is very much opposed.

> —is that the young generation has no chance of having free ideals and shaping evolution by their means; instead he is shaped to the existing forms and to the ideas which it pleases his rulers he should possess.

In this case the House of Commons are his rulers. John Dewey, who is very well known in Canada as a distinguished American educator, has this to say about military training:

> Military training "is undemocratic, barbaric and educationally wholly unwise."

We are coming to the time when we shall be scientific enough to take the advice of people who are experts on any given subject. These men whom I have quoted are experts in the field of education and we should listen to them.

Recently a survey was made of the school system of British Columbia by two educational experts, Doctor Putman and Doctor George Weir of the University of Columbia. They had this to say about military training in the schools:

> We take strong exception to the plan of having any part of this work done by militia officers, who naturally give it a military bent.

But as the Minister of National Defence pointed out to me last year, a second commission was appointed and it gave a contrary opinion. Whether that was because the first one did not give an opinion suitable to the powers that be, I do not know. It looks as if it were the reason and I would need to know some of the facts of the case before I would believe it was not. This year many people went to the educational conference in Vancouver, the one that was addressed by Tagore and also by the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen. What was said there on cadet training, I do not know, but something must have been said about it, because the result of it was that the Lethbridge Board of Education decided,

after one of their number had attended that conference, that they would no longer have cadet training in the schools of Lethbridge and they discontinued it. The organized farmers in the different provinces of Canada have again and again taken their stand as being opposed to cadet training. Organized labour has done the same thing many times. Certain women's organizations have taken a similar stand. None of the churches has yet reached that point, but they are getting there. The question has been discussed and a motion to the effect was almost carried last year. There is still hope that some time before long they, too, will take a stand against military training in schools. The most forward-looking women's organization on peace that I know of is the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, whose international president is Jane Addams of Hull House, Chicago. These are outstanding women who have given a good deal of time and thought, and indeed much suffering, in the cause of peace. At their Dublin conference, which I unfortunately was not able to attend, they passed the following resolution:

> We women of the Women's International League are of the opinion that the time has come to educate all children for peace; we hold it to be a crime against the souls of ripening youth to picture war to them as a necessity, or even as a moral duty; to train them in war-handicraft and instruct them in the art of killing.

I think that is very beautifully put, and it is all very true.

In conclusion, let me say that I am opposed to cadet training in schools because I believe it is contrary to true education, making the state, and not the child, the first consideration. I am opposed to it because I believe it is not good physical training, because it cramps the mind and lowers the moral sense of youth, causing it to rely upon force rather than upon character. It does not result in self-discipline, and it prevents active and understanding work as a world citizen, as the word is constituted now. It discounts faith and counts on fear. It is contrary to the teachings of great moral and religious teachers of the ages.

To teach military training and the spirit of peace at the same time is to brand ourselves as moral cowards and hypocrites in the eyes of youth, and I know nothing we could do that would be more disastrous for this country and the world at large. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Battle River, that item No. 72 be reduced by $499,999.

Mr. RALSTON: I should like to review in a few sentences the history of this movement. Ever since 1862 provision has been made in Canada for cadet training in the schools. Between 1908 and 1910 agreements were entered into between the different provinces under which the provinces that desired physical training and cadet training might have it, and might have grants accordingly. Every province has come into the scheme. The scheme is purely optional. There is no compulsion about it of any kind or description; any school at any time which does not desire it need not have it, and any boy whose parents do not want him to take cadet training does not need to take it.

The appropriation of physical training as compared with cadet training is indicated by these figures: last year there were trained for physical training certificates 6,644 teachers, all at the expense of the country, as against only 318 who trained as cadet instructors.

I have given the syllabus to the committee on former occasions. It includes physical training, squad drill, signalling, the teaching of alertness, preparation for vocations, first aid, scouting, rifle shooting, organized games, lectures on citizenship and lectures by business men and others on various vocations. Those are the general subjects which are taken up in connection with cadet training purely, but physical training constitutes the greatest proportion of the cadet training as carried on in the schools at the present time.

I think the best and shortest answer which might be made is that by far the greatest number of institutions in respect to which the grant is made are in the province of Quebec, that the greatest increase this year by far in cadet training has been in the province of Quebec, that the movement is supported by the clergymen of the province of Quebec, who obviously cannot be charged with a desire to cultivate the militaristic spirit. I do submit, as I have submitted to this committee before, that the amendment should not carry.

Mr. BOURASSA: I cannot let the last words of the Minister of National Defence pass without giving some explanation. His words would leave the impression that generally in the province of Quebec the clergy or the educational institutions are in favour of cadet training. They are not, if the minister will allow me; for I know the province of Quebec a little better than he does. Unfortunately, I admit, some of the educational institutions have been induced to adopt this system, and I must say that some of them have adopted it not from high patriotic motives but simply because of the money grants; and I am not especially proud of

them for that, nor do I think that a very large proportion of the citizens of the province of Quebec are especially proud of them for it.

The number of people in the province of Quebec, as elsewhere, who agree with the general principles that have just been expressed by the hon. member for Southeast Grey is much larger than the minister may imagine; but in the province of Quebec as elsewhere there are people who will let themselves go for a long time before they realize the consequences of their action.

The minister says that this movement has been in operation for sixty years. Of course, a good many things have been in operation for sixty years and over. Many things were in operation before the war that led the world to the war. It was because many things were let go for years before the war that the war suddenly caught the world without its realizing what was upon it. Of course, a few men did realize what was coming and a few men took advantage of that blindness of the world at large to prepare for the war and launch it upon the world. But since the war, some of these men even have come to see things differently. There were men in various countries of the world who before the war were preparing both young and older men for war, but who are now endeavouring to prepare them for peace. That is precisely the question. Are we going to do after the war the things that will counteract the forces for war, just as before the war we did the things that prepared for and led to the war?

We send every year a delegate or several delegates to the League of Nations, and we have adhered to every public peace move. Splendid orations have been made by the official representatives of Canada at Geneva and elsewhere to show that Canada is prepared to do everything for the cause of peace. But the cause of peace or any other cause is not advanced simply by speeches. It is advanced by the general trend of public opinion. It is advanced by such moral and political forces as are brought to bear upon public opinion to lead it in the right direction.

If we start with the schools, it is not only the question of cadet training in itself, but it is the whole tendency of education in the schools. It varies according to the provinces and according to the educational institutions; but certainly there are some educational institutions in this country which are still going on as they did before the war, developing in the minds of the children something unnatural which changes the nature of the child, and that is the idea that war and everything connected with war is the most glorious thing for the nation and for the individuals composing the nation. The child goes out from the school with that notion, that the great heroes of history are not those men and women who work for peace or for moral or intellectual progress, but those men who are forceful enough or brutal enough to be great conquerors and victors by force of arms. The heroes of all history are the war heroes. Take most of the textbooks still used in our schools in all the provinces, in Quebec and elsewhere. In the books used in Ontario you will see more names of English officers and generals, and in Quebec more names of French generals before the conquest, but through them all runs the same spirit, that war is the most glorious thing which the nation or the individuals composing it can think of. I admit that this government and this parliament have nothing to do with that part of education, but when you take all these things together, the encouragement given by this government to cadet training. glorifying military heroes in the school textbooks and the general trend given to the child's mind in the schools all over the country, it simply means this, that while we talk peace in public speeches and at international gatherings we are not doing the main thing to prepare the future generations in this country for peace. They are doing more of that in the old countries. They are doing it at present in Germany, in France, also, and, of course, in England, and it is being done not only by individuals but by institutions. They are developing the peace mind, and they are not being discouraged by the public powers. That is especially true of Germany. Whatever view may be taken of the responsibility of Germany in the great war, and probably Germany was chastised by defeat, if there is a country in Europe at the present time which is working for peace in that most efficient manner which is so characteristic of the Germans it is Germany. They have gone to the root of the thing. In the years that preceded the war, and more particularly before the war of 1870, the schools of Germany were said to be preparatory schools for the army. Today the schools of Germany, from the primary school to the university, are the preparatory schools of the peaceful generations to come. Having felt the scourge of war, having realized that war is not only a crime against humanity, but the greatest calamity that can befall any nation, they are now preparing the youth of their country to prevent war in the future. They are not doing it to the same extent in France unfortunately, but there also, there is at least a certain reaction against war. In England the reaction is stronger, and I hope

with the political change on the horizon that the work of peace will be enhanced there as well as in Germany.

Well now, what are we going to do, first, as a portion of the British Empire, and second, as one of the nations of the world? Are we going to stand pat? Are we going to proceed along the old routine, which has been followed since 1862 the minister has just said; or are we going to react energetically and intelligently? Are we going to make our professions of love of peace true or not; or, as the member for South-east Grey has said, are we going to stamp ourselves, not intentionally but as a matter of fact, with the stamp of hypocrisy by preaching peace before the world and not putting it into practice at home?

The great difficulty in Geneva to-day is to prepare the nations for disarmament. Everybody admits that it is useless to talk of peace if the nations do not disarm. Why does not the cause of disarmament make more progress? Because some of the nations connected with the League of Nations have not disarmed according to the solemn pledge they gave in the Versailles treaty, on the pretence that under present conditions they cannot disarm. The result is that no nation disarms.

Physical disarmament is of course very important. It is very essential and very practical to reduce the extent and the effectiveness of the weapons of war. But it is still more important to disarm morally, it is still more important to change the mind which produces the causes which finally make use of the arms of war. Warships, cannons, poison gases do not start by themselves, they do not create the causes of war. They are more or less powerful means of war in the hands of the government of any country. But they create the scourge of war the moment the moral causes of war crop up or create the occasion which launches war. The physical means are simply the means to the end, and physical disarmament will not be accomplished, or will be useless, until moral disarmament has been brought about.

Now, can we educate the youth of Germany, or the youth of France, or the youth of England, or of Italy in the love of peace? No, we cannot. But we can do something to educate the children of Canada in the love of peace. Does this government think it is a duty to the Canadian nation to give the various provinces money in order to prepare cannon fodder in the form of young boys taught at school to love war, to love military uniforms, to love the glamour of war until they have tasted of it? If we are sincere in our love of peace why do not we make some offers to the various provinces to help them in establishing some kind of peace education? I am sure that in the province of Quebec some of those institutions to which the minister has referred would be mighty glad to organize a peace department rather than a war department; but they are still doing what the minister says the federal government has been doing—they continue to do what they did before. Well, they should be induced to do something else.

This afternoon I have been reading an extremely interesting lecture given in Paris —and this is a sign of the times—by a Hungarian diplomat, one of the representatives of his country at the League of Nations. Of course, four or five years ago he would not have been listened to in Paris. Discarding his official capacity, and speaking as a human being appealing to his fellow beings, whether of French or of foreign origin, he asked them and I ask now: Why don't we look through this question? If we do, then we find out that there are two or three obstacles to the establishment of peace. One of them, of course, is the absurd system of treaties that was built up in the days of rancour and hatred immediately after the war, built up by the victors against the vanquished, which naturally could not be a sensible peace. But that may be arranged, and of course will be arranged. Common sense will prevail over blind passion. The second obstacle is the system of alliances which arose out of those nonsensical treaties. That also may be arranged. But those two causes will not disappear before you have created in the masses of the people of each country a state of mind which will not only permit but impose such a reform. Disarmament will not be brought about in every country the world over, treaties will not be revised, alliances will not be broken and replaced by the real exercise of the forces of arbitration under the League of Nations, until in all countries that peace spirit is created.

Well, that peace spirit will not grow of itself. We have helped to create the contrary spirit. For generations we have been doing that without realizing the import of our action. Governments were no more realizing what they were coming to than those educational institutions in Quebec or elsewhere are realizing to-day what they are preparing for the next generation. For years they have received a certain amount of money from the federal government to costume a few boys, making them caricatures of soldiers, and they continue doing that. Well, suppose we assisted practically and do something to counteract that spirit, to prepare armies of peace, and to develop the mind of peace in those boys in-

stead of the mind of war. The mind of war develops by itself under that false system. Then with a certain degree of pride and sincerity we could go to Geneva and elsewhere and prove that within the British Empire, as one of the main units of that splendid galaxy of nations, we are helping the cause of peace, the cause of disarmament, and that through the British Empire as well as through our own individual influence at Geneva and elsewhere we are also helping the cause of peace.

So long as we do not take the means to cure the war spirit within ourselves it is almost useless to talk peace outside. It is not altogether useless to do so, because it enables a few people to realize, as the member for southeast Grey realized long ago, and has so expressed it, that there is something false in this system. But this government which is pledged to peace, this government which in the province of Quebec especially has appealed to all the feelings of peace against the warlike party on the other side of the house, should be consistent in Quebec and elsewhere, and advocate a peace policy not only at election time when their candidates appeal to that feeling in Quebec, but in this parliament and in all the provinces of the Dominion.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 15; nays, 56.

Item agreed to.

General stores, $891,800.

Mr. FRASER: I had some correspondence with the department in connection with providing further accommodation for the stores in the city of Kamloops. There is a large quantity of stores there kept in a very unsuitable building and I should like to know whether the minister has made provision for further storage accommodation at that point.

Mr. RALSTON: In the provision which has been made in connection with military district No. 11, there is an item with regard to Kamloops drill hall, providing for increased storage accommodation. I presume that is what my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. FRASER: Is there any added amount?

Mr. RALSTON: No. We know the general nature of the repairs which are being made in the whole district. The repairs are made on request from district headquarters.

Item agreed to.

Manufacturing establishments, $587,000.

Mr. SPENCER: To what manufacturing establishments does this item refer, how many are there, and where are they?

Mr. RALSTON: There is the Dominion arsenal at Quebec. There is also a building at Lindsay but it is not used.

Mr. SPENCER: These are for munitions?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, small arms ammunition and a certain amount of eighteen pounder.

Mr. SPENCER: Are there any private concerns manufacturing ammunition?

Mr. RALSTON: The Dominion Cartridge Company makes sporting ammunition.

Mr. SPENCER: Is it run for private profit?

Mr. RALSTON: The Dominion Cartridge Company makes sporting ammunition.

Mr. SPENCER: Does it make ammunition for export?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think so.

Mr. SPENCER: Where are the uniforms made?

Mr. RALSTON: There a few firms engaged in this line, such as Workman in Montreal, Woods Manufacturing Company in Ottawa, Grant-Holden-Graham in Ottawa, Clayton in Halifax, and various minor ones.

Mr. SPENCER: We need a lot of uniforms for our soldiers, and we have considerable spare help in our penitentiaries—men who are very badly in want of work to do. The penitentiaries make a large quantity of goods for the government in the way of post office bags as well as uniforms for some of the mounted police. Why should not these particular uniforms be made in those institutions? It would be advantageous from the standpoint of prison discipline, inasmuch as it would provide more work for the prisoners, and it would save the country a lot of money.

Mr. RALSTON: We have some war stock on hand. The principal objection to my hon. friend's suggestion is the obvious one, in which the Minister of Labour would be interested, namely, that it would be regarded as competing with Canadian labour.

Miss MACPHAIL: I am afraid that is not true. Organized labour in Canada has stated repeatedly that it wants the inmates

of our penitentiaries to be given productive labour with pay in order to provide for the dependents of prisoners. That obstacle is entirely removed.

Mr. RALSTON: If it is with pay I do not see the advantage.

Miss MACPHAIL: There is a great advantage. At the moment the wives and families of men who are serving prison sentences are suffering. The men in the penitentiaries are given their food and they have a roof over their heads; and while one can hardly say that they have the creature comforts, at least they are able to keep life in their bodies. But that is not always true of their wives and dependents. I can see a great advantage in paying prisoners for any work they do. It is time we began to use a little common sense in the government of Canada. There is no reason on earth, except the one the minister can think of at the moment, why uniforms for soldiers should not be made in the penitentiaries. I have talked with a good many men who have to do with getting orders from the government departments for manufacturing units in the penitentiaries, and they have the utmost difficulty getting such orders from the different government departments.

Mr. SPENCER: If the objection were removed which the minister sees from the point of view of his colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan), would he still object to placing orders with the penitentiaries?

Mr. RALSTON: I should be glad to consider the question of having garments made in these institutions if this objection were removed and if the workmanship were satisfactory and the proper materials were used.

Mr. BANCROFT: I wish to support the suggestion made by the hon. member (Mr. Spencer). In the institution at Stony Mountain, in the constituency I have the honour to represent, they do exceptionally good work. They make the uniforms worn by the guards, the wardens and other officials of the penitentiaries, and those uniforms are equal in fit and quality to those used by the militia. I feel sure that there would be no trouble at all in getting uniforms of proper fit and style made in our penitentiaries, and I hope the minister will investigate this question and see if something cannot be done along the lines suggested.

Mr. GEARY: Would the minister tell me if he has under consideration the issue of coloured pre-war clothing, also what is the supply of khaki clothing on hand, the supply of pre-war issues on hand which were turned in at the beginning of the war; and what hope the militia may entertain with regard to the issue of the coloured clothing in the near future?

Mr. RALSTON: As my hon. friend knows, representations have been made from time to time with regard to the coloured clothing, but the most the department has been able to do is to authorize the use of coloured clothing on certain special parades. With regard to the supply on hand, I think we have very little pre-war clothing in our own stores; some of the units have some of this clothing but we have very little in the department. I cannot give my hon. friend the quantity of khaki clothing on hand.

Item agreed to.

Non-permanent active militia, $2,315,000.

Mr. SPENCER: The Kellogg peace pact was signed this year, and we must remember that last year the Prime Minister said that every department of the government was a department of peace, although the army of Canada is not very large, still it does not get very much smaller, and I would like to ask the minister, in view of the fact that the world is turning to peace, if he cannot see his way clear to make some slight reduction in the army of this country.

Mr. RALSTON: I thought I answered that question when I answered my hon. friends from Southeast Grey and Winnipeg North Centre; under the present situation I do not see how we can reduce the number any further. As I have endeavoured to point out, there has been a reduction less than it was before the war; money does not go nearly as far now and we are training only about half as many men. I am afraid I cannot accede to my hon. friend's request.

Mr. EVANS: At this time I would like to secure from the government a statement as to their policy with regard to the militia. Surely the minister does not expect us to believe that all these men are necessary for a police force for Canada; that cannot be so. There must be some policy behind the whole thing. Last year there was an increase of $230,700 in this vote. That would seem to indicate that the government has a definite policy, and I would like the minister now to show us the need for this vote and the reason why the expenditure under his department is increasing from year to year. I cannot help but think

that we are wrongly teaching young men how to bear arms and giving them instruction in the art of killing.

I was very much struck the other day by reading that Rasmussen, the Danish Minister of Defence, the day after the signing of the Locarno treaty introduced into the Folketing of the Rigsdag of Denmark a bill for the disarmament of the military and naval forces of that country. At the time his colleague Doctor Moltesen, Minister of Finance, declared that the frontiers of Denmark were more secure than ever they had been. Both parties agreed to the disarmament bill on the ground that they were safer under this agreement than they would be than by arming the nation.

I believe that if our government would make a grant which would enable men of foresight and intelligence to study questions which might arise and involve us in interantional affairs we would have no need to pass a vote of $20,000,000 for militia and defence. I want to also emphasize the fact that our action in this regard might very well be misinterpreted in different parts of the world. I think the Anglo-French pact of last year should give us some thought; our action now might be taken as favouring one side or the other. That pact certainly caused a great deal of concern both in Europe and America, and public opinion both in France and in England compelled its withdrawal. I am glad to see that public opinion on this subject is being crystallized; I am also glad to know that the Canadian public are taking up this matter as never before. In a letter which I received the other day from Saskatoon I am told that there is to be a provincial peace conference in Saskatchewan, organized by the women of that province, and every public body which in any way moulds public opinion has been asked to take part.

Coming back to the item under consideration, I think it is quite unnecessary that we should pass it at this time; I cannot see that it is needed and I am going to move in amendment that it be reduced by $2,000,000.

Mr. RALSTON: I really cannot think that my hon. friend, while he may be serious in the sentiments he has expressed, is serious in moving this amendement

Mr. EVANS: Yes, certainly I am serious.

Mr. RALSTON: As I endeavoured to explain, the permanent force is simply an instructional cadre; it does not even form an extensive police force. As I informed the committee previously, taking all available men from eighteen to twenty-one for three years' service our strength would be something like 240,000, but this item provides for 12 days of training for only 33,000 men. The vote has not been increased over last year; it is exactly the same, so I am at a loss to understand my hon. friend's reference to votes increasing each year. Let me repeat that I do not think my hon. friend is serious in practically suggesting that this vote be wiped out entirely, or in other words that there be no defence force in Canada at all. As I have explained, it is regarded as a part of our national equipment that we should have some defence force. Canada's fortunate geographical position is such that we are not compelled to make the preparations which European countries must carry on; we do not maintain any standing army, and I feel that my hon. friends do not quite appreciate the fact that Canada is disarmed to an extent far greater than any other country in the world. I think that is clearly shown when I point out the fact that the per capita expenditure in Canada is only $1.59 as compared with $2.60 for the next lowest country. Let me point out one other instance. The little country of Guatemala, in Central America, has a population about one-fourth as large as the population of Canada, yet that little country maintains a permanent force of over 5,000 men as compared with about 3,300 in the permanent force in Canada. I just mention that fact to show that we cannot be accused of being over-militaristic and that we are simply endeavouring to maintain a skeleton force which may be called upon in time of emergency. We all hope, just as much as does my hon. friend, that that emergency may never arise. My hon. friend has referred to the very laudable action which was taken by Denmark in connection with disarmament. An editorial appeared in the London Times only a few days ago complaining rather bitterly of Denmark's action in this respect. That paper contended that Denmark was not leaving herself in a position to carry out the international obligations which she had undertaken under the covenant of the league, and it claimed that the action which that country had taken in respect to the so-called disarmament—after all, if you look at the matter carefully you will discover that it is hardly disarmament, because she has made a coast patrol out of her navy and a police force out of her army —was not consistent with her international obligations.

Miss MACPHAIL: In case of trouble within Canada would the non-permanent active militia be called out by whoever calls them out?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not want my answer to be considered as being made glibly, but I would say that that would depend on whoever calls them out.

Miss MACPHAIL: Who does?

Mr. RALSTON: If I remember correctly, it depends on our constitution; I think it is the attorney general of the province.

Miss MACPHAIL: When they were called out in Nova Scotia did the non-permanent active militia go down there?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Miss MACPHAIL: Have they ever been called out in the history of Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: Not that I know of, and that is what I was endeavouring to point out.

Miss MACPHAIL: What good are they?

Mr. RALSTON: I am afraid my hon. friend is not listening, or else I am not making myself clear. I have endeavoured to point out that the backbone of the defence forces of Canada is the non-permanent active militia. That is not the police force which I have been talking about; it is the defence force for purposes of defence when necessary.

Miss MACPHAIL: This afternoon the minister pointed out, that we had no fear from American aggression, to prove that he quoted from the speech which the Prime Minister had made in Geneva. He did not tell us just whom we should fear; I have no fear of anyone and I do not think anyone else has. This non-permanent active militia does not belong to the permanent force; if it did I would be more in sympathy with the minister. It belongs to a defence force to defend us against something which does not exist. We need this money for so many things, but I do not want to start discussing that question because it would take too long. I want to say to the minister that it is no dislike of him or lack of appreciation of his ability and his desire to serve his country which has kept us on his trail all afternoon. I wish the Prime Minister would move him on to some other department where we could approve of him and put someone in as Minister of National Defence who might be open to censure. I would like to know where the camps are; how many trained last year, and for how many days; do the same men train year after year or is a new batch sent out annually; what do they do while they train; do they fight sham battles, do they practise bombing, do they dig trenches and try the poisonous gases to see whether they are effective, or what do they do?

Mr. RALSTON: Last year the approximate number which trained at the camps was 33,581 of all ranks. These men received twelve days' training, some at local headquarters and some in the camps. We have not sufficient money to take all these men to camps. The artillery camps are Petawawa, Camp Hughes and Sarcee Camp. The central camp schools are at Camp Borden, Kingston, Connaught, which is near Ottawa, Petawawa and Sarcee Camp. The Central camp schools are as follows:

District—
- No. 1 London.
- No. 2 Niagara.
- No. 3 Barriefield.
- No. 4 St. John's.
- No. 5 Lévis.
- No. 6 Aldershot.
- No. 7 Sussex.
- No. 10 Hughes.
- No. 11 Vernon, Rodd Hill, Heal's and Macauley.
- No. 12 Moose Jaw and Dundurn.
- No. 13 Sarcee.

The district camp schools are as follows:

District—
- No. 1 Port Stanley and London.
- No. 2 Niagara and Huntsville.
- No. 3 Barriefield and Peterborough.
- No. 4 St. John's, Ayer's Cliff and Pointe aux Trembles.
- No. 5 Cookshire, Lévis and Rimouski.
- No. 6 Aldershot and Halifax.
- No. 7 Sussex.
- No. 10 Hughes.
- No. 11 Vernon, Macauley, Maple Bay and Heal's.
- No. 12 Moose Jaw and Dundurn.
- No. 13 Sarcee.

Mr. HEAPS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of National Defence a few moments ago made the statement that a skeleton force was being maintained in the Dominion, but I observe that in the estimates for 1927-28 a total amount of $15,932,812 was provided for national defence; in 1928-29 the amount had jumped to $18,936,446, and in 1930 it is up to $20,123,378, quite an appreciable increase since 1927-28. If we keep on increasing the estimates at this same rate we will be putting a good deal of life into the bones of the skeleton which the hon. minister spoke about this afternoon. I find that practically all the various items show an increase in the past three years, irrespective of what they cover.

ranging from five to twenty per cent. If that is the way the minister preaches peace propaganda I would like to know what he would do if he assumed a warlike tone.

I cannot see the need of this expenditure for national defence, as I think the trend of events is in an entirely different direction. The nations of the world are beginning to realize the absolute futility of armaments, and this is borne out by the report of the League of Nations. I cannot see why Canada should spend the money which she is spending to-day. It is hardly fair for the minister to compare us with some of the smaller republics in South America; it is hardly fair for him to compare us with some of the European countries, because we are in a totally different position. We have the United States to the south of us and, as has been pointed out this afternoon, I do not think we spend one cent in protecting our shores from any possible menace from the south. I do not think there is any likelihood of an invasion from the north, and possibly the same statement would apply to an invasion from the east or west. Therefore, I cannot see why our estimates should be continually increasing, and I trust that the minister will recognize the protests which have been growing from year to year and that next year instead of an increase we will have a considerable decrease in these estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Evans has moved that vote No. 83 be reduced by the amount of $2,000,000.

Miss MACPHAIL: Does not the minister believe that the reason large numbers of men go to these camps is a very natural desire on their part to gather together out-of-doors in the summer time and spent twelve days away from their daily toil? Has he ever thought of the tremendous good that would come by having camps similar to these, with the military idea wholly eradicated, with the camps given over to physical training, to the goodwill that will be generated by the conferences and to active educational work along any line, cultural, international or anything they like? My opinion, which I may be foolish in voicing for the first time in the house, is that the reason men go so readily to the camps is that deep in their hearts there is a desire of getting together; the need of good fellowship, the freedom from the ordinary toils of life: these are the things that lure them there. The men themselves are not particularly interested in the military idea and might be quite glad if it was eliminated altogether. I give this as a constructive suggestion.

[Mr. Heaps.]

Mr. GARDINER: May I be permitted to ask the minister, in view of the scientific research into destructive forces for war purposes, what value in a future war will be the non-permanent active militia? Will it be of any value at all?

Mr. RALSTON: I can assure my hon. friend that man power is still the basis of any defence scheme or any defence force all over the world. My hon. friend is talking about auxiliaries in the shape of mechanized forces. The principle of military training still holds good.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Permanent force, $4,950,000.

Mr. CLARK: I wonder whether the minister could give a statement, not necessarily to-night—I realize he cannot do that—as to how many civilians are employed in this department and the total salaries paid to them over a period of years commencing from say 1910 to date?

Mr. RALSTON: I think I have the information upon which such a statement could be made up. My hon. friend understands that it would take a little time to have it prepared.

Mr. CLARK: Yes.

Mr. GEARY: Complaints have reached me as to the engagement and discharge of men in the permanent force about Christmas time last year. I understand that men enlist for a year with a probationary period of three months. A number of men had enlisted and seemed to be assured of their winter's service, but before the expiration of the three months, to be exact, the day before Christmas, men in different districts were let out without notice. They were put out into the world in the middle of winter, so to speak, after they had enlisted for a year and had every reason to expect that they were settled for that time at least. Complaints as to what was thought to be rather hard treatment have reached me and I should be glad if the minister could give me any information with regard to the matter.

Mr. RALSTON: This was simply a case of not having sufficient money. I thought it was in January. I have under my hand a circular on this matter, from which I will read extracts:

It was found that the permanent force vote would not provide for the strength of 3,272, as

it then stood, for the remainder of the fiscal year. The strength would have to be reduced by 112 so as to bring the vote within the appropriation.

These were the men who were discharged.

(a) That all deserters who have returned since September be discharged at once.

(b) To discharge all recruits, except in the cavalry and horse artillery, who have been enlisted this autumn and have not yet been finally approved by their commanding officer; that is, within three months of enlistment.

(c) To permit all other ranks who may desire, to be granted a free discharge, which would be granted under paragraph 386 (xvi) king's regulations, Canada, "his services being no longer required."

The result was that by the end of December —and my hon. friend is right about the date —there was a net reduction of 200 against the permanent force vote. As a matter of fact, out of the 200 there were only 66 of the class to which my hon. friend refers. Most of them were those who requested their discharge.

Mr. GEARY: That is a circular addressed to different depots or districts?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. GEARY: Could the minister give me the number discharged in each district?

Mr. RALSTON: I think there is a return of the number discharged. The figures are as follows:

Military District	Number Discharged
No. 1	17
No. 2	21
No. 3	10
No. 4	8
No. 5	18
No. 6	51
No. 7	Nil
No. 10	23
No. 11	38
No. 12	1
No. 13	11
Headquarters	1
Total	199

Mr. PLUNKETT: What district is No. 7?

Mr. RALSTON: St. John, New Brunswick.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Were the discharges carried out indiscriminately or proportionately across the whole Dominion? Was the number discharged in the western provinces on the same basis as the number discharged in Quebec and the eastern provinces?

Mr. RALSTON: The discharges were carried out by classes according to the principle which I read in the circular. In St. John it happens that there is no permanent force and there are no recruits. That is why there is not any dicharge there. In military district No. 6, which is Halifax, there were fifty-one.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the minister give us some particulars in regard to this vote? It is rather hard to understand why it costs about $5,000,000 to keep up a permanent force of about 3,300 men.

Mr. RALSTON: I just want to remind my hon. friend that I thought we were reducing this vote a good deal. The vote for the permanent force in 1922 was $6,255,000, and it is now $4,950,000. The purpose of the vote is to cover expenses in connection with the general maintenance of the permanent active militia, including pay, allowances, subsistence, forage, fuel, light, water supply, medical and dental services. The estimate is based upon a strength of 330 officers and 3,068 other ranks, making a total of 3,398 of all ranks. This represents a decrease of 4 officers and 17 other ranks as against last year.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I should like to have some particulars of the vote. The minister's explanation does not seem to cover the point. There are about 3,330 men in this force and yet it costs about $5,000,000 to maintain them.

Mr. RALSTON: Pay and allowances amount to $4,096,000. The balance is made up of transport and travelling; stores; equipment and supplies; printing and stationery supplies; grants to messes, library, et cetera; light and power; water and taxes; telephone rentals; removing garbage and refuse; medical services; dental services; veterinary services; contribution towards pensions of British army personnel on loan to Canada; courses of instruction, and miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses, including premium on surety bonds, advertising and so forth. The big item is pay and allowances.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the pay for a private Canadian soldier?

Mr. RALSTON: The private soldier over eighteen receives pay, $438; allowance for clothing, $182.50; fuel, $54.75; light, $18.25; rations, $182.50, or a total for the single man of $438 pay, plus $438 allowance, or $876. The married allowance is $255.50. So the married man receives $438 pay, plus $693.50, or $1,131.50.

Mr. SPENCER: That is by the year?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes. The enlistment is for three years.

Item agreed to.

Royal Military College, $375,000.

Mr. SPENCER: How many students were at the college last year, and what was the cost?

Mr. RALSTON: There were 199 students at the college last year, and the full vote of $375,000 was spent.

Mr. BRADY: I would like the minister to tell the committee as to the real value of the Royal Military College, because I believe there is not an institution in Canada to-day that is doing such a splendid work. You will find there students from the various high schools throughout Canada. They have gone there in doubt as to their future, and they have come out fortified with knowledge and vision, with character beyond words, and they take a prominent place among the bright young men of Canada. I visited the Royal Military College some weeks ago and I found there students from every part of Canada, including western British Columbia, and among them students that I myself had taught in Prince Rupert. I would ask the minister to stand up right now and let us know why he is not adding to this vote, and why he is a little bit timid about showing the educational value of the Royal Military College and asking for only $375,000.

Miss MACPHAIL: What was the number of students who attended the institution in 1920, and what was the cost that year?

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend the number of students, but I have here the number of graduates. There were 33 in 1920, and 34 last year. The amount voted in 1920-1921 was $349,819.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the basis of admission to the college, and do the students pay any of their expenses themselves? I notice that the cost per student figures out to about $1,900.

Mr. RALSTON: First they pay $100 a year, and then for the four years they pay in addition $1,050 for clothing, and so forth; so that the four-year course costs them $1,450. The method of admission is by selection according to merit. My hon. friend will remember the discussion in the house last year. The word "merit" was retained in the statute, and I can assure him that that has been the basis of admission. Allotment is made to the various provinces according to population and applications are received, the educational qualifications being the matriculation examination for the province. There are certain regulations with regard to the age limit and regulations particularly with regard to physical fitness. Having regard to the marks made, showing the scholastic ability of the student, together with his age and physical fitness, selection is made by a selection board up to the allotment of each province.

Mr. BRADY: I am pleased that the minister has given us the qualifications for entrance to the college. For the students from British Columbia, for example, is the senior or junior matriculation essential?

Mr. RALSTON: Without looking up the regulations, I do not think that senior matriculation is required, although senior matriculation gives the student just that much better standing and a preference in selection.

Mr. BRADY: I do feel that the Minister of National Defence has not yet realized the wonderful work that this institution is doing for the youth of Canada. I do say from my knowledge of that institution, and of the young men who were trained there and have come forth from that institution with courage and faith and knowledge and vision, that the minister should stand up to-night and ask not merely for $375,000, but for a larger vote. He should go further; he should encourage in every possible way our Canadian youth to enter an institution wherein virility, purity of life and courage towards attainment are developed to the limit. I do think, sir, that the Canadian people should be proud of the Royal Military College at Kingston and I am glad to be able to say to-night from honest conviction that it is one of the finest institutions in the whole Dominion for educating the young ambitious youth of Canada.

Miss MACPHAIL: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it is not worth the trouble for me to say that I do not agree with our very affable and polished Irish colleague, but I cannot let his remarks pass without protest. If we want to instil courage in our young men let us elect them to the House of Commons; that will develop it if anything will.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Miss MACPHAIL: Yes, it will—if they are men. I think the cost of training our youth at the military college is excessive. It is usually people well able to afford the cost of education who send their children to the military college, and the $1,400 paid by the students for four years is certainly not much.

Mr. RALSTON: It is $1,450.

Miss MACPHAIL: It is not much for four years. But my main objection is not to the cost. As I have said very many times in this

house, we have two schools of thought in Canada; one which thinks security can come by peaceful means, and the other which thinks it can come only by military preparation. The military college was established in the days when the latter school of thought was more dominant than it is to-day—for it is still more or less dominant. In those days the blue-blooded young men were sent there. By the way, I do not know how they became blue-blooded; I thought that all Canadians were "red-blooded" anyway. The colour of the blood is a bit confusing anyway. Some of the so-called "cream" of Canada went to the Royal Military College, the idea being that it was a little more exclusive than most educational institutions and that those young men might serve as officers in the Canadian militia in the event of war.

The reason I object to the grant to this college is that the Dominion government is backing the one school of thought in Canada, the military school, and is giving absolutely no help to the other school of thought, which as I said before, think that security does not come from warlike methods. It is high time that we scrapped the military college at Kingston. If the blue-blooded people of Canada—my blood is red—want to train their sons in military tactics, they have already by special legislation taken enough money from the common people to enable them to build a college for the purpose. I cannot sit silent while the House of Commons votes money for the Royal Military College. My own opinion is that it develops snobbery. If it is not military it is snobbish; I think it is possibly both. The young men can go to any university in Canada and be educated for civil life. But, Mr. Chairman, I am getting into deeper water all the time; not only do I disagree with my friend the Minister of National Defence, but now I find myself out of sympathy with the very affable member for Skeena (Mr. Brady).

Mr. BRADY: It is not often, Mr. Chairman, that I really feel at home in the House of Commons, but I do now after listening to the very genial and lovable member for Southeast Grey, who has endeared herself not only to the government—which she often supports—but to the official opposition which she likewise supports, for not later than yesterday evening she supported us on one of the most vital questions that has come before the House of Commons this session. I refer to the debate on the Australian treaty. But much as I revere and appreciate her opinions,—words to me are very significant,—to-night she used three outstanding words when speaking of the Royal Military College — "fashionable" — "blue-blooded" — "snobbery". Now, candidly, I should like to accompany the hon. member for Southeast Grey to the Royal Military College at Kingston, to disprove her statements. During three years only on two occasions has it been my privilege to speak in reply to the very charming and very lovable member for Southeast Grey. After all, hon. members will realize that in the days "when knighthood was in flower" and heroes set out in quest of adventure to rescue some charming female in distress, valour and sentiment were supported by good judgment and discretion. Therefore when to-night I heard the hon. member for Southeast Grey say that the Royal Military College was only for those who are "fashionable," "blue-blooded" and "snobbish", I realized, for the first time in three years that the charming member for Southeast Grey had not visited that splendid institution known as the Royal Military College. Now, I know something of the young men who are educated in the Royal Military College at Kingston. While I would be the last man in the world to reflect upon the integrity, sincerity and truthfulness of the hon. member for Southeast Grey, I must tell her that I know thoroughly the type of young men who go through the Royal Military College at Kingston. The hon. and charming member I know has read her history, and she must know something of the days of the plebeians in ancient Rome. Perhaps there is an analogy between the plebeian and the modern democrat, but I wish to tell the hon. member for Southeast Grey right now, that in my sixteen years knowledge of the Royal Military College not one of the students from British Columbia was fashionable, blue-blooded or snobbish—not one. Who were they Mr. Chairman? They were the young boys who failed to get the benefit of the higher education that the universities afford; they were trying to find their way; they were boys who needed the discipline which the Royal Military College could give in order that they might find their feet. And they found what they sought. I wish to say right now, in the presence of the hon. and gracious member for Southeast Grey, that the young men trained in the Royal Military College in Kingston have come forth from that institution not merely as scientific men—and I know many of them who have taken their B.Sc. and M.Sc.—but as an honour to their fathers and mothers, and they are the pride of the community in which they live. Everyone knows the persuasive powers in this

house of the hon. member for Southeast Grey. The moment she rises to her feet, silence reigns in the house, and all give her obeisance. No matter what she says, the male sex bows to her judgment as it has ever done in all ages, to the devoto femineo sexu. Therefore I say that no matter what the hon. member for Southeast Grey says, whether she condemns the Royal Military College or whether she opposes the vote provided for the national defence of Canada, we realize that at least her heart is with us, because I have never yet found myself disagreeing with her even though at times, tentatively, she tries to tell us that if we, the Conservative party, are not good she will vote with the government in power, which she seldom does.

Miss MACPHAIL: Before the resolution carries I want to say that I accept the hon. gentleman's invitation.

Item agreed to.

Royal Canadian Air Force—all expenses in connection with the general maintenance and training of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and the auxiliary and reserve air force, including training personnel for civil air operations, $1,697,694.

Mr. BOYS: When the supplementary estimates come up I shall have something to say in reference to Camp Borden.

Mr. CLARK: Is the cost of the air base at St. Hubert, Montreal, included in this vote?

Mr. RALSTON: It is in the next vote.

Mr. CLARK: I can ask the question just as well under this vote. Has the minister reconsidered the decision made by the government last year to establish air bases in other cities, for instance, Vancouver and Halifax? In British Columbia this is considered a very vital matter. Recently the people of Vancouver passed a by-law and they are going to spend $300,000 of the city's own money to establish an air port. It does seem to me that this is a national matter, and in relation to a city like Vancouver, where there is an all the year round port which is likely to become one of the most important ports in North America, the question is one which should engage the attention of the government in a serious manner. Has the government recently considered cooperating with cities like Vancouver and Halifax, where there are national ports, in this very important respect?

Mr. RALSTON: That was considered quite recently, particularly in connection with Halifax. Halifax was very anxious to establish an air port and, like any other city, desired to have assistance given it. We had to give them the same answer we gave Vancouver in that respect. Provision is being made for substantial assistance in connection with the lighting of aerodromes, a matter which has been regarded as a severe tax on the municipalities and those who own them. We have passed an order in council providing for an expenditure of $10,000 as a maximum in connection with lighting, particularly flood lights and special search lights. Boundary lights are, of course, not provided by reason of the fact that each aerodrome has different requirements. But in connection with certain standard lighting equipment the department is making a substantial contribution.

Mr. CLARK: How does the minister justify an airport in Montreal and not at Vancouver?

Mr. RALSTON: The airport at Montreal was established as part of an imperial air route, having regard to the suggestion made at the 1926 imperial conference for the development, if possible, of dirigible communication between Great Britain and the continent of North America. At that time the Prime Minister, who was representing Canada at the conference, undertook that provision should be made for a mooring mast and necessary terminal facilities in Canada, and the aerodrome at St. Hubert was purchased and equipped with that object in view. Perhaps my hon. friend does not know that any commercial companies who are using that aerodrome are paying for the use of it; it is not free.

Mr. CLARK: I raise now the claim of a city like Vancouver; it appears to me that there is a strong claim for the province of British Columbia. During a great part of the year we are five nights on the train from the city of Ottawa—five nights to communicate between the capital of the country and such a city as Vancouver, and six nights so far as Victoria is concerned. We have a strong claim for the establishment of an air service between that part of the country and central Canada; indeed, our claim is stronger than that of Montreal. I appreciate the fact that Montreal has a strong claim, and also the fact that the establishment of the aerodrome there is partly the result of the imperial conference.

Mr. RALSTON: Altogether.

Mr. CLARK: If that was the sole reason—the request of the imperial government—this country would not be spending the money which it is spending on that port. The fact is that this country recognizes its responsibility in developing its airways; that work must be done. Therefore I now advance the

claims of the province of British Columbia, because in my opinion it is far more important to establish close and quick connections within our own country than to establish such connections between Canada and some other country.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: I am glad the Minister of Justice agrees with me; I hope he will bring the matter before council and advocate it very strongly. We on the Pacific coast do feel the need of quicker communication with the centre of Canada, and I think we have very strong claims indeed to some consideration in this respect. We feel so strongly on this question that in Vancouver, as I have said, we have voted $300,000 of our own money for the establishment of an airport for that city, and with all this money being spent we feel that we are entitled to a portion of it.

I bring this matter to the attention of the minister, particularly in view of the fact that if he reorganized his department as I suggested this afternoon, manning it with men sworn in the service of the Department of National Defence instead of civilians employed at very much higher salaries, he could save enough money to go a great deal towards the establishment of a service between the Pacific coast and the central part of Canada.

Mr. MacLAREN: How many cities in Canada have established airports at their own expense, and what are the names of the cities?

Mr. McKENZIE: I should like to ask the minister whether any arrangements have been made between Canada and the United States for the establishment of airports on the border and, if so, what arrangements have been made for joint control.

Mr. RALSTON: No such arrangements have been made. I am having my officers look up the list of cities which have established airports, but perhaps I can give some of them from memory. Kingston is opening its airport to-day and Hamilton is opening its airport on June 6, I believe.

Mr. MacLAREN: At their own expense?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, or at private expense; it is done without any contribution from the Dominion government. London, Ontario, has had an airport for some time, and in addition there are airports at Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and other places. My hon. friend knows of course about St. John, where I think they are spending about $80,000—

Mr. MacLAREN: I think it is about $100,000.

Mr. RALSTON: —and Halifax is spending about $150,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Winnipeg.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, and Fort William.

Mr. BIRD: Would the minister tell the committee how many fatal accidents occurred last year in this service?

Mr. RALSTON: I am informed that there were eighteen fatal accidents in 1928.

Mr. BIRD: How much of the increase is for new equipment, new engines and so on?

Mr. RALSTON: Practically none of the increase will be devoted to new equipment; the greater part will be devoted to the development of air routes.

Mr. BIRD: I should like to take this opportunity to point out that economy certainly should not be practised in regard to equipment. An aeroplane engine is not a very costly piece of mechanism; I suppose $20,000 or $30,000 would pay for the ordinary engine, and I think we should realize that human lives are constantly depending upon these machines.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is under a misapprehension; the cost of an ordinary engine is from $4,000 to $8,000.

Mr. BIRD: Then that makes my argument much stronger, although of course some engines cost much more than that. However, I had occasion to visit one of our larger bases last fall, and although I am not qualified to judge, it struck me at the time that some of the equipment had seen a good deal of service; it seemed to me that some of these engines had been running quite a number of years. Wherever else we economize we should not do so in connection with the equipment of our air service. During my casual visit I was very much impressed with the type of Canadian manning our air service, not only as to personal character but as to the spirit manifested; it seems to me that a new tradition is being created which some day will rival the tradition of the sea. I was also struck with the type of service they were giving in these daily patrols over the waste spaces of northern Manitoba. In the ordinary course of duty these men are performing what I consider to be feats of great heroism, without any notice being taken by the general public; day after day, at the word of command, they take trips hundreds of miles in length over barren wastes. I agree in general

with the remarks made on this side of the house to-night; I believe we should reduce our military expenditures, but here is a type of expenditure which is not purely militaristic but which serves a civil purpose as well, and which is helping in the conquest of northern Canada. I wanted to say this word on behalf of the men who are exposing themselves every day in that northern country. I should like to see that their equipment is of the best and that all the modern inventions making for greater safety are supplied to them whatever the cost may be.

Mr. GERSHAW: Could the minister tell us what assistance, if any, is given by his department to the different cities in the establishment of airports?

Mr. RALSTON: I outlined to the committee a few moments ago the assistance we give. We have nothing to do directly with the purchase, the laying out or the preparation of the airports. Our assistance consists of two things; first, we provide the services of officers of the department as frequently as they are necessary, to make surveys of the proposed airports and to advise as to their suitability or as to what is necessary to make them suitable. Then we give assistance in connection with the permanent lighting of these aerodromes up to the amount of $10,000; I think we provide the total cost of the beacon and 50 per cent of the cost of the other lights, and in each case the assistance is limited to $10,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Is it a fact that the government presents two airplanes to any city which inaugurates a flying club?

Mr. RALSTON: That is a fact.

Mr. SPENCER: Under what conditions is that presentation made?

Mr. RALSTON: The conditions are contained in an agreement, and I will give my hon. friend a brief resumé. The club must have at least ten men who have qualified as pilots, either in the war or by other training; the club must agree to provide an instructor and pay for his services, and provide for the maintenance of the machines and a suitable place for operation. If that is done an agreement is entered into and the department supplies two planes. A bond is taken to provide against injury to the planes through breach of the regulations or on account of negligence. A further provision is contained in the agreement whereby $100 is paid to the club for every man who passes as a certified pilot as a result of the activities of the club. A further provision is that if within one year the club provides another plane, then the department will provide one also.

Mr. CANTLEY: What will be the cost of the mooring mast which is being erected at St. Hubert?

Mr. RALSTON: The total cost, including the amount in the estimates of this year, which will include the cost of land, the work which has been done and which will be done this year, is $1,623,262.16. That includes the land, levelling, draining, mooring tower, winches, hydrogen gas plant, buildings, water supply, railway siding, lighting, fencing, full installation of meteorological equipment, cost of day labour, cost of materials, inspection, miscellaneous items, maintenance and operation.

Mr. CANTLEY: That will complete the project?

Mr. RALSTON: That is what we expect.

Item agreed to.

Construction of magazine, etc., Halifax, $100,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What are the particulars of this item?

Mr. RALSTON: This is a progressive item, to cover the completion of the joint services magazine at Halifax.

Item agreed to.

Mackenzie basin system—radio services—for the maintenance and operation of the Mackenzie division radia system with stations at Dawson, Mayo, Edmonton, Fort Smith, Fort Simpson, Fort Resolution, Aklavik and Herschel island, $140,500.

Mr. BENNETT: What does this cover?

Mr. RALSTON: It covers the telegraph services which we maintain in the Mackenzie basin right up to Dawson city.

Mr. BENNETT: Is there any relation between those services and the services maintained by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Public Works? There seems to be a duplication which is very difficult to explain.

Mr. RALSTON: We provide the services for the Department of the Interior.

Item agreed to.

Battlefields memorials, $170,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Have these memorials been completed?

Mr. RALSTON: I think six or seven of them are completed, but the Vimy memorial

is not finished and one can hardly guess at the time when it will be completed. I believe it will be at least two or three years. My hon. friend will understand that that is the outstanding Canadian memorial on the other side; the others are comparatively small memorials at some six or seven important points on the battlefields.

Mr. SPENCER: What arrangement is being made to keep the grounds around these memorials in condition?

Mr. RALSTON: The Memorial War Graves Commission which has done such excellent work in connection with the maintenance of the cemeteries are making arrangements with us to do the same sort of work in connection with the memorials.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: What amount is included for Louisburg?

Mr. RALSTON: That would not come under this item.

Item agreed to.

To provide for legal expenses, etc., re-action in connection with regulation of aerial navigation, $13,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Does not the department employ legal men to look after these things?

Mr. RALSTON: This is a reference which was mentioned this afternoon to decide regarding the provincial and federal jurisdiction.

Item agreed to.

Nation Defence—salaries, $764,875; contingencies, $70,000.

Mr. CLARK: Does this item include any increases other than the increase granted to the deputy minister?

Mr. RALSTON: There are no increases in salary at all but there are fourteen new positions in connection with the civil air service.

Mr. BENNETT: Do they come under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: There is an increase in the deputy minister's salary?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister explain that?

Mr. RALSTON: A number of increases were granted in connection with different departments, as the government felt that the time had come when the deputy ministers should be better provided for. The Deputy Minister of National Defence has to handle the militia branch, the naval branch, the military air branch and the civil air branch. In view of his professional qualifications as an engineer, and his long service, experience and efficiency, speaking as minister and head of the department I felt quite justified in recommending the increase.

Mr. CLARK: What is the salary of the chief of general staff?

Mr. RALSTON: $8,000.

Mr. CLARK: I am opposed to this increase, first, on the general ground of increases to any deputy minister at this time. We have in this country numerous civil servants who are not being paid a living wage, whose requests have been advanced at various times during the present session on this side of the house. I see nothing in the supplementary estimates for any increase to the postal workers, who are being paid salaries under $100 a month. It is quite clear from the statements issued by the government that these men are not being paid a living wage according to the standards of government departments; consequently I am opposed to an increase in salary to any deputy minister at this time. I am opposed to an increase to this particular one for very different reasons. First, the men who have occupied the position of chief of general staff are considered the most experienced that the country can find for technical purposes and are supposed to be the most highly trained men we have. For instance, since the war we have had Sir Arthur Currie who, for all practical purposes was chief of staff although perhaps he did not actually occupy the position; and since then we have had General Burstall, General MacBrien, General Thackeray. This country apparently cannot afford to retain in its service men like General MacBrien. If we cannot afford to pay men like that $10,000 a year, we cannot afford to pay a deputy minister $10,000 a year. I am therefore opposed to the payment of any salary such as this to a deputy minister so long as we are unable to pay our civil servants living wages, or to pay men of the experience, for instance, of General MacBrien a salary equal to that now proposed.

I am further opposed to this increase, because in this department we have many soldiers who receive low pay and also we have civilians who are absorbing a very large percentage of the total National Defence estimates. We have not yet received the exact amount that civilians in this department are getting, but this afternoon the minister gave a rough estimate of $2,500,000 which he said later on was, perhaps, too high. In any case, civilians in the Department of National

Defence are receiving salaries which are approximately equal to the total upkeep of the non-permanent active forces. Under these circumstances I am opposed to any increase in this vote.

Mr. POWER: May I ask the minister how many generals there are in his department? I memember some years ago there were twenty-three generals employed in the Department of National Defence for something like 3,000 men. In time of war one general was considered enough for a whole brigade, which was a little over 3,000 men, but in time of peace we had twenty-three generals on our payroll. I have never been able to find out just what they did. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, I do not wish to defend this department or any department which has increased the salaries of the deputies; but may I point out to my hon. friend that after all the chief of staff is really a subordinate officer to the deputy minister?

Mr. CLARK: That is not correct.

Mr. POWER: I may be wrong. If I am, I am subject to correction, but my impression is that the deputy minister is the head of the department and, after all, the chief of staff is employed in that department, no matter what you call him or how much gold braid you put on him. The duties of the chief of staff are confined to one thing; they are duties of a military character.

Mr. CLARK: What is this department for?

Mr. POWER: The department has to deal with a number of things. Among others it tries to run a navy.

Mr. STEVENS: That is well put.

Mr. POWER: At any rate, it tries to train naval cadets. It has a volunteer naval reserve. The deputy minister looks after all that. It is going into the development of aviation. I am not aware that the chief of staff would have anything to do with civil aviation whatever business he might have to superintend in connection with military aviation. Therefore, under the circumstances, not that I am prepared to say that any deputy minister or even that the deputy minister of this department is entitled to a salary of $10,000, I would say that he was entitled to more salary than the chief of staff.

Mr. McGIBBON: Would the hon. member move an amendment to that effect?

Mr. POWER: Well, he is getting it, is he not? I cannot move an amendment to give him what he is getting.

[Mr. Clark.]

Mr. RALSTON: The committee will not expect me to enter into a discussion of the comparative values of the various officers whom my hon. friend has mentioned. I do not yield to anybody in my admiration of any of the officers of whom he has spoken. At the present time General McNaughton is occupying the position of chief of general staff and is receiving a salary of $8,000 a year. I know my hon. friend will not for a single moment criticize General McNaughton's capacity or ability to do that work.

My hon. friend has brought up the question of civilians two or three times, and I do not quite agree with him on the information I get. My information is that if all the civilians in the department were replaced by military personnel, the increase would be very considerable. I have verified that to some extent and I think I am right; I think also that some of the military members of the staff agree with me. I do not know where the hon. member for Quebec South got the number of twenty-three generals. At headquarters in 1922, we had twelve, and in 1929 there are three.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, June 5, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South) presented the fifth and final report of the special committee on Dominion Elections Act and Corrupt Practices Inquiries Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: As this report will be published in votes and proceedings perhaps we might dispense with the reading of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

Mr. L. K. LAFLAMME (Montmagny) moved:

That a message be sent to the senate informing their honours that this house has concurred in the first and final report of the joint committee of both houses on the restaurant, and requesting their honours to unite with this house in approval of the said report; and that the clerk of the house to carry the said message to the senate.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON QUARTZ MINING ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES A. STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 343 to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State) moved the first reading of Bill No. 342 (from the senate) to amend the Companies Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PENSION BOARD—MEDICAL EXAMINATION

Mr. PETTIT:

1. Is a government employee, being a disabled returned soldier, when called upon for medical examination by the Pension Board, docked any portion of his pay or salary on account of his having received allowances from the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?
2. If so, what departments follow this practice?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. No deduction is or has been made from the pay or salary of a civil servant on account of his receiving travelling allowances from the Department of Soldier's Civil Re-establishment or the Department of Pensions and National Health. No other allowances are paid in respect of medical examination of civil servants by the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada. Prior to the 1st April, 1928, a civil servant while undergoing a period of observation or treatment in hospital enjoyed an income of $30 per month less than while at work. From the 1st April to the 31st December, 1928, his income while in hospital or at work remained the same, unless his pension exceeded compensation, when his income would be reduced by such excess. From the 1st January, 1929, he is granted his full salary plus any allowances to which he may be entitled by way of compensation.
2. Answered by No. 1.

MINING CORPORATION—TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. McGREGOR:

1. What mining corporations, if any, in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, have been exempted by the government from taxation during the past three years?
2. When was such exemption begun and for what period does it extend?
3. Was such exemption given by order in council?
4. Was the proposal to give such exemption from taxation submitted to parliament before being given?
5. Is it not a fact that such corporations, if not so exempted from taxation, would be taxed only on profits?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1 to 4. Taxation is a provincial prerogative. By order in council dated the 13th December, 1910, provision was made that no royalty should be charged on the products of copper mining locations acquired under the provisions of the regulations for the disposal of quartz mining claims on Dominion lands in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Northwest territories and the Yukon territory, for a period of ten years—that is, up to the first day of January, 1921. By order in council dated the 16th December, 1920, the product in copper of the mineral claims at Flin Flon lake in the province of Manitoba were granted an exemption from the payment of royalty on certain conditions for a period of ten years from the 1st January, 1921. At the time these concessions were granted it was not the policy to consult the province on such points. By order in council dated the 25th November, 1927, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, Limited and by order in council of the 10th September, 1928, the Sherritt-Gordon Mines Limited were granted, with the approval of the provincial government, exemption for a period of twenty years from the 1st day of December, 1927, from payment of royalty on products on a limited area of their holdings in the province of Manitoba provided smelters and reduction plants necessary for the development of the property are constructed and such products are treated therein.

5. Yes.

PENITENTIARIES—PADDLING AND SHACKLING

Miss MACPHAIL:

1. How many prisoners in Canadian penitentiaries were paddled in 1928?
2. On whose authority was the paddling done in each case and by whom?
3. How many prisoners in Canadian penitentiaries were shackled to the bar in 1928?
4. On whose authority was the shackling done, and by whom?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. 41.
2. On the authority of the warden by a penitentiary officer under the supervision of the warden and surgeon.
3. 249.

4. On the authority of the warden by a penitentiary officer under the supervision of the deputy warden or chief keeper.

HARBOUR COMMISSION, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. JONES:

1. How many members comprise the board of harbour commissioners of the port of St. John, New Brunswick, and what are the names and addresses of the said commissioners?
2. What is the term of their office?
3. What is the yearly salary paid to each commissioner?
4. How much was paid to each commissioner for the past year as expenses, exclusive of salary?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Three. President, William E. Scully, Saint John, N.B.; commissioner, Robert T. Hayes, Saint John, N.B.; commissioner, Alexander McMillan, Saint John, N.B.
2. During pleasure.
3. William E. Scully, $4,000 per annum; Robert T. Hayes, $3,000 per annum; Alexander McMillan, $3.000 per annum.
4. Hon. W. E. Foster (former president), $441.87; William E. Scully, $423.80; Alexander McMillan, $85.

PENSION DEPARTMENT, REGINA—HEART AND LUNG EXPERT

Mr. IRVINE:

1. Who is the heart and lung expert attached to the Department of Pensions at Regina?
2. When was he appointed?
3. On whose recommendation was he appointed?
4. What salary does he receive?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Dr. John B. Ritchie.
2. Dr. Ritchie was first appointed as medical officer of the Frank sanitorium, under the military hospitals commission, a predecessor of the Department of Pensions and National Health, on the 11th December, 1916. He was subsequently promoted to be medical superintendent of that institution and continued until December, 1918, when he was transferred as medical superintendent of the Bishop Pinkham hospital, Calgary, under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. He resigned that office in October, 1919. He was appointed chest specialist, with headquarters at the office of the department in Regina, in November, 1919.
3. Dr. D. A. Stewart, medical superintendent of Ninette sanitorium, Manitoba, and Dr. B. H. Olson, medical superintendent of the Frank sanitorium, Alberta.
4. $250 per month.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—TRANSFERS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. How many members of the Northwest Mounted Police or the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were transferred from localities west of Port Arthur, Ontario, to localities east of Port Arthur, since 1914?
2. What functions are the members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police performing in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?
3. What functions is it proposed or purposed that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police shall in future perform in these provinces?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. 1914-1919	Nil
1920	272
1921	18
1922	14
1923	31
1924	24
1925	22
1926	32
1927	35
1928	18
1929	16
Total	482

2. In the province of Manitoba—Enforcing federal laws and assisting in the enforcement of provincial laws in the northern part of the province around Hudson bay.

In the province of Saskatchewan—Enforcing federal laws and all provincial statutes in the province.

In the province of Alberta—Enforcing federal laws and assisting in the enforcement of the game laws in the northern part of the province, such as at Fort Chipewyan.

3. There is no information at present which would indicate that there will be any change in the near future in the duties of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in these provinces, as above outlined.

SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG RAILWAY

Mr. BELL (Hamilton):

1. Is the Sydney and Louisburg Railway operating under a dominion charter?
2. Who is the owner of the Sydney and Louisburg Railway?
3. Are the rates of the Sydney and Louisburg Railway subject to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, or to what control are they subject?
4. Does the Sydney and Louisburg Railway benefit by the payments made by the federal government under the Maritime Freight Rates Act, 1927?
5. What total amount has been paid to the Sydney and Louisburg Railway each year since the Maritime Freight Rates Act was instituted?

6. Does the amount of the fund paid to the Sydney and Louisburg Railway cover the traffic represented by the transportation of coal from the mines of the Dominion Coal Company for consumption at the plant of its allied interest the Dominion Iron and Steel Company?

7. Would the refund payments also cover traffic represented by the transportation of coal from the mines of the Dominion Coal Company to their own shipping piers for furtherance by water?

8. What amount has been to paid to the Dominion Coal Company by the Dominion Fuel Board covering bonus of one fifth of one cent (1/5 of 1c.) per ton per mile on shipments of coal from Sydney transhipped by rail to Ontario points? Also on direct shipments by rail from Sydney to Quebec and Ontario points, both in accordance with order in council P.C. 539, dated March 30, 1928?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. No.
2. The Dominion Coal Company.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Six months ending December 31, 1927, $150,408; calendar year, 1928, $277,632.24; calendar year, 1929, no payment yet made.
6. Yes.
7. Yes.
8. (a) Nil; (b) nil.

The payment of 1/5 of 1 cent per ton per mile authorized by order in council of March 30, 1928, (P.C. 539) is paid to the railway companies transporting the coal and not to the operators or coal distributors.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How much did the Dominion government pay by way of steamship subsidies for services to British or foreign countries: (a) in the fiscal year 1921-22; (b) in the fiscal year 1927-28?

2. To what countries are subsidized services now provided?

3. To what countries does the Canadian Government Merchant Marine maintain regular steamship services?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. (a) $751,757.76; (b) $248,107.10.

2. South Africa, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentine Republic, New Zealand, Alaska and the British West Indies.

3.

From Atlantic

Regular sailings during the year:

To London and Antwerp fortnightly in winter, ten-day service in summer.

West Indies:

From Montreal (summer), Halifax (winter)—Fortnightly passenger and freight service to Hamilton, Bermuda; Nassau, Bahamas; Kingston, Jamaica.

From Montreal (summer), Halifax (winter)—Fortnightly freight service to Kingston, Jamaica, direct; connecting steamer between Kingston, Jamaica, and Belize, British Honduras, operating on fortnightly schedule.

From Halifax and St. John (all year round)—Fortnightly passenger and freight service to Bermuda, St. Kitts, Nevis, Antigua, Montserrat, Dominica, St. Lucia, Barbados, St. Vincent, Grenada, Trinidad and Demerara.

From Montreal (summer), from Halifax (summer and winter)—Fortnightly service to Bermuda, Porto Rico, St. Kitts, Antigua, Guadeloupe, Martinique, St. Lucia, Barbados, Grenada, Trinidad, and Demerara.

Australia:

From Montreal (summer), from Halifax (winter)—Three-weekly service.

New Zealand:

From Montreal (summer), from Halifax (winter)—Monthly service.

To Brazil, Uruguay and Argentine, South America:

From Montreal (summer), from Halifax (winter)—Monthly service.

Intercoastal:

Service between eastern and western Canada—From Montreal (summer), from Halifax (winter)—Monthly service.

HARROW EXPERIMENTAL FARM

Mr. GOTT:

1. What was the cost of operating the Harrow, Ontario, experimental farm for the year 1928?

2. What returns did the farm make?

3. Who is the superintendent of the farm?

4. What salary is paid him?

5. Has the government given consideration to the placing of the farm in charge of a Canadian citizen?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. $21,801.23 (Fiscal year ending March 31, 1929).

2. $8,676.50 plus the crop of Burley tobacco as yet unsold; which, however, has been processed and is in storage.

3. Herbert Franklin Murwin, from May 1, 1929.

4. $2,220 plus house.

5. No employee of the government was considered to possess the necessary qualifications for promotion to this position, and consequently the position was advertised, throughout Canada, copies of the advertisement appearing in the Canadian papers being sent also to a number of Americans known to possess the qualifications required. The Civil Service Commission found that no Canadian citizen, possessing the necessary academic

qualifications, together with experience in experimental work and knowledge of tobacco, made application. The only applicant who was properly qualified was Mr. Murwin, who, although an American citizen, had formerly lived in Essex county and had some knowledge of Canadian conditions.

BREAKING ANIMAL QUARANTINE—PROSECUTIONS

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine):

1. Did the Department of Agriculture within the last year prosecute in the courts a case of breaking of animal quarantine in the county of Huntingdon?
2. If so, what was the result?
3. What lawyers represented the department and what amount was paid to each?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Yes.

2. Wm. Morrison and Wm. Greer each were fined $25 and costs, the costs in the case of Wm. Greer being $28.80 and in the case of Wm. Morrison $30.20, or in default fifteen days in gaol. This conviction was appealed and judgment was rendered against the department on a technicality.

3. Numa E. Brossoit, of Valleyfield, Que.

Amount of prosecution.. ..	$368 40
Amount of appeal..	363 20
	$731 60

TUBERCULIN TEST RECORDS—HUNTINGDON

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine):

1. Has the system of keeping the records of the tuberculin test of cattle in book form in the Huntingdon area been discarded?
2. If so, why?
3. In the present test is there a check-up made of all animals previously tested?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Yes.

2. A loose leaf system has been substituted which relieves the veterinary inspector of copying out reports, thus saving time and taking up less space. It reduces the chance of error.

3. Not unless certain conditions are found to exist,—

(a) If animals bear the health of animals branch eartags and pass the tuberculin test no further check is made; (b) If any reactors are found all animals in the herd are checked over and their identity established; (c) If any animals are found without health of animals branch eartags the whole herd is checked over, tested, then quarantined and held under quarantine until a second test is made at the end of 60 days.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

DANVILLE POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine):

1. Is the postmastership of Danville, province of Quebec, at present vacant?
2. If so, who is the temporary or acting postmaster of this office?
3. Was the vacancy advertised by the Civil Service Commission, and when?
4. What are the names of the applicants for the said postmastership, and who is the successful candidate?
5. If the vacancy has not yet been filled, what is the reason for the delay?

Mr. VENIOT:

1. Yes.
2. Alfred Raymond.
3. Yes, from the 5th to 20th October, 1927.
4. The candidates are:

Herbert Stewart Brown.
Melville Lyster Hall.
John Robert McLeod.
James Archibald McCallum.
Joseph Eugène Guilmette.
Louis Lafrance.
Maurice Lussier.
Joseph Masson.
Jude Thibault.
Herbert Harold Robinson.
William S. Dennison.
Joseph Aimé Jutras.
Joseph Ernest Park.

No selection has yet been made.

5. To obtain competent bilingual candidate.

GREAT LAKES LIFE SAVING SERVICE

Mr. COWAN:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries or any other department of the government made any investigation into the cost of providing and maintaining a life saving service on the great lakes, and especially on lake Superior?
2. Has the Dominion of Canada provided any wireless or other life saving equipment on any of the great lakes?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. The view of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for some time has been that the best protection it can give to the men who sail our sea coasts and inland waters, is (1) by providing them with the most up-to-date aids to navigation, accurate charts, lights, fog signals, buoys, radio, etc.; (2) by seeing that their vessels are safe and seaworthy and that they are equipped with adequate life saving appliances and that they are properly manned in so far as qualified certificated officers and engineers are concerned; (3) by broadcasting weather forecasts and storm warnings from its radiotelegraph stations and supplementing these broadcast messages by visual storm

signals. The department is considering the equipment of its service steamer "Murray Stewart" with modern life saving devices and utilizing her as a patrol steamer on lake Superior in the fall of the year.

2. Yes. Radio stations for ship to shore communication are maintained at the following points: Kingston, Toronto, Port Burwell, Point Edward, Midland, Sault Ste. Marie and Port Arthur. A radio beacon station is in operation at Southeast Shoal light station (lake Erie) and further beacon stations will be built and placed in operation this season at: Michipicoten island (lake Superior), Cove island (lake Huron), Long Point (lake Erie), Main Ducks (lake Ontario). At Point Pelee, Ontario, a constant lookout is maintained by the crew of the life saving station an a suitable power boat is under agreement to proceed to any ships in distress.

ICE BREAKING—PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM

Mr. COWAN:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries or any other department of the government entered into a contract with the Dominion Towing and Salvage Company Limited, of Port Arthur, or any other company for ice breaking in the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William for the years 1929 and succeeeding years?

2. Is it the intention of the department to call for tenders for such work, if a contract has not already been entered into?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. The contract covering the fall of 1928 and spring of 1929 was dated 20th November, 1928. All work under this contract has been completed.

2. No decision has been taken in the matter.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

EXPENDITURE ON HARBOURS

Mr. RENNIE:

What amount of money has been spent by the government on the following harbours each year from 1900 to date: (a) Montreal; (b) Quebec; (c) St. John; (d) Toronto; (e) Vancouver; (f) Hamilton; (g) Halifax?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—MR. RICHARDSON

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

For a copy of all correspondence, applications, ratings, and all other documents in the possession of the Civil Service Commission and the Department of National Revenue, together with copy of report of the proceedings and decisions thereof with respect to the appointment of Mr. Richardson, assistant dry goods appraiser at Winnipeg, Manitoba?

AUTOMOBILE SEIZURES AT ATHELSTAN

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine):

For a return showing the number of automobiles seized at the port of Athelstan during the years 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927 and 1928, the name of the parties from whom seized, date of seizure, date of sale, to whom sold, amount received, how long in storage, name of party with whom stored, and amount paid for storage.

PREVENTIVE OFFICERS, PICTOU

Mr. CANTLEY:

For a copy of all correspondence passed during the years 1928 and 1929 between the honourable the Minister of National Revenue or any official of the government and any person or persons in the county of Pictou, Nova Scotia, relating in any way to the removal, replacing or appointment of preventive officers in the east and/or west sections of Pictou county

EXPORT OF WHEAT TO FRANCE AND ITALY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Minister of Finance been advised of an increase of duty on wheat imported into France and also on wheat imported into Italy?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): I have no information regarding Italy; we made inquiry last night but have not yet received advice. We have information as to the increase in France. I think my hon. friend has the memorandum now.

Mr. BENNETT: It is fifty cents a quintal.

Mr. ROBB: Yes. I am sending on the memorandum to the officers of the department to inquire as to how Canada will be affected

Mr. BENNETT: It is over fifty cents a bushel.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

CIVIL SERVICE COUNCILS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Last year the government accepted the proposal to establish civil service councils. May I ask the Minister of Labour when these will come into actual operation?

Hon. PETER HEENAN (Minister of Labour): I expect they will be in operation inside of one month.

SUPPLY—DISMISSALS

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): As I understand that this motion is for the house to go into committee of supply for the purpose of considering the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce, I desire to bring to the attention of the house the case of the dismissal of one Mr. Couture, of St. Bernard, Dorchester county, from his office as inspector of weights and measures, which is under a sub-department or branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I desire at the same time to present facts in connection with this dismissal, which I trust will justify the Minister of Trade and Commerce in granting an inquiry into the charges which have been alleged against this official and which were the grounds for his dismissal. I also intend before closing my address to move an amendment to this motion to go into supply, dealing generally with the matter of dismissals for partisan political activities.

I may state at the outset that in proposing this amendment I am not proposing a vote of want of confidence in the government; I trust that the amendment will so commend itself to the government that they will be prepared to accept it. Paragraph 489 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms makes it clearly apparent that the acceptance of this amendment will not prevent the house from going into committee of supply at the present time. That paragraph reads:

> When an amendment has been adopted to the motion for the house to go into committee of supply or of ways and means, it may be forthwith moved that the house resolve itself into such committee immediately or on a future day.

So that the acceptance of the amendment which I propose would not prevent the house from going into committee of supply on the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

During the last session I had occasion to bring to the attention of the house the case of an official of the Department of National Revenue, one Dumoulin, of Notre Dame des Bois, in the province of Quebec. I wish now to pay tribute to the minister of that department (Mr. Euler) for the manner in which he fulfilled the promise which he made on that occasion. He declared that under the circumstances disclosed in that discussion he believed that Dumoulin should have an opportunity of appearing before a commissioner to prove his innocence of the charges made against him by a member of this parliament. He also stated that, if the innocence of the dismissed employee was proved, he would see, in so far as it lay within his power, that there should be redress—not that the official should be reinstated in office, because the minister held that there was a ruling of the Department of Justice that a minister, after the dismissal of an official, had no power to reappoint him to the same office. But the Minister of National Revenue did declare on that occasion that if on inquiry this official proved his innocence he would have the man reinstated in some other similar office. The minister ordered an inquiry, which was duly held. Evidence was taken and it proved the entire innocence of the dismissed official. I wish to say in commendation of the minister that he did thereupon recommend for appointment the ex-official Dumoulin who had been so dismissed. It is true that Dumoulin on that occasion was compelled again to stand examination before the Civil Service Commission; it is true he was appointed, not to the same but to a similar office; it is probable that although he was proved to be innocent he lost his interest in the superannuation fund to which he had contributed for so many years before his dismissal; and unless the law is changed I do not think there is any doubt that he will lose the priority which he had attained by reason of several years of service in that department—all of which are grave disadvantages accruing from a dismissal which now admittedly had been improperly made.

I have therefore looked into the law with respect to the dismissal of officials, not only in Great Britain but in this country. I find that in Great Britain, as in Canada, the executive and administrative powers of the Privy Council include all those matters which, under our constitution, are entrusted to the sovereign by virtue of the royal prerogative. His Excellency the Governor General acts, in the exercise of that royal prerogative in respect of the domestic affairs of this country, on the advice of the Privy Council of Canada. In Canada those orders in council which are expressed to be made on the recommendation of a committee of the Privy Council and to be approved by the Governor General, make appointments to office, remove from office officials appointed during the pleasure of the crown, and accept resignations and order dismissals from office. We made some slight change from the British procedure by vesting in the Civil Service Commission the

power of making appointments to office, but the right of dismissal is exclusively vested in the governor in council of Canada.

In Great Britain officials holding office during pleasure may be dismissed by order in council without cause being alleged, but, so far as I have ascertained, every official dismissed from office for an alleged breach of the law is not dismissed until a complaint has been made before a court having jurisdiction in the matter and until that court, after having heard witnesses at a trial, has decided either by judge or by judge and jury that the official has been guilty of a breach of the statutes. That is the complete protection which is afforded by the British procedure and by the constiutional practice of that country.

In Canada officials of the civil service may be dismissed for political partisanship as defined by chapter 22 of the revised statutes of Canada, section 55, which reads as follows:

> No deputy head, officer, clerk or employee in the civil service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election if, under the laws governing the said election, he has the right to vote; but no such deputy head, officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work in connection with any such election, or contribute, receive or in any way deal with any money for any party funds.
>
> 2. Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall be dismissed from the civil service.

Another section provides that the dismissal can be made only by order of the governor in council. This statute, which was introduced into our law in 1918, changed the whole status of the civil service of Canada and should have abolished all other practices with regard to dismissals or recommendations for dismissals which theretofore had obtained in this country. It provides, in brief, that a civil service official may vote if he is entitled to the franchise, but he shall not engage in partisan work in connection with any election; he shall not contribute, receive or in any way deal with any money for party funds. Those are the two classes of offences, and the only classes, which constitute political partisanship under our law, in consequence of a breach of which an employee of the civil service may be dismissed. If the governor in council, which is the government of the day, should dismiss an official of the civil service for an alleged act of political partisanship which does not fall within the terms of this provision of the statute, then I suggest that the government itself is responsible for a breach of the law of this country. A mere charge of political partisanship is not sufficient; political partisanship is merely a legal conclusion drawn from certain facts; and in accordance with British justice—and I may add in accordance with Canadian justice—the complainant is bound to state the specific acts which are alleged to constiute political partisanship, as well as the times when and places where the alleged acts were committed, in order to give the accused full information for the preparation of his defence. Of course, any competent person may lay such a charge, whether he be an ordinary citizen, a member of this house or a member of the government of the country.

I do not wish to use strong terms, but certainly it does outrage our sense of justice and right dealing if the individual who prefers a charge against a civil servant should be permitted to sit as judge and jury and to pass judgment upon his own complaint. Our Canadian law and practice now affords, and should afford, complete protection to an official of the service who has faithfully, competently and efficiently performed his duty, against any fictitious charge which may be preferred against him. If the minister of a department demands efficient and loyal service from those under his supervision, as he should, then it is necessary that the minister should see that those officials who give such service receive his protection, as minister of the crown, against all fictitious, false or deceitful charges made against them.

If you take the Civil Service Act and read it together with the Inquiries Act you will find that our procedure implies several conditions: First, the complaint must be made directly or indirectly to the minister of the crown who has been appointed and solemnly sworn to administer the particular department of government in which the accused is employed; second, it is the bounden duty of that minister of the crown to see to it that his officials, from whom he necessarily demands loyal and efficient service, are completely protected against false and malicious charges or complaints, from whatever source they may emanate; third, except in the case of complete admission or confession of guilt, it is impossible for the minister to fulfil his duty and responsibility in the premises except by ensuring that the accused shall be informed of the nature and details of the charge preferred against him, and that the accused also shall be afforded full opportunity to present his defence and prove himself innocent of the complaint or charge made against him; fourth, to that end it is necessary that the minister, personally or through a commissioner appointed for the purpose, should conduct a full and impartial inquiry into the facts alleged and the issues arising out of such allegations; fifth, our statutes have made

full provision for such departmental inquiries. I would refer to the Inquiries Act, which is chapter 99 of the revised statutes of Canada. Section 6 of that act is as follows:

6. The minister presiding over any department of the civil service of Canada, may appoint at any time, under the authority of the governor in council, a commissioner or commissioners to investigate and report upon the state and management of the business, or any part of the business, of such department, either in the inside or outside service thereof, and the conduct of any person in such service, so far as the same relates to his official duties.

The Inquiries Act vests in the commissioner so appointed very large powers. The commissioner may summon witnesses and require them to give evidence on oath, and he may engage counsel to assist and aid him in such inquiries. However, there are certain matters in which our law allows the commissioner no discretion whatever. The Inquiries Act provides as follows:

12. The commissioners may allow any person, whose conduct is being investigated under this act, and shall allow any person against whom any charge is made in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.

13. No report shall be made against any person until reasonable notice shall have been given to him of the charge of misconduct alleged against him and he shall have been allowed full opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel.

Such are the wise provisions of our laws with respect to inquiries into the alleged misconduct of any officer of any department in our civil service. The accused is allowed to be represented by counsel and reasonable notice shall be given to him of the charge of misconduct alleged against him. He shall be allowed full opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel, and the accused is further protected in that even if a report is made against him by the commissioner, in which the minister presiding over that particular department fully concurs, yet the minister may not by his own motion dismiss the accused from his office or employment. The minister can only report the commissioner's findings to the governor in council, and parliament has enacted, for the due protection of the civil servant, a provision that he may be dismissed only by order of the governor in council, that is, by the government of the day upon whom the legal and moral duty and responsibility is placed of assuring to the accused that he has been fully protected in his rights and privileges under the law, including the full opportunity to present his defence and to prove his innocence of the charges of misconduct preferred against him.

I do not wish to take up the time of the house in going fully into the law, but I suggest that it might be considered by the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe). If an order in council dismissing an official alleges a case which is not true in fact, that official has the right to proceed to the courts and have the order in council set aside. It is obvious in the case of a civil servant who is receiving a small salary of $1,000 or $1,500 per year that through his very impecuniosity he is denied access to the courts for relief against the order in council affecting his dismissal, where it has been procured by deceit, misrepresentation or through any obvious error.

In the case of Dumoulin, which I have just discussed, I think the action of the minister of the crown was entirely commendable—I know that was the opinion which prevailed throughout the length and breadth of the province from which I come, and in many other provinces—and as a result the civil servants with small salaries and humble positions have a confidence, which they did not have heretofore, in the loyalty to their interests of the chief of their department when they are performing their duties efficiently and honestly. It gave to them a new faith and confidence that justice would prevail in the civil service of Canada whenever the facts were brought to the notice of the minister presiding over any department of the civil service.

It was alleged in that case that an official having been dismissed, his reappointment could not be made because appointments must necessarily emanate from the Civil Service Commission. I have looked into the law in that respect and I differ decidedly from the position which has been taken. The report of the Department of Justice was correct in view of the facts presented to it, as to whether the head of a department could appoint to the civil service a dismissed official, but that is not the real issue. The real issue was whether or not, when an order in council had been passed under a misapprehension or misrepresentation, or through any other error, the governor in council of itself had the inherent right to amend its own order or to rescind its own order which had been obtained through misstatements of facts or other errors. I find that in England and in this country the governor in council has an inherent right to rescind its own order when it has been improperly obtained, or to amend and modify it so that it may express the real facts upon which it is founded, and that inherent right has been exercised time and time again in the history of this country during the last sixty years. Incoming governments have reversed the decisions of their predecessors, and governments, on

ascertainment of the real facts, have rescinded their own orders in council and have modified them and amended them, and that is the modus operandi in which mistakes can be and should be remedied.

This case which I am now approaching appeals to me because the dismissed official had been some fourteen years fulfilling the duties of his office. He has sent to me commendation after commendation from his superior officers approving of the honesty and efficiency and zeal with which he had performed his duty. He was a man of very modest salary; he had children of his own and he had adopted three other children of a brother who was deceased, and had large family responsibilities placed upon him. His being cast on the street at his age and after so many years of service was a misfortune which few of us, who do not live in lowly circumstances, can fully apprehend. For many years I was one of the executive heads of a large construction works employing thousands and even tens of thousands of men. It has been my duty to be at the bedside of many men just as they were passing into eternity from the ravages of a disease or the result of an accident. Contrary to the ordinary view, I never found a man who seemed to be worried very much about his own soul's salvation. What that man was worrying about was his own wife and children in some foreign land, from which he had come to engage in these works, and who were dependent upon his salary for their well-being. The one thing that he represented to me on his deathbed was: How can my wife and bairns live when I pass out? I have seen other young men from distant lands who seemed to be wild and reckless youths, but who, on their deathbeds, were not concerned about their souls' salvation; each one was wondering how some aged parent, father or mother, in a distant land could survive, if deprived of the contributions which he or she received from his weekly or monthly wage. Therefore I say that dismissals of this kind come home to the families of those dismissed as a cruel misfortune which, if they believe it to be unjust, not only wounds the spirit of the man but wipes out his confidence in the justice of his fellowmen. It must be admitted that justice is the aim and end of all good government, of all efficient and honest administration in this country. Therefore, on this ground I intend to call your attention to the particular facts of the case of Couture.

The documents have been brought down by the minister in compliance with an order of the house. The first letter which is from the Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, is dated February 15, 1927, and reads as follows:

My Dear Colleague:

I beg to recommend the immediate dismissal of Mr. Hypolite Couture of St. Bernard, Dorchester county, P.Q., inspector of weights and measures in the Department of Trade and Commerce, on account of active political partisanship in the course of the three last federal elections and notably that of 1926—and that of my personal knowledge.

I trust you may see your way clear to grant this request.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Lucien Cannon.

Honourable James Malcolm,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

Let me direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to that complaint. I am not intending in this discussion to make any partisan recriminations whatsoever. I simply wish to get to the real facts of the case, in the hope that the government of the day may see it in somewhat the same light as I see it and resolve to make just amends. This letter is dated February 15, 1927. The election of 1921 was held on December 17 of that year and five years and two months had elapsed before the charge was made. I suggest that although there is no statute of limitations, still there should be some limitation of time within which charges of political partisanship should be brought. The election of 1925 was held on October 29 of that year, so that one year and four months had elapsed. If the charge of political partisanship, which is spread over all those general elections in a term of more than five years, refers particularly to the election of December 14, 1926, five months had elapsed since that election took place. This is a charge of active political partisanship. I suggest that under the statute an official may be dismissed for actively engaging in partisan work in connection with such election, but it is due to an accused official that the facts indicating political partisanship should be stated so that he may have warning of the grounds of the accusation made against him. A mere charge of political partisanship is merely a legal conclusion; it involves no facts whatsoever. Shortly thereafter I find a communication from the Minister of Trade and Commerce to His Excellency the Governor General in council, file No. 24584:

The Department of Trade and Commerce
Canada

To His Excellency the Governor General
in Council:

The undersigned begs to recommend that Inspector C. H. Couture of the weights and measures branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce, of St. Bernard, Dorchester

county, P.Q., be dismissed from the service on account of active political partisanship in the course of the three last federal elections, the said dismissal to take effect on March 1 next.

In connection therewith, the undersigned begs to attach hereto a letter received from the Honourable the Solicitor General, member for Dorchester, under date of February 15, stating that Mr. Couture has been guilty of active political partisanship, to his own personal knowledge.

(Signed) James Malcolm,
Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Ottawa, February 26, 1927.

On March 2, 1927, the Minister of Trade and Commerce writes to the Solicitor General as follows:

Honourable Lucien Cannon, M.P.,
Solicitor General,
Ottawa.

My Dear Colleague:

I have your letter of the 15th ultimo, recommending the immediate dismissal of Mr. Hypolite Couture, of St. Bernard, Dorchester county, P.Q., inspector of weights and measures, on account of active political partisanship in the course of the last three federal elections, to your personal knowledge.

In accordance with your request, I am recommending his dismissal to council.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) James Malcolm.

I then find an order in council which was passed on March 4, 1927, dismissing Couture from the service, the said dismissal to take effect on March 1, 1927. I will not take the time to read it. The next communication is dated March 4, 1927—a telegram from the Department of Trade and Commerce, reading as follows:

J. A. W. LeBel,
District Inspector of Weights and Measures,
Quebec, P.Q.

Have received instructions that Inspector Couture dismissed March first—Writing—notify Couture.

(Signed) E. O. Way,
Director.

I am skipping some of these telegrams, but on March 5, 1927, the director of weights and measures wrote to Mr. Couture as follows: This is in French. I have made a translation and personally I stand responsible for the translation. I think it is fair and correct.

March 5, 1927.

Mr. C. H. Couture,
Inspector of Weights and Measures,
St. Bernard, County of Dorchester,
Que.

Sir:

Following instructions received from the ministry I telegraphed yesterday evening to the inspector of the LeBel district as follows:

"Have received instructions that Inspector Couture dismissed March 1. Writing. Notify Couture."

This confirms my telegram and according to the ministerial order relating to your dismissal you are accused of political partisanship.

[Mr. Cahan.]

Under these circumstances I cannot do otherwise than to request you to remit your equipment, your stamps and your contingent fund to Mr. LeBel, who will give you a receipt for everything.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) E. O. Way,
Director of Weights and Measures.

Upon the receipt of this letter Mr. Couture wrote to Mr. LeBel, the district inspector, as follows—this is also a translation which I made:

Quebec, March 10, 1927.

Mr. J. A. W. LeBel,
District Inspector,
Quebec.

Sir:

I have received with the most profound regret the letter of Mr. Way, director of weights and measures, informing me that I was dismissed from the service for cause of political partisanship.

I therefore appeal to you to declare if ever you have been witness of any such conduct on my part, and if I have not always performed my duties as inspector of weights and measures to your satisfaction and to that of the department.

It seems to me that the department, under these circumstances, ought, at least, to give me an opportunity to vindicate myself and to grant a complete inquiry, which will bring to the light of day the real ground for any such accusation.

I send you a letter which I pray you to please deliver to Mr. Way, in which I request such an inquiry, and I urge you to please support my request.

I have always done my duty, according to my conscience, and I owe to my family, as I desire to prove to the department, that I am completely innocent of any such accusation.

Hoping that my humble request will receive the consideration of the officials of the department, and subscribing myself with this confidence,

Yours very sincerely,
(Sgd.) Chas. H. Couture.

On the same date, Mr. Couture addressed Mr. Way himself, as follows:

Trade and Commerce
Canada

Weights and Measures Inspection Service

Quebec, March 10, 1927.

Mr. E. O. Way,
Director of Weights and Measures,
Ottawa.

Sir:

I have received the 7th instant, your official letter informing me that I was dismissed from my services as inspector of weights and measures for cause of political partisanship.

I must tell you at once that this charge is without foundation. Not believing that I am guilty of any such infringement of the conduct which every civil employee ought to have, and as every accused, according to the common law, has the right to be heard in his own defence, before being found guilty, I come to solicit from the department that an inquiry may be instituted in regard to my case, and if the

proof really establishes findings of political partisanship it will then be necessary for me to bear all the responsibility.

I supplicate you then to be pleased to submit my humble request to the officials of the department, or other officials of the civil service, and I hope that this inquiry will be accorded in all justice and equity.

I remain, sir,

Your very humble servant,

(Signed) Chas. H. Couture.

These letters being received on March 11, on that date Mr. Way, acting officially as inspector of weights and measures, sent this letter to the deputy of the Department of Trade and Commerce:

To F. C. T. O'Hara, Esq.
Department of Trade and Commerce

Ottawa, March 11, 1927.

Inspector C. H. Couture

Herewith please find two letters from Inspector C. H. Couture, recently dismissed, one addressed to me and one to Mr. LeBel, district inspector of Quebec.

Shortly put, Mr. Couture denies that he is guilty of political partisanship, and requests that an inquiry be held into his conduct.

In his last paragraph to me he says:—

"I will ask you to be good enough to submit my humble request for an inquiry to the authorities of the department, and I hope this inquiry will be granted in all justice and fairness."

(Sgd.) E. O. Way,
Director of W. and M.

The deputy minister of the department on March 14 wrote to the Minister of Trade and Commerce a letter in which he enclosed these letters which I have just read and called attention to the dismissal from the service of Mr. Couture. That letter reads as follows:

Ottawa, March 14, 1927.

Inspector C. H. Couture of
Weights and Measures, St. Bernard, Que.

Inspector C. H. Couture of the weights and measures branch at St. Bernard, Dorchester county, Quebec, was recently dismissed from the service on account of active political partisanship, at the request of Hon. Lucien Cannon.

Mr. Way, director of weights and measures, reports that he has received two letters from Inspector Couture since his dismissal, which I attach hereto.

In brief, Mr. Couture denies that he is guilty of political partisanship and requests that an inquiry be held into his conduct.

(Signed) F. C. T. O'Hara,
Deputy Minister.

I submit to this house and to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that having received immediately a protestation of innocence such as was contained in the letter submitted to him by his deputy, and asking for an inquiry into the facts, it was his moral duty to take advantage of the authority vested in him by the Inquiries Act and to have proceeded to obtain the appointment of a commissioner to inquire into the facts which constituted or were alleged to constitute political partisanship in this case. Instead of that, the Minister of Trade and Commerce writes to his colleague the Solicitor General on March 17, 1927, as follows:

Honourable Lucien Cannon, M.P.,
Solicitor General,
Ottawa.

My dear Colleague:

As you are aware, at your request, on the grounds of political partisanship to your knowledge, an order in council has been passed, dismissing Inspector C. H. Couture of the weights and measures branch of this department.

I enclose herewith two letters which Mr. Couture has since written, one to Inspector Labelle of the Quebec district and the other to Mr. Way, director of weights and measures, here.

Will you please advise me at your earliest convenience if you are willing to have an inquiry granted.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) James Malcolm.

I suggest that, when a complaint of this nature has been preferred against a member of the civil service, the minister of the department in which that official is engaged should not apply to the complainant to ascertain as to whether the complainant is agreeable to an inquiry into the facts alleged by the complainant. I suggest to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, for whom I have the highest esteem, that that was not what might reasonably have been expected of him as head of the department in dealing with this complaint. The reply to that letter is as follows:

Office of the Solicitor General
Canada

Ottawa, March 21, 1927.

My dear Colleague:

I am in receipt of yours of March the 17th with reference to the dismissal of Mr. C. H. Couture, inspector of weights and measures, in the Department of Trade and Commerce, together with Mr. Couture's letters written to Mr. Way, director of weights and measures, and Inspector Labelle of the Quebec district.

I am returning herewith Mr. Couture's letters for your file and may say that I do not think an inquiry into this matter necessary to corroborate the statement I have already made.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) Lucien Cannon.

Hon. James Malcolm,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

Now Couture had clearly asserted his innocence and had requested an inquiry. He had, I suggest, the moral, constitutional and legal right to be heard in his own defence, and that right should not have been denied him. He was entitled, I submit, to show that the Solicitor General no matter how high placed that office is—I have every respect for

the office and every respect for the present incumbent of it, and I am not going to exaggerate my statements with words of bitterness at all—he had a right to show that the Solicitor General had misapprehended the real facts or that he had been misinformed or that he had made his recommendations in error. He had a right to receive from the Minister of Trade and Commerce an inquiry which would enable him to elicit the real facts on which that accusation was based, because it must be admitted that even the Solicitor General is not endowed with omniscience, that even he may at times be misinformed.

Mr. CANNON: It is not a case of being misinformed. I was witness to the act of partisanship.

Mr. CAHAN: Then I will say it is not impossible, as I believe in this case, that if the hon. Solicitor General was a witness his own eyes deceived him.

Mr. POULIOT: Were you a witness yourself?

Mr. CAHAN: I was not, but I have read some of the evidence. I think it at least establishes a prima facie case to that end, and is sufficient to induce the Minister of Trade and Commerce to institute an inquiry into the real facts of the case, so that they may at least be known.

Now, Mr. Couture was dismissed by order in council as from March 1. But as he was away performing his duties, proceeding from one village to another throughout the district, they could not find him for several days, and so the Minister of Trade and Commerce, taking advantage of the inherent right of the governor in council to amend and modify, or even to rescind, its own orders, asked that the order be amended on the grounds that:

> as this employee was out on inspection work it was impossible to get in touch with him until one o'clock p.m. on Saturday, March 5; and that in addition, this officer had to come to Quebec on Monday, March 7, to hand in his equipment, revenue stamps, the money collected the previous week, and the balance of his contingent fund—

Therefore the Minister of Trade and Commerce:

> begs to recommend that the date of Mr. Couture's dismissal be changed from March 1, 1927, to March 8, 1927.

An order in council to that effect was passed on April 4, 1927. There is one man in the department—I do not know him, I never came in contact with him—who at least is a just man, and this letter indicates it:

[Mr. Cahan.]

> Department of Trade and Commerce,
> Ottawa, April 21, 1927.
>
> H. B. Borbridge, Esq.,
> Chief Accountant.
>
> Re ex-Inspector C. H. Couture,
> Retirement Fund.
>
> With regard to the above and the refund of Couture's superannuation moneys, the act apparently only withholds such repayment where there is misconduct. Apparently misconduct can be interpreted to include political partisanship —as this is an offence for which an officer can be dismissed from the service, but it seems to me that when a man has lost his position on this latter charge, the government hardly desires to add deprivation of the officer's contributions from salary to superannuation. Misconduct in relation to dismissal usually implies a moral offence, such as a breach of trust, dishonesty, unauthorized absentations, etc., but on this score Mr. Couture has a perfectly clean record.
>
> It seems to me then that a submission might be made to council seeking payment to Couture of his superannuation fund contributions on the above lines.
>
> E. O. Way,
> Director of Weights and Measures.

Then on April 22, 1927, the Minister of Trade and Commerce makes a recommendation to His Excellency the Governor General in council to that effect. In the memorandum attached he shows that Couture had been first provisionally and later permanently appointed, that his service at the retirement date was thirteen years, two months and eight days, and that he had contributed to the superannuation fund $401.91. Then the case goes before the treasury board and they recommend this repayment to Couture.

Mr. BENNETT: Was it paid to him?

Mr. CAHAN: The correspondence shows that some months later a cheque was sent to Couture, but he returned it and said he had reason to believe that an inquiry would be granted which would lead to his reinstatement in the service, and that he did not wish to accept the cheque. It was returned by him, and so far as I can ascertain it is now held by the Finance department awaiting the decision as to his application for an inquiry.

Mr. POULIOT: So he was not much in need of money?

Mr. CAHAN: He was not much in need of money! There are a few men in this world who have more regard for their reputation, for their personal honour, than for the mere pittance which they receive from the superannuation fund of this government.

The next letter is from Couture himself, and is also a translation which I personally made. It is as follows:

St. Bernard, July 28, 1927.

The Honourable J. Malcolm,
Minister of Commerce,
Ottawa.

Mr. Minister:

The 7th of March last, for cause of political partizanship, I was dismissed from my duties as inspector of weights and measures, a position which I have occupied since December, 1913, and for which I had obtained my permanent appointment in June, 1914.

The 10th of March last, I addressed a letter to Mr. E. O. Way, director of weights and measures, requesting him to submit my case to you and to the Department in which I urged that an inquiry should be granted to me, in order to provide me with facilities for proving my innocense of the accusations made against me, and of which I am ready to give you full explanation. This letter has remained without reply, and, for your information, I submit to you the enclosed copy.

It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that, by virtue of the British law, a permanent employee, even if he is culpable, has the right to an inquiry, especially when he has fulfilled, to the satisfaction of his superior officers, all his duties, during fourteen years.

I would remind you that I have contributed to the pension funds and that I have an insurance of ten thousand dollars ($10,000) in the insurance of the civil service, an insurance which I pay in favour of my wife and of my five children, in case of accident.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that an appeal to your spirit of justice justifies me in demanding an inquiry, and I will submit to the consequences of it, if it is unfavourable to my pretensions.

While awaiting a favourable reply to my request, please accept the expression of my most sincere sentiments.

I have the honour to be,

Mr. Minister,

Your very devoted servant,

Chas. H. Couture.

On August 16, 1927, the following letter was despatched to Mr. Couture from the office of the Minister of Trade and Commerce:

August 16, 1927.

Charles H. Couture, Esq.,
St. Bernard, Que.

Dear Sir:

I am desired by the Honourable James Malcolm to let you know that your letter of the 28th ultimo asking for an inquiry into the question of your dismissal as inspector of weights and measures for the district of Quebec on the grounds of political partisanship has been duly received.

In reply the minister desires me to say that as you were dismissed on the recommendation of one of his colleagues of the government, who had personal knowledge of the situation, he does not see that any good purpose can be served in reopening the matter. He notes that you have taken your refund of contributions to the superannuation fund, and he therefore regards the whole matter as closed.

Yours faithfully,

R. O. Campney,
Private Secretary.

The minister was under an obvious misapprehension with regard to Couture's acceptance of the superannuation fund, but I presume he had been so informed. In this letter the Minister of Trade and Commerce urges that no good purpose could be served by instituting an inquiry. Couture had performed his official duties for nearly fourteen years, enjoying the full confidence of his superior officials and receiving every evidence of their approbation. Now, is it not the bounden duty of the minister at the head of a department who enjoys the loyal support and faithful cooperation of his subordinate officials, to protect them against all charges of misconduct which are not duly supported by evidence? And when such an official asks for an inquiry, protesting his innocence, I suggest to the minister, does it not serve a good purpose, in fact is it not essential to the proper administration of the department, that that official should have full opportunity to vindicate his reputation as a loyal officer and to prove his innocence of the charge preferred against him? I have another letter from Mr. Couture replying to this letter signed by the minister's private secretary. I have had it translated and it reads as follows:

St. Bernard, August 25, 1927.

Honourable minister:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th instant, by the intervention of your private secretary, telling me that I have been dismissed from my duties of inspector of weights and measures, upon the recommendation of one of your colleagues in the government who claims to have personal knowledge of the facts. Permit me to say that I am in a position to affirm, with proof for its support, that the Hon. Lucien Cannon has purely and simply been led into error by jealous and malicious persons who covet my position.

I have informed the Hon. Lucien Cannon of all this affair, and I have reason to expect that with the information which I have given to him, he will do justice in granting me the inquiry which I claim.

I have the honour to be Mr. Minister,

Your obedient servant,

Chas. H. Couture.

The Honourable James Malcolm,
Minister of Commerce,
Ottawa, Ont.

I have another document which was not brought down by the department. Whether it was sent to the Solicitor General—because the correspondence in the department

of the Solicitor General has not been brought down—or whether it was sent to the Minister of Trade and Commerce or his deputy, I am not in a position for the moment to affirm. But it is an affidavit of Mr. Couture, a translation of which I have made:

I, the undersigned, Chas. H. Couture, ex-inspector of weights and measures of St. Bernard (Dorchester) declare solemnly that on the 5th of September, 1926, I was present at a public meeting which took place at the public hall in the vicinity of my residence, and that I listened to the speakers, who succeeded each other, with all the respect which I have always given to our public men.

During the speech of the Hon. Lucien Cannon—

It certainly should not be an act of political partisanship, when the Solicitor General is holding a meeting on a public street beside the residence of an official, that that official should step out on that public street to listen to the words of wisdom and eloquence which come from the lips of the minister. Admittedly, however, this man did so.

During the speech of the Hon. Lucien Cannon, a group of young lads, among which I recognized the three young brothers Fontaine, (Armand, Laurier and Daniel) of a very Liberal family, came to mingle with the young girls of the village, of which there were two of mine, adopted daughters, aged respectively ten and eleven years.

I ask the house to note the ages—ten and eleven.

They made a certain noise, which nevertheless did not disturb the meeting. Since these infants were about a hundred feet from the throng, and seeing my niece approaching in my yard,—

His own lawn was a few feet away from where the public meeting was being held—

I knew that she came to restore good order, and it was for that reason that I remained in my place.

The following day, the 6th of September, I was present at a meeting held in the interior of the public hall, by the Conservative candidate, Mr. Robert Cote. Having entered one of the last into the hall, on account of the absence of the mayor, they asked me twice to preside at the meeting. I categorically refused, adding the last time that: "I do not mix myself in such matters."

I did not utter a word during the address, except that being one of the first to leave, I said to a woman that it is growing warm. She replied, "It is warm". I replied: "Pardon Madam, I said it is growing warm".

Evidently the suggestion was that his active partisanship consisted in the statement that the Solicitor General had rather a poor reception in the village.

Mr. CANNON: He is not referring to my meeting at all; he must have reference to the Conservative meeting.

[Mr. Cahan.]

Mr. CAHAN: Then he should not be dismissed for saying, "It is growing warm," referring to the atmosphere, even though someone who overheard his remark sent broadcast the scandal that he was saying that the Solicitor General had received a warm reception at the meeting.

I have never again seen Mr. Robert Cote; I have never spoken to him since that day.

I have been connected with the civil service since 1913, and from that date I have never been present at any other meeting in my county during the electoral campaigns, excepting those which took place in my parish,

And I have signed,

Chas. H. Couture.

Sworn before me at Quebec,
this 17th day of September, 1927,
Aurele Leclerc, N.P.

I suggest, as that is the ground for the charge, that it is not active political partisanship for a member of the civil service to stand on a public street and listen to the orations of the Solicitor General. There is another affidavit, the translation of which was made not by myself but by one of the officials of Hansard while I was busy making the other. It reads:

I the undersigned, Tharsille Ouellette, domiciled at St. Bernard of Dorchester, solemnly declare that on Sunday, September 5th, 1927, at a political meeting held in the public hall (opposite the residence of Mr. Louis Goulet, sr., our neighbour) I was in charge of the house of my foster-father (Chas. H. Couture, inspector of weights and measures), my aunt having left to accompany her daughter and niece, boarders at the monastery of the Ursulines at Quebec.

My uncle was at the meeting. I was in the house busying myself with preparing the dinner. I went out for a few moments to listen to the speech of the Hon. Lucien Cannon. I walked up to the gates of our lawn located at a distance of about 125 feet from the public hall. My two little cousins aged 10 and 11 years (adopted daughters of my uncle, Chs. H. C.) whom I was looking after, were on the sidewalk in the midst of a crowd of Liberal and Conservative small boys and girls, among whom were the three little brothers Fontaine, who were laughing and by their gestures wished to ridicule the speakers and their speeches. I could hardly believe my eyes seeing the little Fontaine, belonging to a well known Liberal family, acting thus.

My first care was to bring back my little cousins to our house and twice ask the others to keep quiet and allow the people to listen in peace to the speakers, adding that it was not nice on their part to act that way.

From there the little Fontaine went with little Goulet (Conservative) to a limousine which was stopped in front of our home and in which was a small boy about ten years old; thinking that he was "a little Cannon," according to them, they began to throw apple cores at him and even to spit on him. The poor child tried in vain to protect himself.

This roused me, so going up to that automobile, I sent the little rascals away, happy at having set free the little boy who fortunately was not a Cannon, as I learned later. Returning to our lawn, I continued listening to the speeches in company with the two little girls which were under my care.

During the dinner I told everything to my uncle who told me: "If you had not done so, I think I would have flogged you."

And I have signed,

Tharsille Ouellette.

Sworn before me at St. Bernard this 6th day of October, 1927,

J. M. Fortin, N.P.

I have here a letter which was sent to the Hon. Lucien Cannon. This also is a translation by one of the Hansard reporters:

St. Maxime de Scott, Que.,
October 12, 1927.

To the Hon. Lucien Cannon,
Solicitor General.

Sir:

Enclosed please find the affidavit of Miss Tharsille Ouellette, niece of Mr. Hippolyte Couture, also a copy of the letter of the ex-parish priest of St. Bernard, the Rev. Abbe Turcotte.

Mr. Luc St. Pierre will write to you with reference to this matter, if he has not already done so.

I have a copy of that letter, which is along the same line.

All this can be added to the request of the Liberal leaders of Dorchester with a view of reinstating Mr. H. Couture in his old position of inspector of weights and measures.

I have also a petition along the same line signed by eighty or ninety of the leading Liberals of the county of Dorchester, merchants, notaries and others of the utmost respectability, praying the Solicitor General to institute an inquiry into this dismissal. The letter proceeds:

As I have had the honour of telling you, sir, it is our conviction to all of us that it would be to the credit of the Liberal party and to your own, sir, to carry out this act of justice. My continuous travelling through this region, especially in Dorchester, makes it very clear to me that all our Liberal leaders of any importance, are unanimous in wanting this thing done. Without any doubt this civil servant enjoyed the esteem and trust of everybody. Many complain of the manner in which Lambert puts the case; they are indignant at the way he runs Mr. Couture down. They even speak of ejecting him should he come forward again. We are convinced that it is but jealousy and petty interests that have conspired against the victim and led you astray. I have no need of recalling —you are as well aware as we are—the unfortunate situation in which this affair places Mr. Couture and his respectable family. Mr. Lambert boasts of being the only one who can within 24 hours have Mr. Couture reinstated. I for one am far from having such great confidence in my humble power. On the contrary I am convinced that the only one who can do it, and do it easily (considering the request and all the documents in his possession), is you, sir.

Allow me, sir, in closing my letter to assure you of my humble and very sincere devotion,

Rosario LeBel.

Next is a letter from the parish priest; this is also a translation, which I fancy I made myself, although I am not sure:

St. Bernard, Co., Dorchester,
March 16, 1927.

To The Honourable Lucien Cannon,
Privy Councillor and Solicitor General.

Sir,—I wish to ask a favour which I know you can grant in all justice.

Mr. Chas. Couture, my parishioner, has just received notice of his dismissal as inspector of weights and measures, without even being granted the means of vindicating himself. I have always known him as a good father of a family and honest citizen and this position allowed him to bring up a large family. He has moreover taken upon himself responsible obligations, such as a life insurance in the civil service and at his age he now finds himself on the street.

I wish to ask you as a minister of justice to grant him at least an inquiry. He will bear all the responsibilities and, as a man of the legal profession, who has always had to vindicate righteousness either at the bar or in parliament, I beg of you to kindly accede to my humble request. From such an inquiry, justice will be satisfied and your high reputation as the representative of our county will be enhanced.

I am, sir,
Your very humble servant,
(Sgd.) J. P. Turcotte,
Parish priest.

On October 17, 1927, the Solicitor General wrote Mr. LeBel as follows; this is also a translation:

Ottawa, Oct. 17, 1927.

Dear Mr. LeBel,

I beg to acknowledge your letter dated October 12, attached to a statement sworn by Miss Tharsille Oullette with reference to Mr. Hippolyte Couture.

Be assured that these communications will receive my best attention.

I am,
Sincerely yours,
(Sgd) Lucien Cannon.

Mr. R. LeBel,
St. Maxime de Scott,
County of Dorchester.

A year after his dismissal Couture received a cheque for $401.92, representing his contributions to the pension fund. He immediately returned the cheque, and the department were somewhat troubled to know what to do with it; finally they sent it back. On March 7, 1928, Mr. Couture wrote as follows:

St. Bernard, March 7, 1928.

Sir,—I have the honour to return to you under this cover the cheque No. 1621 of the amount of $401.91, being my contribution to the pension funds. This cheque has been returned to me by the chief accountant of the Department of Commerce.

I should tell you that I have had the honour of having an interview with the Honourable Lucien Cannon the 3rd instant. He has told me that he would request the Honourable James Malcolm to grant me the inquiry which I claim, then it will decide whether I ought to be reinstated in my duties as inspector of weights and measures. This is the reason why I return to you my cheque.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd) Chas. H. Couture.

To the Deputy Minister,
Department of Commerce,
Ottawa, Ont.

Then on March 29, 1928, the Solicitor General wrote the Minister of Trade and Commerce as follows:

Solicitor General
Canada
Ottawa, March 29, 1928.

Personal.

Re: C. H. Couture, former Inspector of Weights and Measures, Quebec.

My dear Colleague:

Referring to our previous correspondence relative to the above-named,—I beg to say that representations have been made to me by Mr. Couture himself, and by his friends on his behalf. Under the circumstances, therefore, I have no objection to an inquiry being granted him.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) Lucien Cannon.

Hon. James Malcolm,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

I wish to commend the Solicitor General for writing that letter; it indicates that the evidence which I have submitted to the house, and which previously had been submitted to him, had some influence. However, it will be noted that he says he has no objection to an inquiry; under the circumstances would it not have been equally commendable, if not more so, if the Solicitor General had insisted that an inquiry be granted? It seems to me that such a course on his part would have been far more consistent with the traditions of the high office which he holds. On April 17, 1928, the Minister of Trade and Commerce replied:

April 17, 1928.

Confidential.
Honourable Lucien Cannon, K.C., M.P.,
Solicitor General,
Ottawa.

My dear Colleague:

I have your letter of the 29th ultimo written in connection with the dismissal of Mr. C. H. Couture, formerly in the weights and measures inspection service at Quebec. With reference to this matter I may say that the deputy minister took the question of his possible reinstatement up with the Department of Justice in February last, assuming that such a step might result from an investigation of the case, but he was informed that this procedure was impossible.

[Mr. Cahan.]

I enclose herewith copy of the letter written by my deputy minister and the reply thereto from the Deputy Minister of Justice. It would not seem possible, therefore, to open this matter at this late date.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) James Malcolm.

I do not think it is necessary for me to read the letter written by Mr. O'Hara, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, to the Department of Justice; the important thing is the reply of the Deputy Minister of Justice:

Ottawa, February 28, 1928.

410/28

Dear Sir:

I have the honour to reply to your letter of the 18th instant relative to the question whether a former official of your department who was dismissed from the service by order in council on the ground of having been guilty of political partisanship, can now be reinstated, or whether he will have to apply for a position in the usual course.

I may say, in reply, that if the order in council dismissing this employee has taken effect from its own date mentioned therein, there is no power in the governor in council to reinstate the employee so dismissed and he cannot reenter the service except by appointment under the Civil Service Act or by virtue of special parliamentary authority.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) W. Stuart Edwards,
D. M. J.

F. C. T. O'Hara, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

I suggest to the Minister of Justice that his deputy missed the real point of the question which he was called upon to decide. It is obvious that the Minister of Trade and Commerce could not appoint an official to his department either originally or a second time after he had been dismissed, but the real point was whether or not the Privy Council of Canada, or the governor in council, has the inherent power to rescind, modify or amend an order in council which it has passed under a misapprehension of fact. If an inquiry showed that the Solicitor General, in making this complaint, had been deceived by the reports and rumours which were current, or even that he had not worn his farseeing glasses that day and had been deceived by his own imperfect eyesight, once the governor in council is convinced that a wrong has been done and an order in council issued based upon a misapprehension of facts, then the governor in council has the inherent power to remedy that defect by rescinding the order in council.

I have no wish to weary the house, but I desire to place on record one other letter, which is also a translation:

St. Bernard,
April 30, 1928.

The Honourable Lucien Cannon,
Solicitor General,
Ottawa.

Mr. Minister:

Permit me to importune you one last time.

You have dismissed me as inspector of weights and measures, the 1st of March, 1927, for political partisanship.

I have received the official advice of my dismissal the 5th of March, and, the 10th of the month, I have requested an inquiry of Mr. Way, director of weights and measures, who has not replied.

Since then a great number of your friends and of mine have written you in my favour, declaring to you that never, to their knowledge, have I done an act of political partisanship.

To the curé of Scott you have replied the 9th of March, that you regretted that which had befallen me, that my conduct in the last electoral campaigns had compelled you to adopt the attitude which you have taken. You declare again in this letter that I have encouraged your adversary to insult your family, your wife, and yourself. The curé replied to you that he himself had made an inquiry and that he had soon ascertained that my dismissal was an affair arranged and decided in advance by those who boasted of making me lose my position to obtain it afterwards.

There was a caucus with young Blais of St. Bernard to decide upon my dismissal. At this caucus, amongst others, Mr. Rosaria LeBel and Arthur Giroux of Scott assisted.

Now, you well know the opinions of Mr. LeBel regarding me; as to Mr. Giroux his name appears among the eighty and more names who have requested of you my reinstatement; he has said and repeated that he was deceived.

I, myself, have procured the delivery to you of sworn declarations denying absolutely and categorically that I have meddled in any way whatever with politics since 1913.

As you do not appear to have faith in the declarations of your friends and mine, I have requested an inquiry, this time of Mr. Foran, the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, who has replied to me that the commission cannot intervene and telling me to address myself to the Deputy Minister of Commerce.

I thereupon requested this inquiry of the Hon. J. Malcolm, the 20th of July last. He replied by his secretary on August 10th that inasmuch as I was dismissed upon the recommendation of one of his colleagues, who personally knew the situation, he did not deem it expedient to open an inquiry; that otherwise, I had accepted my cheque for the amount of my contribution to the pension funds, and that he considered the matter closed. Then this cheque I have twice returned; it is now at the Department of Finance, awaiting that the question may be considered.

In the course of an interview which I had with you, on March 3rd last, you asked me to choose whether I desired you to concern yourself with my pension or with an inquiry, adding that I was not obliged to reply immediately, that an inquiry might cause me surprises.

I immediately replied to you that I desired an inquiry.

The 25th of April last, your secretary wrote to me that you had no objection to this inquiry being granted, but that the Hon. Mr. Malcolm had declared that such an inquiry could have no practical result, because of the provisions of the civil service law in such matters, and, in consequence, that it could not be granted to me.

There is my situation. I have been dismissed because of political partisanship, it is said; and I have not had an opportunity to defend myself.

I have employed all the means at my disposal. I have formally denied these allegations; your friends have declared the same thing to you; I have many times requested an inquiry, which has been refused me.

A large number of citizens, Liberal leaders of the different parishes of the county, have requested my reinstatement, which I have not yet obtained.

Without any doubt your good faith has been surprised; you have been deceived, and you ought now to take account of it.

I conclude then that since you have been able to dismiss me by means of false reports, of machinations and intrigues, you have certainly the power, knowing now the facts, to restore my position, and, if I do not obtain it, I will be forced to believe, much to my regret, that you have permitted yourself to commit an injustice.

At least, I should be granted an inquiry, and if the facts and allegations which have led to my dismissal are proved, I will very willingly submit, for I would have merited that which has happened to me.

All I desire is that they will afford me the means of proving my inocence.

Requesting from you the favour of a final reply, Mr. minister,

Your very humble servant,
(Sgd.) Chas. H. Couture.

The Solicitor General's department wrote on May 8, as follows:

Dear Mr. Campney:

Re: C. H. Couture

Hon. Mr. Cannon has asked me to transmit to you, for your minister's attention, copy of a letter received from Mr. C. H. Couture, former inspector of weights and measures, Quebec, which I herewith enclose.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) Pierre Brunet,
Private Secretary.

Mr. R. O. Campney,
Private Secretary to the
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

The letter which I have just read was passed over for the consideration of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. A similar letter was written on June 1, 1928, by Mr. Couture direct to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The reply is dated June 11, 1928, and is as follows:

Mr. C. H. Couture,
St. Bernard, P.Q.

Sir:

Your letter of the 1st instant has been discussed by the minister and deputy minister.

Mr. O'Hara remarks that under the existing laws it is absolutely impossible to reestablish

you in your former position. The minister is therefore of the opinion that there is absolutely nothing to gain by the inquiry which you claim and he asks me so to advise you.

Accept, sir, my sincere compliments.

(Sgd.) I. Macartney,
Acting Secretary.

I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce, after having dictated that letter, suffered some slight qualms of conscience, because on June 12, 1928, he wrote as follows:

Honourable Lucien Cannon,
Solicitor General,
Ottawa, Ontario.

My dear Colleague:

Relative to the matter of Couture. It appears that even if an investigation were granted he could not under the law be reinstated in his former position.

We have therefore written Mr. Couture stating that we did not see what would be gained by an investigation.

We have not definitely refused to grant an investigation. This will depend upon your advice to us.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) James Malcolm.

The minister was putting it up entirely to the person who made the accusations as to whether or not an investigation should be held into the conduct of one of his officials, who, as the evidence before him and before his department showed, had been a faithful official for some thirteen or fourteen years. If I had time I would read the official commendations as to his efficient service which from time to time he had received from his superior officers. If the minister thinks that that is a fair way to deal with a loyal, faithful and efficient employee I cannot agree with him. When a loyal and efficient subordinate officer is allowed to be deprived of his position by means of an accusation, which he is in a position to refute, you destroy the spirit of the whole department over which you preside. When you deal unjustly with a man under you, you destroy the spirit of faithfulness and loyalty of the men who have been loyal to you.

Mr. MALCOLM: That has not been done.

Mr. CAHAN: The reply from the Solicitor General is dated March 16, 1929, and reads as follows:

I have received a letter from Mr. Maurice Dupre, K.C., of Quebec city, regarding Mr. C. H. Couture, the former inspector of weights and measures, and I am sending a copy of same to you, for your information and consideration.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) Lucien Cannon.

Honourable James Malcolm,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

[Mr. Cahan.]

With the permission of the house I would like to put the letter of Mr. Dupré upon Hansard, as I have not the time to read it.

Mr. MALCOLM: That will be all right.

Mr. CAHAN: I then put this letter dated March 13, 1929, from Dupré to Hon. Lucien Cannon, upon Hansard:

Fitzpatrick, Dupré, Gagnon & Parent,
Barrister, solicitors, etc.,
Morin Building,
111 Mountain Hill,
Quebec, March 13th, 1929.

Copy.

Honourable Lucien Cannon, K.C.,
Solicitor General,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:—Re: Mr. Charles Hippolyte Couture, Mayor of St. Bernard, county of Dorchester.

As you are aware, Mr. Couture has been dismissed as inspector of weights and measures without any investigation and for supposed political partisanship. Mr. Couture had occupied his position for 14 years.

We are positive that nothing could be found against Mr. Couture even on the ground of political partisanship but in spite of his efforts no investigation has been granted yet, although you have stated in a letter (April 25th, 1928) that you had no objection to such an investigation.

Mr. Couture would like to prove to you and to the public that the grievances against him are illfounded.

You have already before you numerous demands and petitions signed by very prominent persons of the constituency of Dorchester, irrespective of political creeds or opinions, and praying for an investigation.

The reasons alleged, or supposed to be alleged, are that in the course of a meeting, Mr. Couture encouraged some people to manifest against you or your friends. On the other hand, Mr. Couture and his friends emphatically deny such accusations and it is to justify himself and prove the untruth of these accusations that Mr. Couture respectfully prays for an investigation.

Would you have the kindness to grant such an investigation or at least to recommend same.

I apologize for the trouble I am giving you and, with anticipated thanks, I beg you to believe me

Very sincerely yours,
(Sgd) Maurice Dupré.

The next letter is dated April 12, 1928, from the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the Solicitor General. It reads as follows:

Hon. Lucien Cannon,
Solicitor General,
Ottawa.

My dear Colleague:

Relative to your letter of March 16th, Re C. H. Couture, I enclose herewith a memo which I have received from my deputy minister regarding this man.

Will you kindly advise me if you have anything to suggest that I might do further in this matter?

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) James Malcolm.

A memorandum is enclosed containing the report from the Deputy Minister of Justice, stating that the minister cannot reappoint him.

Mr. BENNETT: Did he get back his superannuation money?

Mr. CAHAN: He received a cheque and then went to see the Solicitor General. Believing, as a result of that interview, that he was about to be granted an inquiry he returned the cheque, and I understand that it is now in the possession of the Department of Finance.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not cash the cheque?

Mr. CAHAN: No, he did not cash the cheque, he returned it immediately by return mail. I think I read the letter of April 10, 1929, in which the Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

Will you kindly advise me if you have anything to suggest that I might do further in this matter?

There does not appear to be any reply to that letter in the file.

Mr. POULIOT: Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the matter with you?

Mr. POULIOT: He is through.

Mr. CAHAN: I feel very strongly about this matter. Whether or not this man is reinstated upon proof of his innocence, he has a right to a public inquiry, as provided for by the Inquiries Act, in order that he may exculpate himself from this charge and vindicate his personal honour as a loyal and efficient servant of the department. I trust the minister will take the same action which his colleague, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) took, and follow the precedent then established. I am quite sure that it would not detract from the high reputation which the minister has gained as an honest and efficient administrator of the department which has been placed in his charge by the right hon. the Prime Minister.

In my opening remarks I pointed out that in moving this amendment I did not desire it to be taken as a vote of want of confidence in the government, but simply to establish what I believe to be an important principle. I trust the right hon. the Prime Minister will accept this amendment. According to the rules of the house, as I pointed out, if this amendment passes it does not defeat a second motion immediately made to go into committee of supply. I refer to section 489 of Beauchesne. I beg to move in amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart):

That all the words after "that" in the motion of the Honourable the Minister of Finance be struck out and the following words be substituted therefor:

"In the opinion of this house no person should be dismissed from his employment in the civil service of Canada on a charge of political partisanship until the allegations of fact, on which such charge is based, shall have been investigated by a commissioner appointed under the provisions of part two of the Inquiries Act, chapter 99 of the revised statutes of Canada, and said commissioner's report thereon shall have been submitted for the consideration of the governor in council."

I submit that is in accordance with the law as it stands, although it may not be quite in accordance with the practice that has grown up. If this resolution were adopted as a matter of policy in the administration of the several departments of government, this would ensure that every man who denies the accusations made against him and who asks for an opportunity of proving his innocence, would have an opportunity to do so, such as the law provides. It would further ensure that the governor in council, in considering these matters which strike at the hearts and homes of so many people, would have the facts before them in passing these orders in council, and in taking the responsibility which every government is bound to assume, of exercising the right of dismissal of officials who have been charged with breaches of the law.

Mr. POWER: Is the resolution intended to have a retroactive effect so as to cover the Couture case, or is it only for the future?

Mr. CAHAN: The Couture case, I recognize, must now depend upon the discretion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and upon that of the Prime Minister and of his colleagues. I ask them, and I asked them at the outset, to exercise a discretion in this case in the way that I have suggested, namely, by granting an inquiry now, but to provide for the future I ask that we shall obviate difficulties, misfortunes and even possible injustices of this kind by making provision that these civil servants shall have, upon request, the right to an inquiry where they may have an opportunity of proving their innocence, although they are taking a responsibility there that one does not take in a court of justice, where every accused is deemed innocent until proven guilty. Under the English practice an official who is charged with offending against any statute, is dismissed by the government

only when the complainant has gone into the courts and procured an information or an indictment, and a judgment of the court that the man is guilty, so careful are they of preserving the rights and liberties of those employed in their civil service.

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal very briefly with this matter as the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) has reviewed the statements in the case, clearly, concisely and accurately. A member of parliament stated to the minister that he had, not hearsay, but personal knowledge of a civil servant having been actively engaged politically during, not one election, not two, but three elections. The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George is too clever a lawyer to think that there was any delay in reporting on this man's offence in 1921 or in 1925. Those dates were mentioned purely to show that the man had been, not a late, but a consistent offender. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the practice followed has been a rule which has been accepted by governments for many years and we have no less an authority endorsing the general principle than the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) who, when speaking in the house on April 17 last, admitted that certain dismissals were made on his recommendation, which he contended, and which I contend, he had a perfect right to make.

Mr. BENNETT: That was under an order in council.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes. In the case now under consideration the order was granted and the civil servant was dismissed. Everything that could be done to be just and fair to Mr. Couture with regard to his superannuation was done. The matter was discussed with the accountant of the department and a cheque was offered to Mr. Couture. The cheque was later returned, the Department of Justice, when the matter was referred to them, ruled that the governor in council had no authority to reinstate the man. There are two points which I have to consider. My hon. friend says, first, that the dismissal was a reflection on this man's honour. A dismissal for political partisanship is, in my opinion, no reflection on any man's honour or loyalty. It is no reflection except that the man chose to take an interest in party politics and at the same time to act as a civil servant of Canada. A civil servant of Canada has to make the choice between taking an active interest in party politics and holding his job, and I will say to my hon. friend that it is a very good thing for the Dominion of Canada that civil servants have to make that choice. We have evidence in other countries where civil servants are actively engaged in party politics, and I do not think their governments compare favourably with ours. This man's loyalty to the department is unquestioned. I believe Couture was a good public servant, but he apparently did not appreciate his job enough to keep out of politics.

Mr. CAHAN: Why not give him an opportunity to prove his case?

Mr. MALCOLM: Just a moment. I have to choose between the word of this man and that of a colleague or any other member of this house, I do not care whether he sits on this side or the other, who says that of his personal knowledge he knows a civil servant to be guilty. I have to choose between two men, and a member of parliament has the right to make a request of the minister.

Mr. MANION: Does the minister mean to suggest that if I made a complaint about somebody taking part in politics on behalf of his party, he would dismiss him?

Mr. MALCOLM: It is the right of every member to make such a request.

Mr. HANSON: Would the minister dismiss the man?

Mr. MALCOLM: It has not been the practice in the past to extend such a privilege to the opposition party, but that is the right of a member of parliament.

Mr. CAHAN: Has that right existed since 1918, since the Civil Service Act was passed?

Mr. MALCOLM: It has, and my hon. friend knows it has been accepted by both parties. It was accepted on April 17 by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. HANSON: Does the minister want the house to understand that if a member on this side makes a charge on his personal responsibility that a civil servant has been guilty of political partisanship, the minister would dismiss him without investigation? That is the gravamen of the matter.

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend has the point entirely wrong.

Mr. HANSON: No, I have not.

Mr. MALCOLM: I say that when a member of parliament makes a request of the minister for dismissal and states that to his

personal knowledge the civil servant has taken an active political part in an election, the minister has the right, if he believes the charges to be true, to dismiss without an investigation.

Mr. GEARY: He has the right.

Mr. MALCOLM: That has been held, and it was held by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BENNETT: I was dealing with the 1911 election before the Civil Service Act was amended.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The act did not change anything in that respect.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am not going to make reference to the dismissals that took place in 1911, although I could refer to many if I chose in my own department. This is the only dismissal that has taken place in the Department of Trade and Commerce since I have taken charge, and I believed that my colleague knew what he was talking about when he said that this man had been consistently guilty of political partisanship. I am not going to deal with the acceptance of the principle of dismissal for political partisanship by citing dismissals in the past, but I do want to refer to the way in which the matter was handled and which my hon. friend thinks was unfair. No good could have come from an investigation because the man could not be reinstated. The only justice that could be done to him was to give him back his contributions which were payable under the Superannuation Act. I had to choose between the statement of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, who did not say that he made these charges on some evidence of others but that he personally knew of the man's guilt, and Couture's statement. I was not going to open an investigation which could have done Couture no good. It could not have reestablished his honour because his honour was never questioned; his loyalty was never questioned. He simply chose to take part in party politics.

Mr. CAHAN: And to violate a statute, and it is on account of his violating the statute that he is charged with political partisanship.

Mr. MALCOLM: He does not violate any law of God or man at all.

Mr. CAHAN: He was violating section 55 of chapter 22 of the revised statutes of Canada, which constitutes political partisanship, and that is the only ground on which the governor in council had the right to dismiss.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is not the point I want to discuss. That is not the point of my hon. friend's criticism at all. My hon. friend takes two grounds for criticism. He says that the whole principle should be changed and that this house should support the principle that when a member lays a complaint an investigation should necessarily follow immediately. I am going to submit to my hon. friend that in some cases complaints may be unjust. In cases in the past civil servants may have been dismissed on very slim charges. Does my hon. friend not think it is better to have our civil servants in Canada keep out of politics. I think the best administration will follow if our civil servants vote as they choose but do not actively engage in an election.

Mr. CAHAN: We all agree on that.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is a principle we are all agreed on.

Mr. BENNETT: Just before the house rises, may I ask if the minister would bring down at three o'clock the order in council which was agreed upon by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There was no order in council.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, I think so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There was an agreement as to the rule, but no order in council.

Mr. BENNETT: I think it was embodied in writing.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. MALCOLM: Mr. Speaker, to review very briefly the remarks I made before luncheon, I should like to point out to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that I cannot find any orders in council pertaining to dismissals, except one order passed in 1908, which sets out that a complaint against a civil servant of political partisanship shall be made in writing. The Civil Service Act of 1908 provides that a civil servant may be dismissed for political partisanship. The possible loss of position becomes one of the terms of employment of a civil servant; for he is employed on the understanding that if he engages in promoting the welfare of political parties he is liable to dismissal.

I agree with my hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George that Mr. Couture has done nothing for which he can be brought to

account in a civil or a criminal court, and that no penalty can possibly be imposed upon him. By the terms of his contract of employment he may lose his position due to the fact that the Civil Service Act under which he is employed provides that he may not do certain things. If on investigation the charges were substantiated the dismissal would of course be justified.

Undoubtedly there is an injustice which my hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George points out. If the investigation proves that the charges were not of a sufficient serious nature to justify the dismissal, then the government finds itself in the position brought about by the ruling of the Justice department, that under the Civil Service Act it has no power to reinstate that man. He can only again enter the civil service by going through the regular channels prescribed by the Civil Service Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that in this particular case all the requirements of the Civil Service Act of 1908 have been complied with and the practice followed by all governments since that time has been observed. Complaints of active political partisanship within the personal knowledge of a member of the house had been lodged in writing against an officer of my department. The charge stated that he had been guilty of active political partisanship on three occasions. I may say that in my opinion it was the only charge which was sufficiently well founded to justify dismissal of an officer of my department since I took office. I took the word of my colleague, a member of the house, when he said that it was on his own personal knowledge that he preferred the charge; that indeed he had been a witness to the man's actions, and therefore knew that he was guilty.

When Couture asked for an investigation into the charge, I referred the request to the member in question, who plainly said that he saw no reason for an investigation as he had personal knowledge that the man was guilty. In other words, I had either to believe the member of the house who very definitely made the charge, and who is in a position to defend his action, or to take the word of the officer who had been dismissed and whose position had been filled by the Civil Service Commission. Two years afterwards, further representations having been made to him, the member did write the letter read by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George stating that he had no objection to an investigation. But my contention is that no good end could be served by granting the investigation. If I could have reinstated Couture I would have granted his request for an investigation.

[Mr. Malcolm.]

Under the law as it stands to-day I can do nothing to put Couture back in his position, because the position has been filled by the Civil Service Commission. There will have to be a change in the act dealing with reinstatement before cases such as this can be dealt with.

In so far as the general principle of my hon. friend's amendment is concerned, I do not hold with it at all. As I have said, it is desirable that civil servants should have the freedom of exercising their franchise, but I think it is undesirable that civil servants should take part in party politics. If we adopt the principle that a minister must hold an investigation every time a member of the house charges that some civil servant has been guilty of an act of political partisanship for any party without leaving to the minister the right to turn down the dozens, yes, hundreds of applications that may come for dismissals, following a general election, then whoever are in charge of the departments will be in a turmoil of investigations, considering dismissals. I contend, no matter what party is in power, that the request must first of all be decided by the minister from the point of view of its seriousness, which will eliminate probably 90 per cent of the charges.

Mr. CAHAN: Is not that possible still? That is quite possible.

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend agrees with that point. No minister is anxious to worry himself and the officers of his department with many dismissals; the minor requests he brushes aside. When members of the house, complaining against civil servants for being partisans, are forced to put their charges in writing and forced to say that they know the particular persons have been guilty of an offence which is a violation of the terms of employment they do some thinking before making the charge in writing; and I contend that the regulation in this respect has been of great benefit to the civil servants of Canada. But I do not think that the civil service of Canada will be benefited, or that civil servants will be any more secure in their position against complaints, if we adopt my hon. friend's amendment that, no matter from which member the complaint may come, it will be compulsory on the part of the minister to grant an investigation into the charge that has been brought forward.

Mr. CAHAN: I think the resolution calls for such an inquiry only before a dismissal; that is to say, before the governor in council may act, by dismissing the person whom complaint is made against, there shall be a report from a commissioner who has inquired into the charge.

Mr. MALCOLM: If I misinterpreted my hon. friend's amendment—

Mr. CAHAN: That was my intention.

Mr. MALCOLM: —I will withdraw my argument in that regard; but I understood the amendment to imply that every complaint should call for an investigation.

Mr. CAHAN: No, before dismissal, preliminary to dismissal.

Mr. MALCOLM: So far as that suggestion is concerned, there may be much merit in it. As to whether or not the adoption of that suggestion would involve a want of confidence in the government, I am not prepared to say. I would not support my hon. friend's amendment if it meant a want of confidence in the government.

Mr. CAHAN: I did not intend it as a vote of want of confidence.

Mr. MALCOLM: I shall have to leave it to some of my colleagues to interpret the meaning of the amendment. I was about to say that I should be willing to give the hon. member's suggestion very serious consideration, for I do not think the matter is one that can be settled without consideration.

So far as Couture is concerned, if the Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) feels that the charge has not been established I shall have no objection to granting an investigation. I must say however that under the present ruling we cannot restore him to the position which has been filled by another. Should an investigation be held and it is proved that the man's offence was not of such a nature as to justify his dismissal, all we can do is to try to place him in some other position. To that extent, if my colleague the Solicitor General thinks it advisable, I am prepared to go with my hon. friend from St. Lawrence-St. George.

Mr. GEARY: I understood the minister to say that this is the only case of dismissal in his department since he took charge of it.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. GEARY: There were hundreds of other cases—

Mr. MALCOLM: I did not say hundreds.

Mr. GEARY: I understood the minister to say so.

Mr. MALCOLM: I said that in the administration of departments of government there might be dozens or hundreds of minor complaints.

Mr. GEARY: The minister has in mind, I gather, some complaints in his own department.

Mr. MALCOLM: Quite.

Mr. GEARY: Quite a number of them.

Mr. MALCOLM: Often.

Mr. GEARY: In what way would those complaints differ from this one? I understand that in this case the Solicitor General added to his request for dismissal a sentence to the effect that he had personal knowledge of partisanship having been exercised. I should have thought that a written communication from any member of parliament asking for the dismissal of a civil servant on the ground of partisanship would imply personal knowledge on the part of the member; it would imply that the member, before bringing forward the complaint, had personal knowledge of partisanship on the part of the person complained against. Are we to take it that in none of the other cases to which the minister has referred has there been such an indication on the part of the member complaining as to personal knowledge? Is that the distinction?

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend realizes, as every hon. member does, that ministers constantly have complaints about civil servants to the effect that they have been engaging in partisan activities, but in a great many cases the evidence is hearsay. Frequently letters are written about men in the civil service; but unless a member of the house complaining is prepared to take responsibility in the matter and to say that he has personal knowledge, I think that ministers as a rule always turn down the consideration of any complaint. And I think it is right that they should.

Mr. GEARY: Perhaps the minister and I are at cross purposes; I am speaking only of requests for dismissal coming from members—any member at all. I suppose a defeated candidate would be included in that category. I am speaking of them and of them only. Surely a request coming from a member, on his responsibility, for the dismissal of an officer must imply that he has personal knowledge of the matter whereof he complains. There is no hearsay about that. Does the Minister, in referring to many other cases, refer to those cases which have been stated in writing by members, but without the addition of such words as, "I have personal knowledge"? Are those the ones he has turned down?

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend is quite right. Members are inclined probably to make verbal complaints—

Mr. GEARY: I am speaking of written complaints.

Mr. MALCOLM: —and verbal complaints are not considered; the order in council of 1923 covered that point.

Mr. GEARY: I am not speatking of them.

Mr. MALCOLM: So that to-day a complaint must be in writing. If a man writes complaining about a civil servant and says, "I have heard certain things," I do not take such a complaint seriously. If a member is not willing to say he has personal knowledge and is in a position to defend his complaint in the house, I am not prepared to dismiss a civil servant; I am not prepared to take action on hearsay evidence. That is the type of letter to which I pay no attention.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Do I understand the minister to say that any member of this house, whether he be Liberal or Tory or Progressive, may write to the minister to say that he has personal knowledge that such-and-such a civil servant in the department has been engaged in political partisanship, and the minister will thereupon dismiss that civil servant?

Mr. MALCOLM: Not at all. But the minister has a right to consider a complaint from any member of the house; that is my interpretation of the custom followed for years.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It would be a defeated government candidate on whose recommendation the minister would act.

Mr. MALCOLM: A defeated government candidate would not be a member of the house.

Mr. CAMPBELL: But it is on the recommendation of defeated government candidates that very many dismissals take place.

Mr. MALCOLM: Not of appointments under the act.

Hon. LUCIEN CANNON (Solicitor General): The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) has brought forward a matter with which I am particularly concerned, and he has broadened out the debate by incorporating in his suggested amendment reforms, complete and entire, in the system which has prevailed in Canada in relation to civil servants guilty of political partisanship, and the means whereby they may be dismissed. At the outset may I say, sir, that I do not think it would be possible for this house to accept the amendment of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George otherwise than as meaning that it implies a vote of want of confidence in the government, and in support of the interpretation I would quote Bourinot at page 424:

> An amendment moved to the motion to go into committee of supply (or ways and means) does not necessarily involve want of confidence in the administration. When such an amendment simply affirms a general principle, or sets forth a public grievance, and does not directly or impliedly challenge the conduct or policy of the government, it is not, in a parliamentary sense, a motion of want of confidence—

The amendment brought forward by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George implies a challenge of the conduct of the government in connection with this particular matter, and therefore it is a motion of want of confidence.

Mr. CAHAN: I do not follow that reasoning.

Mr. CANNON: I think Bourinot's reasoning is very simple. If on the motion to go into supply a member of the house expresses a general principle to which he desires the house to agree, it is not a motion of want of confidence, but if the amendment implies a criticism of the conduct of the government in any particular matter, it then becomes a motion of want of confidence.

Mr. CAHAN: Is this not merely the statement of a principle, without any particular application?

Mr. CANNON: I do not like to refuse to allow my hon. friend to interrupt, but he has spoken for two hours while I have only forty minutes, and I am going to state my case in less than forty minutes if possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the matter brought up by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George is very simple. Many documents have been read; as a matter of fact the entire departmental file has been placed on Hansard, and the purpose for which that file was read is very obvious. Perhaps I might sum up the case and make it very clear and concise so that every hon. member of the house will understand it. A public official in the constituency which I represent had been in the employ of the government for a number of years, and after the elections of 1926, under the practice then existing, as sitting member for the constituency and upon my personal responsibility I wrote the Minister of Trade and Commerce asking for the dismissal of this official on account of partisanship. I do not

withdraw one word of that letter which I wrote to the minister and I do not wish to lessen in any degree the responsibility which I assumed at that time and which I am quite willing to assume before the house and the country to-day.

The principle at stake is a principle of the very highest order; the dignity of the house itself is concerned in this matter. If the member for a constituency can state from his own personal knowledge that an official or a public servant of this country has acted in a partisan way, I say with no hesitation at all that if that member of parliament, be he a Tory or a Liberal, wishes to maintain his authority as far as his constituents are concerned, as well as the dignity of the house of which he is a member, there is one duty incumbent upon him to perform; that is, he should see to it that the official is removed from the civil service. This always has been the rule and the practice, and just here I might recall the expression of opinion given by no less a member of the house than the leader of the opposition. Speaking in this house on April 22 of this year, and not dealing with what might have happened in 1911 but with what did happen last year in one of the western provinces, the leader of the opposition said:

> I also recall that the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier approved of the general terms of that order.

That was the order in council which gave power to a member of parliament to ask for the dismissal of a civil servant for political partisanship.

> Action was taken accordingly, and when last session the hon. member for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly) was able to stand up in this house and say of his own knowledge that he believed a given person to have been guilty of political partisanship, you will recollect, Sir, that at once I said the incident was ended so far as we were concerned.

Those are the words of the leader of the opposition, spoken in this house this year; he said that the moment the hon. member for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly) was in a position to get up in the house and state on his own responsibility that he thought a public official was guilty of political partisanship the matter was ended so far as he and his followers were concerned. Why should the attitude taken by the opposition at that time, expressed by the leader of the opposition, be altered through an amendment brought in this morning by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George? Are there to be two leaders of the opposition? Are there to be two attitudes on the same question? Are we to accept the policy laid down by the leader of the Conservative party in April which I have just quoted from Hansard, or are we now to adopt a new platform as laid down by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, who at times is represented, at least in our papers, as leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec?

What are the facts of this case? I wish to say first of all that I have been a candidate in the county of Dorchester in the province of Quebec on nine different occasions; I have won some of my elections and have lost others, and I think if you inquired of my opponents you would find that as a rule I have been a good loser. Although I have represented the county of Dorchester either in the provincial house or in this federal house for the last fifteen years, if the official records of all these departments are looked up it will be found that during the whole of my career I have had only three officials dismissed from the service. I do not believe in political retaliation; when a fight is over I think we should forget the knocks and blows which were exchanged while the battle was on. However, certain cases are exceptional, and as I stated at the outset sometimes the very dignity of the member for the constituency is at stake. In this case my dignity and authority as a member of parliament and a member of the government was at stake.

Couture was appointed shortly after the election of 1911 by the then sitting member who is now a distinguished member of the supreme court of Quebec. Couture had had the inspector of weights and measures dismissed by the member and had taken his place, and the very manner in which he had obtained the situation showed that he was a political partisan. We had two elections in my constituency in 1917 and Couture took a very active part in both; during the election of 1921 he was very active; he was more than active in the election of 1925, but according to the general principle which I had laid down for my guidance as a public man in my constituency of Dorchester, I did not ask for his dismissal. When I was holding a public meeting in the parish of St. Bernard in 1927, the parish where Couture lives, I had great difficulty in being heard. I think a member who has sat for a constituency can ask at least that his electors give him the privilege of being heard. What was the cause of the disturbance? The cause was a group of children on Couture's property, and Couture himself standing only a few feet away. That disturbance lasted for over half an hour and he never took any steps to stop it, nor did he do the least thing to allow me to be freely heard.

An hon. MEMBER: What a serious charge.

Mr. CANNON: I ask any member of this house, whether he sits on this side or on the other side, if he were attending a public meeting and a disturbance was being carried on, would he not in all fairness see that a proper hearing was given, not only to the candidate during the election but to the former member who had represented the constituency for several years? A few days after this meeting my opponent conducted a meeting in the parish—I do not wish to reopen the questions which were settled on polling day, because they were numerous and serious and could occupy the attention of any serious audience—and he took it upon himself to make a personal attack against myself. I would have been perfectly willing to allow that to pass, but a personal attack was made against my family, against my wife and against my children; Couture was present at that meeting and gave encouragement to the speaker.

Mr. CAHAN: In what way?

Mr. CANNON: If a member, no matter to what party he belongs, cannot have the right of being respected by public officials, it is about time that we closed the doors of this House of Commons and allowed someone else to handle the public business of Canada.

That is my stand in this matter. When those happenings occurred I publicly told Couture that if my party came back into power I would see that he was fired, and I have kept my promise. There are many Conservatives in the public service in the county of Dorchester, and I recognize and acknowledge their right of voting whichever way they desire, as long as they perform their duties as public officials to their own credit and to the benefit of our country. As long as I am a member of this house, I will not stand for any public official insulting either the sitting member or the candidate in any election.

If the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George desires to introduce a new principle, is he willing to make it retroactive? I have been the object of discussion to-day in the House of Commons because of one dismissal in my county made under the circumstances I have just described. If I wanted to play politics in this matter I would ask the hon. gentleman to take cognizance of the list of those who were dismissed in the county of Dorchester in the year 1911 when there was a change in government.

An hon. MEMBER: Read it.

Mr. CANNON: It is too long, I do not wish to delay the house.

An hon. MEMBER: Put it on Hansard.

Mr. CANNON: I have a list of twenty-seven postmasters who were dismissed in 1911-12 by the then sitting member.

An hon. MEMBER: Rural delivery?

Mr. CANNON: Not rural delivery postmasters. There was no investigation although the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George was then in active politics.

Mr. CAHAN: When was that?

Mr. CANNON: Nineteen hundred and eleven.

Mr. CAHAN: I was not in politics then.

Mr. CANNON: The hon. member may not have been in active politics but he was in what I would call potential politics. But did he protest?

Mr. CAHAN: Against what?

Mr. CANNON: Against these dismissals in the county of Dorchester by the then sitting member; twenty-seven postmasters kicked out without any inquiry of any kind being made.

Mr. CAHAN: I have no knowledge of that matter.

An hon. MEMBER: Read the names.

Mr. CANNON: These dismissals were recommended by the then sitting member, but I will not mention his name as he is now a member of the bench. The list is as follows:

Post Office	Postmaster	Date of Dismissal	Cause of Dismissal
Abenakis	Joseph Chabot	1912	Political partisanship.
Coulombe	Stanislas Fontaine	1912	" "
Coulombe	Wilfrid Demers	1916	" "

There was an election in 1916 and I was running for office, but this gentleman was dismissed without any inquiry being made as to his political partisanship. The list continues:

Post Office	Postmaster	Date of Dismissal	Cause of Dismissal
Fir Grove	Joseph Nadeau	1912	Political partisanship.
Frampton	W. J. Doyle	1912	" "
Hennepin	Honoré Morin	1917	" "
Hemeson	John Dillon	1912	" "
Lake Etchemin	Joseph Bégin	1912	" "
Langevin	Misaël Morisset	1912	" "
O'Farrell	Patrick O'Farrell	1912	" "

Even Irishmen were being fired for political partisanship. The list continues:

Post Office	Postmaster	Date of Dismissal	Cause of Dismissal
Ravignan	Alfred Rancourt	1914	Political partisanship.
Rivière Raquette	Amedée Dionne	1913	" "
Ruisseau à l'eau chaude	Jas. Kilgannon	1912	" "
St. Abdon	Omer Faucher	1912	" "
St. Anselme	L. V. Bernier	1912	" "
Ste. Aurélie	Francis Demers	1917	" "
St. Benjamin	O. F. Boucher	1911	" "
Ste. Germaine Station	Léon Lachance	1917	" "
Ste. Hénédine	Mrs. Louise Mercier	1912	" "
Ste. Marguerite de Dorchester	J. B. Bégin	1912	" "
St. Nazaire de Buckland	Chas. Dupont	1912	" "
Ste. Rose de Watford	P. R. Provost	1912	" "
Ste. Sabine Station	Victor Potvin	1913	" "
St. Zacharie	Edouard Groleau	1913	" "
Standon	Arthur Genest	1913	Unsatisfactory management and shortage.

We have at least one case in which there was cause for the dismissal recommended by the then member.

Mr. CAHAN: Those dismissals were all made before the Civil Service Act of 1918 was passed.

Mr. CANNON: Did the hon. gentleman or his party protest? Did Couture protest? Couture had been occupying the position of a man who had been thrown out without any inquiry.

I am coming now to what the hon. gentleman described this morning as the deathbed scene, and the terrible condition in which Couture's family might have been placed. I will say to the hon. member that it was no pleasure to me to have to take the action which I did take, but I took it because I thought I had not only the right to do so but a duty to perform.

Mr. CAHAN: You took that action because of what took place at a meeting at which you were not present and of which you had no personal knowledge, according to your own statement.

Mr. CANNON: In 1911, in the very department that we are discussing now, inspector of weights and measures Mr. Bugeaud was dismissed for political partisanship in December of that year. What about his family? What about the inquiry that the hon. gentleman is asking for? Mr. Guay was dismissed on January 1, 1912; Mr. Caldwell was dismissed on August 1, 1913, and Mr. Prefontaine was dismissed on October 1, 1913. These are four dismissals in the one office in Quebec, and Mr. Couture, whom the hon. gentleman has taken under his wing to-day, replaced one of those who had been dismissed.

The larger question remains: should this be changed? Some years ago it was proposed in France that the death penalty be abolished, and the president answered by saying: "Que messieurs les assassins commencent." "Let the murderers give an example first." In 1911, 12,000 Liberal employees were dismissed without any inquiry. Will the hon. gentleman consent to make his amendment retroactive and allow those 12,000 employees to have an inquiry? That is a fair question. That is a fair way of putting the matter. Would the

hon. gentleman allow his amendment to be retroactive in order that the twenty-seven postmasters in my constituency whose names were mentioned, be given an inquiry and reinstatement?

Mr. CAHAN: Certainly I would if any one of them ever asked for an inquiry and it was refused.

Mr. CANNON: I am perfectly willing to accept the hon. gentleman's answer provided it is confirmed by his leader, because, as I stated at the outset, the attitude of the two hon. gentlemen on this matter is quite divergent. The leader of the opposition said that the right thing to do when a man is guilty of partisanship is to dismiss him.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that.

Mr. CANNON: I quoted from Hansard what my hon. friend said.

Mr. BENNETT: I said: When the member says so of his personal knowledge.

Mr. CANNON: This is my case.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister was not at the meeting.

Mr. CANNON: At what meeting?

Mr. CAHAN: At the meeting of Mr. Cotè of which the minister complains.

Mr. CANNON: I am complaining of both meetings, the one where I addressed the electors and the one where Cotè was.

Mr. CAHAN: And the minister was not present at Mr. Cotè's meeting.

Mr. CANNON: I hope the hon. gentleman will be reasonable enough to admit that I know more about what took place in my constituency in 1926 than he did when he was in Montreal.

Mr. CAHAN: Quite so.

Mr. CANNON: The hon. gentleman makes a strong argument that Couture says that he should not have been dismissed. Has anyone ever heard of an official who was dismissed claiming that he was rightly so? I have not. To end this incident of a very minor character which has taken up already too much of the time of the house, because I have done only in one instance what other members have done in many where their names have never been mentioned, let me say this: there has been one case in my constituency. As to the larger issue whether the whole procedure should be changed, this is a matter of very serious policy which I leave to the opinion of the house.

Mr. JEAN FRANCOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words to say on this matter. I have heard the two-hour speech of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). If he goes to the Calgary stampede this year and meets some Indians there, they will probably call him "Chief Long Breath." The last issue of Life says that besides dance marathons, there might be chewing gum and teeth-brushing endurance contests. Why not have a speech marathon, not for the future, but with a retroactive effect? In this case, the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George would be an easy winner, not with his two-hour speech of to-day but with the six-hour speech he delivered two years ago. In France and in England an hon. member would be covered with ridicule if he spoke for two hours on a single case in regard to which he did not know the real facts.

When the Tories were in power, the people who were dismissed were as numerous as the stars of the sky and the sands of the desert. Now the Tories complain and when their friends make trouble during an election, they would like to have them promoted instead of dismissed. I am in favour of the freedom of the franchise for all the employees in the public service; whether they are Tories, Grits, socialists or anything else, they should be entitled to enjoy their franchise with the greatest freedom. But when it comes to canvassing and making trouble at meetings, that is entirely different. I can speak freely on this subject because I have not asked for many dismissals in my constituency. There are some Tories amongst the civil servants in my constituency, but I do not bother about them. They can vote as they like. But if they cause trouble in meetings, they should be told that they cannot long retain their positions. I think this would be a good opportunity to inform all employees in the civil service to-day that if they want to make trouble during elections or at other times by canvassing against the candidates whoever they may be, they run the risk of being dismissed.

I take this opportunity of congratulating the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr Malcolm) and the Solicitor General (Mr Cannon) on their clear exposé of the case.

Amendment (Mr. Cahan) negatived on division.

SUPPLY—FISH TRAPS

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I understand that this motion covers the estimates, not only of the Department of Trade and Commerce but of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and therefore I should like to say a few words in connection with a subject that comes under the latter department. I am rather timid about introducing this, or, indeed, any subject in the house; I am afraid of adding to that terrible reputation which was ascribed to me yesterday, I see, by reading Hansard. I read it in Hansard because I did not hear a word of it at the time it was uttered. I have no objection to those sentiments being uttered in the house; they are his sentiments, not mine. Indeed, I read them with a certain amount of sympathy, because I recognized them as being the emanation of what I myself sometimes suffer from, namely, an over-quick temper and a bilious disposition. I have striven to be more successful than he, and I think I really have been, in concealing my mean disposition in that regard. I have remembered the doctrine put forward by Solomon. "He that ruleth his spirit is greater than he that taketh a city." I think I can stake my reputation for courtesy in this house up against that of the hon. leader, who gave me such a terrible reputation. Mr. Speaker, human nature is a curious thing—I am speaking generally now. Some men remind one of sausages. They are very thin-skinned, smooth on the outside, but you never know how much of the real hog is in them until you get under their skin.

I wish to make a mild protest in connection with another matter, and that is the habit some hon. members have dropped into, unintentionally I believe, when they are making some remarks, perhaps a bit of biting criticism or an offensive remark about some other member, of speaking in so low a tone that while the remark is audible to the reporter and to the few members sitting around, it is not audible to the member to whom it is applied, and consequently he has no opportunity either to hear or to reply to it. I am quite sure that this is so opposed to any idea of courtesy or courage that I need only to mention it for hon. members to be more careful in the future in that regard.

As regards the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I want to bring up a matter in connection with fish traps. I should like briefly to outline the situation. On the 7th of April last I addressed the following letter to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

The Hon. P. J. A. Cardin,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear sir:

In Vancouver province just to hand I see notice that Judge Ellis has been appointed by you to inquire whether fish traps for salmon should be permitted in northern British Columbia.

I have heard rumours of this, but took it for granted that as I represent so many of the fishing interest of British Columbia, that I would have been given an opportunity of being heard before such a drastic step was taken.

I understood that for some years past, it has been the settled policy of this government not to allow traps in northern waters. Such has been repeatedly announced as the policy and has been carried out. Why then change it without notice, or at least give opportunity of changing it?

I think the step is bad policy, and equally bad politics. The policy has been carried out for some years. I have heard no demand for a change.

Is it permitted me to ask if there was any demand for a change, from whence did it emanate? Did any boards of trade, organizations of fishermen or of cannery men, ask for it?

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) A. W. Neill.

That was on April 7th, and I have not yet had a reply. On May 14th I brought the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister, on the orders of the day. I briefly stated the situation and asked if there might be an opportunity given for discussion of the matter in this house. I was promised a reply later, but I have not yet had one. Under date of May 31st, last Friday, I brought the matter up again in the house and said that I proposed to discuss the matter on the Marine and Fisheries estimates, and in order to be in a position to do so intelligently I asked if the report of the commissioner who had been appointed, and whose investigation at that time had certainly been completed, would be laid on the table for our guidance in the debate. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries replied as follows:

I shall do the best I can to meet the request of my hon. friend.

The report so far as I know has not yet been laid on the table; if it has been, I am ignorant of it. The estimates will soon be coming up and that is the only opportunity we shall have this session of discussing the matter. I again ask if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not lay this report on the table. I have a telegram from British Columbia to the effect that that report was mailed eight or nine days ago, so it must be in the possession of the government now. I do not want to discuss the matter at this

stage, and I am mentioning it only that we may have the report before us when the estimates are being considered, and I would ask that some at least of the estimates be held over until we have had an opportunity to consider the report, and then we can discuss the matter intelligently. This is a matter of very considerable importance to a large number of people in British Columbia.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I have no objection at all to undertaking to comply with the request of my hon. friend.

Mr. NEILL: When? Will it be to-day?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: Thank you.

Motion (Mr. Robb) agreed to.

VACANCIES

ISSUE OF WARRANTS BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have forwarded my warrants to the chief electoral officer for the issue of writs for elections in the electoral districts of Lanark, Frontenac-Addington and Laprairie-Napierville.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Laflamme in the chair.

Trade and Commerce—British and foreign news service, $32,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister give a brief explanation?

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (Minister of Trade and Commerce): This is a grant made to Reuter's news service for distributing Canadian news items in all parts of Great Britain and in foreign countries. The service has been in existence for several years. The total number of news items pertaining to Canada distributed in 1928 was 7,335. Reuter's are distributing news items to a group of British papers, sixty-three in number, carrying out the terms of the agreement by which items of Canadian news are distributed throughout Great Britain and foreign countries. We find that this method is more economical than any other.

Mr. SPENCER: Has the amount been the same for a number of years?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. SHORT: Was not this item cut in half a couple of years ago, and increased again last year?

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, the item was in the main estimates and increased in the supplemental.

Mr. SHORT: Does the minister consider that we are getting good value for the expenditure of this $32,000?

Mr. MALCOLM: I can assure my hon. friend that we are getting very good value for it. In 1927-28 we had 13,571 news items regarding Canada wired by Reuter's to different papers in different countries of the world. The figure I gave a moment ago of 7,335 news items distributed in 1928 covers only three-quarters of the year. I do not want to weary the committee with a summary of the papers to which Reuter's distribute news items, but I can assure my hon. friend that in the opinion of my department we are getting a very good service.

Item agreed to.

Commercial intelligence service, including miscellaneous expenditure in connection with the development and extension of Canada's trade, $750,000.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister might give us some explanation.

Mr. MALCOLM: This is an increase of $250,000 and is due to the opening of three new trade commissioners' offices and the necessary staffs in connection therewith, and to the contemplated opening of six new trade commissioners' offices and the embarking on a much wider program with a view to expansion of the activities of the department.

Mr. BENNETT: Where are the offices?

Mr. MALCOLM: Chicago and San Francisco, Oslo, Hong Kong and Havana.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What does the minister expect to gain from an office in Chicago?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They will sell us more goods.

Mr. MALCOLM: I cannot make any definite pronouncement to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) as to what business may result from contact with the Chicago market, but it is felt that there is a very great market in Chicago for certain Canadian products, just as there is in New York.

Mr. MANION: If they will let you into that market.

Mr. MALCOLM: It was decided to open up trade offices in Chicago and San Francisco to allow Canadian shippers interested to get in closer touch there than they could through the New York office.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I quite understand the desirability of making reasonable efforts to get into the Chicago market—if the Americans wish us to go there. The trouble is that they do not wish us to go there. Why should we spend money in Chicago when we know that there is not the slightest chance of selling them our goods?

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend has had enough experience of the Department of Trade and Commerce to know that our office in New York is of very great service in keeping our shippers in touch with foreign buyers who are visiting that city. I do not think our trade commissioner in Chicago will do any less valuable work than has been done in New York. Many Canadian business men are strongly of the opinion that trade offices in Chicago and San Francisco would give just the same excellent results as have followed the establishment of our trade office in New York. A great many oriental buyers go to San Francisco. We feel that we would be doing a good stroke of business by establishing a trade office there to get in touch with buyers who might be induced to come to Canada. The same remarks apply to Chicago.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister is too good a business man to expect to "put that over." People who want to sell goods go to the place where the market is; they do not depend on an outside competitor to provide them with the market.

Mr. BENNETT: Do those offices do anything in connection with the sale of cereals and other agricultural products?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister name me a single officer of the Department of Trade and Commerce who did anything last year in connection with the sale of wheat?

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend is quite right in regard to that, because in so far as the sale of wheat is concerned it is usually sold on contract, and I do not think a trade commissioner could be of very much assistance in that regard or in the sale of newsprint. I may tell my hon. friend from Lincoln that a few days ago a Canadian business man reported to us that, although the Chicago office has been open only two weeks, when he called there he found fourteen men waiting to make inquiries of our commissioner with regard to the market for Canadian commodities which they wanted to sell.

Mr. BENNETT: To sell to us?

Mr. MALCOLM: No; these men were trying to sell their commodities in Chicago, and were asking for assistance from our trade commissioner.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Could the minister tell us one thing they ever sold?

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend is a little unfair. The office has been opened only two weeks. I am quite frank to say that the experiment looks advisable to me. If it does not prove so, and the commissioner at that point cannot show that he has been benefiting the Canadian shipper, then I think the opening of the office is subject to criticism.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Surely, the minister will find it very hard to prove that the trade commissioner succeeds in doing anything on behalf of Canadian shippers. How can he show us that the trade commissioner could do anything?

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend knows that these offices can show what sales they make. My deputy has just handed me a memorandum from the director of commercial intelligence stating that one outstanding example of the year's work, so far as the alertness on the part of our trade commissioners is concerned, was reported by one of the firms who benefited. This has to do with an agricultural product—apples. Our trade commissioner at Brussels discovered in November that there was going to be a very excellent opportunity for the sale of Canadian apples. He took the matter up with Mr. Forsyth Smith, the trade commissioner at Liverpool. Mr. Smith notified the Department of Agriculture here, who got in touch with the shippers of apples in the maritime provinces, and for the first time in history, through the activity of these men, we have shipped 85,000 barrels of apples this year to Belgium, valued at $467,000. That market had apparently been left in abeyance until the trade commissioner saw its possibilities and informed our shippers. I think my hon. friend realizes that from time to time we get many letters of appreciation of the work done by our trade commissioners. I admit that the work which passes through these offices cannot be tabulated, because much depends on the energy of the man selling his goods, his prices, tariffs and other considerations; but that our trade commissioners are of great assistance to Canadian shippers can be borne out by the letters we receive from the shippers themselves.

Mr. CHAPLIN: When the minister is asked a question about Chicago, he switches over to Brussels. He puts me in mind of

another minister who was instrumental a few years ago in making a treaty with Belgium. He told us in the same flowing language about the enormous quantities of butter the treaty would enable our dairymen to sell to Belgium. "Why," he said, "already contracts have been made in Montreal." But that butter never got into our export returns; it melted somewhere. At the same time the Minister of Justice said: "We are not making this treaty for the old habitants of Jacques Cartier's time, we are making it for the present day farmers of Quebec." I reminded him at the time that the old people who have been dead two hundred years sold just as much butter to Belgium as do their present day successors. The Minister of Trade and Commerce follows the same line—now he tells us about apples. I do not object to making an arrangement through our trade commissioners with people who want to trade with us. But what is the use of making trade arrangements with people who put their tariff up so high that we cannot sell to them. I do object to spending money in a country whose people say deliberately they will not trade with us, that they will put up their tariff so high that it will effectively exclude our products from their market. That is what has hapened in France, and I told the minister a few years ago what would happen there. We enter into a treaty with them, giving them a fixed rate of duty, and we allow them to impose against us a rate of duty variable from day to day. They have changed their rate of duty so that our trade has vanished, and now I understand that wheat, although we made a treaty with them by which we got a minimum tariff, has now gone up, and is going up still further. And it will continue to do so without our being able to do a thing, because we have a stationary tariff.

Mr. HARRIS: Before the minister replies to the hon. member I want to make one or two observations. In his last remarks the minister had something to say about letters he had received from Canadian shippers. I should like him to say a word or two with reference to the letters that he is receiving from shippers who are largely in Europe and abroad. I venture the opinion that never in the history of the Department of Trade and Commerce has there been so much correspondence from manufacturers who find their domicile on the European continent; and at the same time the statistics will show that we are presently receiving from our good neighbour to the south more in the line of manufactured goods than perhaps at any other time in the history of this Dominion. In that same connection I want to point out that a situation has arisen in Canada—the statistics will prove it—which is going to be very embarrassing for this country as one year succeeds another. It is this: the general average of prices in the United States to-day, on commodities made from raw materials which are abundant in this country, is on a level of 10 to 20 per cent higher than are the selling prices of manufactured goods from these raw materials which are enjoyed in this Dominion. This situation arises: immediately there is a small shortage of raw material in that great consuming country of 110,000,000 people, we find that the manufacturers over there come to Canada and take away from the manufacturers of this country their source of raw materials; if they do not take away the raw materials they so enhance the price of raw materials to the manufacturers of this country that one by one those manufacturers find themselves no longer in the position of manufacturers but rather of dealers in perhaps the same finished commodities, buying those finished commodities on the European continent and bringing them here to hold their trade.

The minister in his last words told this house that he was well pleased with the letters he was receiving from shippers in this country. I want him in fairness to the house to make a few observations with regard to the letters he is receiving from the shippers in other lands. To enlarge the point a little further; it is a well know fact that the duty against commodities coming in from the European continent is not nearly so high coming into Canada as that duty is against these European manufacturers going into the United States. The result is that those engaged in industry find that their market price is set by the market price which the shippers in Europe are able to make. The market price for a large part of our commodities is set, not perhaps so much in London and Liverpool, as in days gone by, but in Hamburg, Paris, Lyons, Brussels, Antwerp and Rotterdam. They cannot get their goods into the United States. I hesitate to make the statement—the minister no doubt will enlarge the point for us—but I venture the opinion that they dump those goods into Canada, so that the manufacturer who is trying to make a livelihood in this country finds himself on the one hand deprived of the raw material for the manufacture of his goods, by reason of the fact that the general level of prices in the United States for the finished commodities is a little higher than it is in Canada—finds himself, I say, deprived of that raw material —and at the same time finds his market

flooded by finished material produced in Europe and Great Britain. I would ask that the minister be good enough to see to it that every possible protection that is given to us in the statutes as they exist is taken advantage of, so that in the final analysis we shall not remain between the upper and the nether millstones in the matter of industry in this country.

I had the pleasure last year of directing to the minister's attention another point, and I hope that when he makes his reply he will tell us what is being done in that connection. That particular point, hon. gentlemen will remember, had something to do with this fact. Europeans find themselves able to enter their goods into Great Britain free of duty. Great Britain, on the other hand, finds herself able to ship goods to Canada under the British preference. We are glad to have the British preference, but we desire that those who are shipping into this country under that preference shall play fair. We do not want them to ship their commodities into this country under a preference and at the same time, in the same month, replenish their own supply, for their own consumption, from Europe, using the British preference just for the sole purpose of being able to manufacture over there and ship goods into Canada. We do not want them to ship goods under the preferential tariff and at the same time supply their home market with goods manufactured in Europe under conditions such as every hon. member knows exist on the continent. If this process continues, it is not too much to say that it is only a matter of time when we shall find in Canada that our standard of living, of which we make such a boast and are rightly so proud, will deteriorate to the standard of living under which those people in Europe are living to-day, and to which we do not like to refer. I should like the minister to enlarge on these two or three phases of the present trade situation and to give to the committee some idea of what is being done to look after the interests of those people in our midst who are employed in Canadian industry.

Mr. MALCOLM: In reply to my hon. friend, who objected strongly to the opening of an office in Chicago, on the ground that we should not establish an office in a country whose tariff was unfavourable to the entry of Canadian goods, I can only say that I should not care to take the stand that we ought not to try to sell our goods to anyone who will buy them. I should not like to take the stand, that because the United States decided to raise their tariff on two or three items we should step out of the market and say we cannot do anything. Canadian business men have represented to the department the advisability of this country having offices in Chicago. Whether or not those offices are going to be very helpful I will not venture to prophesy, but I think they will. I do think that until it is shown that the offices have not been helpful, it cannot be argued that they should not be established. I fully admit what my hon. friend says; the United States so frames its tariffs as to make it very difficult for us to trade with that country. But that we do trade with the United States the hon. member does not deny; he does not deny that we send many commodities to the country to the south of us. I will not bother to give the list.

Mr. BENNETT: Three-fifths consists of wood and wood products.

Mr. MALCOLM: A good deal of it, yes. With regard to the remarks of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) with reference to assistance in the sale of wheat, I may say that only on one or two occasions have our men found themselves able to be of much assistance in this direction. Last year in Mexico, our commissioner, Mr. Wilde, did endeavour to be of assistance to Canadian shippers in a general way by getting some of the Mexican buyers to take Canadian wheat. He succeeded in selling in the year about $300,000 worth. I happen to have his report on the matter before me. Our men in Italy at present are making a survey to assist in getting Italy to buy more of our hard durum wheat, which was under discussion the other day.

Mr. BENNETT: They have placed a duty of 75 cents a bushel on that wheat.

Mr. MALCOLM: I quite appreciate that fact, if that be true, it will be harder for our men, but still because we have duties against us I cannot hold that we should give up the work of trying to promote trade through our comercial intelligence service, which was started many years ago and which has been carried on under many governments. I believe Canadian exporters are of the opinion that the service has been of vast assistance to them, and I think it can be made of more assistance. As a matter of fact I am free to say, without desiring to criticize my colleagues, that I do not think we are more than scratching the surface in the way of giving assistance to the business men of Canada through commercial intelligence. I believe a very great

deal more help can be given than has been given, and if I were on the opposite side of the house and one of my hon. friends were minister I would be likely to criticize him for not opening more trade offices.

Mr. BENNETT: It depends where they are opened.

Mr. MALCOLM: I quite agree with my hon. friend that there is not much use in opening offices in places where it is difficult to do business, but I do not admit that because it is difficult we should not try to do business. I do not think we should take everything lying down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not think we should refuse to go into the markets of the United States; as far as I am concerned I am just as anxious to sell there as anywhere else—

Mr. BENNETT: We have not a trade office at Geneva, have we?

Mr. MALCOLM: That is a diplomatic office to which my hon. friend is referring; of course, he is a lawyer and he knows more about diplomacy.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister made a reference to hard durum wheat. Will he be good enough to explain what he means by a hard durum wheat?

Mr. MALCOLM: Durum wheat is a very hard, flinty wheat, as my hon. friend probably knows better than I do.

Mr. BENNETT: A macaroni wheat.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes. The word "durum" is a trade name for this particular wheat, which is largely grown in Manitoba. It does not grade in with our red spring wheat at all; it does not mill the same and the flour millers do not use it. It has found its outlet in the macaroni mills on the continent, and according to my information it cannot be mixed with our red spring wheat because of the difference in texture. It is not sold on the exchanges to the extent spring wheat is sold; it is disposed of in smaller parcels and there is a smaller quantity grown.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would like to ask a question in regard to the markets for wheat. I have been informed by people in the grain trade that practically all the wheat for European consumption is bought by a single firm in Liverpool; I am told that one house in Liverpool buys for fifteen European countries. Can the minister tell me whether or not that is correct?

[Mr. Malcolm.]

Mr. MALCOLM: I believe that statement is rather exaggerated.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Among the countries named by my informant were France and Italy, and I recall an incident which took place at the beginning of the session, when the Minister of Finance informed the house that the trade figures did not correctly represent the trade between Canada and France, because he had found that some wheat consigned to Great Britain had eventually reached France. My informant tells me that this wheat was bought by a firm in Britain and the destination changed to France while the wheat was on the Atlantic. It was really an export from Canada to Great Britain; the profit was made in Great Britain, and it was not an export to France at all. Great Britain exported that grain to France.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think that is true.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And I am told that the firm which bought that grain for France buys all the grain for Italy and thirteen other countries as well. I am told that there is no competition at all in the purchasing of grain at Liverpool because this one house controls the situation and buys for practically all the European countries which import grain. If that is so I can understand the lack of competition, and perhaps that is reflected in the price offered.

Mr. MALCOLM: I hardly think that statement is absolutely correct. The pool has some selling offices on the continent, and they are extending those offices; at the moment they are discussing opening an office in Milan, and in fact we have been asked to make some inquiries for them in that regard. They now have an agent in Milan and also have some agents in France. I do not want to labour the point raised by my hon. friend with regard to the crediting of exports to Great Britain, but I think hon. members generally realize that there is a difficulty in compiling consumption figures as against actual trade figures. We do not know whether all the newsprint we sent to the United States actually remains in that country; they may reexport small quantities of it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, but in that case we export directly to the United States, while in regard to the grain the export was made to Great Britain and the Minister of Finance tried to switch it to show that it was really an export to France.

Mr. MALCOLM: It would be an export to France if the grain left Montreal, as is often

the case, consigned to a Liverpool broker who bought it for delivery with the option of more than one point of destination. The grain might be diverted to France or to Belgium.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But the export was to Great Britain.

Mr. MALCOLM: It would be a sale to Great Britain, but the consumption figure would be shown by France. I think my hon. friend will agree with that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think it is artificial.

Mr. MALCOLM: France and Belgium both keep their figures according to the country of origin; this would be shown as Canadian grain, while we show it as a sale to Great Britain.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The object of the Minister of Finance was to give a favourable impression with regard to our trade with France under his treaty.

Mr. MALCOLM: I quite appreciate that.

Mr. EVANS: I understood the minister to say he was opening a trade office in Chicago. What class of goods will Chicago probably buy from us?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is it proposed to open any other offices in the United States in addition to the one at Chicago?

Mr. MALCOLM: No. I cannot tell my hon. friend what commodities we might sell in Chicago but I can give him a few items as to trade which has been the direct result of the work of our New York office this year. That office has been responsible for the sale of lumber to the extent of $3,750, for the sale of canned salmon to the extent of $4,800,000. They have also made some direct sales of Canadian cattle and there is a trade developing between Canada and the United States in certain varieties of biscuits, although this year that trade amounted to only $158,000.

Mr. EVANS: May I take it that these trade commissioners will be experts in appraising the values of the different goods sold in the different countries of the world? Last year two appraisers were appointed for cities in Germany, and I want to ask the minister if the knowledge obtained by these commissioners with regard to the values of different goods will be available to us?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry; I did not quite understand my hon. friend's question.

Mr. EVANS: Will the knowledge and information obtained by these commissioners in the different countries, with regard to the values of different commodities, be available to us?

Mr. MALCOLM: I can assure my hon. friend that we have the statistics here with regard to most foreign countries, but I do not know which commodity he would like inquired into.

Mr. EVANS: Anything we have to sell.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend realizes that the very duty of a trade commissioner in a foreign country is to survey the field and, if he finds any opportunity for trade, to forward that information here. It is distributed from the commercial intelligence office here to the various exporters, or the trade commissioner may communicate direct with the Canadian industrialist who is likely to be able to fill the orders the trade commissioner believes can be obtained. His job is to study the market in order to help the Canadian exporter.

Mr. MANION: Does he take the orders?

Mr. MALCOLM: I can assure the hon. member that he comes mighty close to it.

Mr. BENNETT: At times he comes too close.

Mr. MALCOLM: He gives every assistance to Canadian firms.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does he assist the live stock business in any way?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, I think every branch of industry is referred to our trade commissioners for information as to available markets. After all is said and done, I think my hon. friend realizes that the question asked by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) is rather a pertinent one. The hon. member asked if he actually took the orders. That is not his duty. His duty is to assist Canadian exporters in every way he can; find information for them and help them to establish connections and agencies. Since the commercial intelligence department was started years ago, I do not think it can be said that any Canadian exporter has received anything but a courteous answer and the utmost assistance when he made inquiries of our offices abroad.

Mr. KAISER: How many countries import wheat from us and how many countries import our flour?

Mr. MALCOLM: I have not the statistics as to the countries to which we sell our commodities.

Mr. BENNETT: Every European country buys our wheat.

Mr. KAISER: The figures I have indicate that thirty-six countries import our wheat and some ninety countries import our flour.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is possibly correct.

Mr. KAISER: Are we encouraging the exportation of wheat as against the exportation of flour; how is it that we are able to send our flour to so many countries and our wheat to so few?

Mr. MALCOLM: I think the hon. member must realize that every country in the world does not grind wheat.

Mr. SPENCER: With reference to the exportation of wheat, I would advise the committee that the pool have agencies both in France and Italy.

Mr. MALCOLM: They have an agent in Italy, not an agency.

Mr. SPENCER: I congratulate the minister upon opening more trade agencies in the United States, as I think we have waited too long to do this. Although the American tariff is against us, if the United States manufacturer takes full advantage of that tariff there is no reason why our goods should not go over the tariff wall. Would the minister advise the committee of the number of trade agencies which we have and where they are located?

Mr. MALCOLM: We have offices in Melbourne, Australia; London; Calcutta; Glasgow; Hamburg; Liverpool; Paris; Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro on the east coast of South America; Lima on the west coast of South America; New York; Bristol; Milan; Mexico City; Havana; Shanghai; Auckland; Kobe; Batavia; Kingston; Jamaica; Brussels; Rotterdam; Port of Spain; Dublin and Cape Town. The new offices will be located at Hong Kong; Panama; Oslo; Athens; Chicago and San Francisco.

Mr. SPENCER: Could the minister advise the committee how many trade agents or commissioners the United States have in Canada?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry but I cannot give the hon. member that information.

Mr. BENNETT: They call them commercial agencies.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the department have that information?

[Mr. Kaiser.]

Mr. MALCOLM: It can be secured for the hon. member if he desires it. I think they are called trade commissioners, but I do not know how many offices are established in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: They have one here in Ottawa.

Mr. HARRIS: Would the minister be good enough to answer the questions I asked?

Mr. MALCOLM: I thought the hon. member was making a speech, and I did not get the import of his questions.

Mr. HARRIS: If the minister wants a speech we can oblige him any time he is ready. I asked the minister to make some observations to the house with regard to the amount of service which is being given to importers to this country who are bringing European and other goods to Canada and supplying a demand which could very readily be supplied by our own home industries.

Mr. MALCOLM: The whole object of our commercial intelligence department is to assist Canadians who desire to export; it has nothing whatever to do with the importing of goods. Our trade commissioners do not assist Canadian merchants to find commodities; that is not their job. The trade commissioner's job is to help the Canadian exporter find a market. I hope the hon. member does not think that the work of the Canadian commercial intelligence department has been based on the principle of helping to buy foreign goods? It is based on the principle of selling Canadian goods abroad.

Mr. HARRIS: But they are wandering into the other line of endeavour.

Mr. MALCOLM: Oh, no.

Mr. HARRIS: My next question had to do with the commodities from Europe finding their way into Great Britain and replacing consumption there, and Great Britain in turn exporting them to Canada under the British preference. I asked this same question last year and perhaps the minister has had a chance to think it over and may be able to give me a reply this year?

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not think the hon. member is fair in asking the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he is putting through estimates on commercial intelligence, to go into a question which belongs properly to the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. BENNETT: Or National Defence.

Mr. MALCOLM: Perhaps. As to the hon. member's suggestion that commodities of continental manufacture might come via

Great Britain and enter Canada under the British preferential tariff, I think he must recall the discussion which took place a short time ago in the house, when the Minister of National Revenue was discussing the enactment of the 50 per cent British labour content requirement. That matter comes purely within the jurisdiction of the Department of National Revenue and this vote has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. HARRIS: The third question had to do with the export from this country of raw material. Are our trade commissioners finding markets for this raw material? Would the minister give the committee some information with regard to how the work of the offices would be divided up as between raw materials and manufactured goods? In other words, how much emphasis has the minister given in his instructions to these trade commissioners as to the service they should give in connection with the sale of raw materials as against manufactured goods?

Mr. MALCOLM: The work of the Canadian trade commissioner is the same as that of any other public servant, he is supposed to be of assistance to Canadian exporters. A Canadian exporter may desire to export newsprint and may ask for a survey. A Canadian exporter may desire to export wood pulp and he may ask the trade commissioner to secure for him some information as to possible markets for that commodity. He may ask the commissioner to find a market for pulpwood. I am giving these illustrations advisedly, because any man who believes in employment in this country knows that it is better to export newsprint than to export wood pulp, and it is better to export wood pulp than to export pulpwood. I hope the hon. member does not think that the trade commissioner has it within his jurisdiction to dictate to the exporter and say to him that he is not doing the right thing when he does not grind his pulpwood up and sell it in the form of paper. These men are employed for the service of Canadian exporters, no matter what their line of business may be. I can quite conceive that my hon. friend might say that we should not ship any finished leather to New York, but if we can ship leather and cannot ship shoes, why not ship leather? I do not think it is within the province of the trade commissioners to dictate; it is their duty to serve. The commercial intelligence branch is a service branch for which this house votes money. It gathers information which it is difficult for business firms to obtain in foreign countries, and supplies the information to Canadian exporters. It is not a department which should dictate governmental policy. It has to do the best it can under whatever policy may be in effect.

Mr. HARRIS: Surely the minister must admit that they have direction. He does not want to leave with the house the impression that they are merely employed on surveys for some of the Canadian exporters. Have they enough business from Canadian exporters to keep them employed 100 per cent of their time? There must be some portion of their time when they are looking for something to do, and when they receive direction from the minister as to what sort of service they are going to render. Will the minister tell us what these trade commissioners are doing during the portion of their time that they must find on their hands when they are not making a particular survey for some exporter of some particular commodity? There must be some guiding policy given by the minister, and surely we have a right to know what surveys are being made and what they consist of.

Mr. MALCOLM: The trade commissioners representing Canada do not waste much time. We have some extremely good men in the service. As regards their not having direction, I do not think the trade commissioners ever had any better direction than they have today under Mr. Chester Payne, the director of the commercial intelligence service. My hon. friend would like some information. May I read the progress reports of the office in Buenos Aires giving new business secured for Canadian firms directly by the office amounting to $164,888.

Mr. BENNETT: For how long a period?

Mr. MALCOLM: This is the new business secured during the year. Newsprint sold through the office by the efforts of Commissioner McColl amounted to $40,000. He sold $31,000 worth of radio supplies. Elastic webb, which is another article that we have been able to introduce into the Argentine, was sold to the extent of $20,000 worth. These are not big items, but they are articles which have not been sold there before by Canadian exporters. There were $15,000 worth of rubber shoes and $14,750 worth of storage batteries sold. Eighteen new agencies were established during the year in the Argentine republic. The market was investigated on certain items for eighty-eight different firms who asked for investigations. Our total exports to the Argentine republic in 1928 amounted to $11,085,000 and I think in 1929 Mr. McColl was able to show

an increase from $11,085,000 to $14,493,000. I feel that as respects our exports to the Argentine, a country which is competitive with us in regard to wheat and other grain products but not with regard to manufactured products, the result of Mr. McColl's work of the year has been very satisfactory.

Mr. SHORT: I notice among the list of agencies read by the minister, he does not mention Newfoundand. Are there any commercial agencies in Newfoundland?

Mr. MALCOLM: We have no trade commissioners in Newfoundland.

Mr. SHORT: Does the minister not think that a trade commissioner in Newfoundland could secure a great deal more business for this country than a trade commissioner in Chicago? This is one of our own dominions within a short distance, especially of the maritime provinces, which imports practically all the manufactured articles and a great deal of the food products it uses. I am told that the bulk of its imports to-day is from the United States, of the very articles which could be supplied by Canada. There has been of late a great deal of discussion in the newspapers with reference to Canadian trade with Newfoundland, and all the articles are condemning the government of Canada for not appointing a trade agent in Newfoundland and going over to the cities of the United States where the markets are practically closed against us, establishing agencies there and letting trade that is right at our own doors be captured by the United States. This is a matter that the Department of Trade and Commerce could very well look into. The trade that is nearest home is always the most satisfactory to have. We could supply many of the commodities that the people of Newfoundland are to-day importing from the United States; but if the government does not think that trade is worth looking after and prefers to establish agencies in Chicago and other United States cities where the tariff is so high against us, I think the government is showing very poor business judgment. I thought I would draw the matter to the attention of the minister, because there are splendid opportunities for trade with Newfoundland.

Mr. MALCOLM: We have looked upon Newfoundland as being a very easy country to reach, and one of our own men occasionally goes there to make a survey. At one time there was a trade commissioner's office in Newfoundland and a former minister thought it advisable to close the office because there was not enough work to keep the trade commissioner busy. We had contemplated, if we succeeded in making a proper tariff agreement with Newfoundland, reopening an office. Our business with Newfoundland is not very difficult to look after and it is hard for a man in that country to find enough work to keep him busy. He has not much travelling to do because the business is practically all in the one city, namely, St. John and it is in the hands of a limited number of firms. Our trade with Newfoundland amounts to about $11,000,000 and is quite substantial.

Mr. SHORT: It might be double that amount.

Mr. MALCOLM: It might be, if the Newfoundland firms found it profitable to import from Canada. My hon. friend will realize that Canada has not had any favourable tariff consideration from Newfoundland in the past. The rate of duty is the same on a Canadian article as on a United States article and it is not always easy for the Canadian exporter to increase his business. We are suggesting that Newfoundland should give us an empire preference. If that were done we would probably be justified in opening an office there.

Mr. SHORT: Is it not a fact that Newfoundland just recently tried to negotiate a trade agreement with this country but did not meet with very much success? Did their Prime Minister not visit Ottawa within the last few months and go away very much discouraged with the reception he got in regard to trade relations?

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not quite like the idea of my hon. friend from Digby trying to encourage the minister to establish a trade agency in Newfoundland. My experience from a business point of view is that wherever these trade commissioners have meddled, they have interfered with trade instead of benefiting it. My own company, coming down to personal matters, are presently and for a number of years have been doing a very fine trade with Newfoundland. Formerly we did a fine trade with France before the government monkeyed with it, but when they made their French treaty they cut us off entirely from the French market, and that is my reason for saying that I would very much prefer them to leave Newfoundland alone.

Mr. BENNETT: If they are going to make a treaty, yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes, because I am not at all sure of the benefits of their treaty-making.

Mr. BENNETT: Every one they have made has been a failure.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister a few minutes ago stated the amount of canned salmon that had been sold in New York owing to representations made by our office there. I would like to inquire whether this was imported into the United States for home consumption, or was reexported from the United States. The minister also said that a considerable trade had been worked up in biscuits.

Mr. MALCOLM: A small trade.

Mr. CHAPLIN: My objection to opening offices in the United States is based on my experience. Whenever my company or any other company that I ever had anything to do with worked up a business in the United States, just as soon as we got the business established, the United States immediately shut off the whole thing by raising the tariff overnight, and I say that simply to open an office in a country like that is an impossible business proposition. It is not right to spend the money on it, because we do not get any lasting benefit from it. I know that, and the minister knows it just as well as I do.

Mr. MALCOLM: The minister can speak feelingly on that point.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Very likely, if he has had anything like the experience that I have had. I have got so that I leave it alone entirely. I do not want any Canadian money spent in opening up offices in the United States, in Chicago or anywhere else. You can waste money enough without doing that. My experience has been that just as soon as you work up a trade with the United States it is shot to pieces overnight by an increase in their tariff, and they do not have to wait for congress to meet to raise the tariff.

Mr. MANION: I wish to offer a suggestion to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that is a method by which he might save this whole expenditure. I assume that this vote is in the estimates for the purpose of helping Canadian business and Canadian business men. My hon. friend himself is a well-known business man, and I think he will agree with my suggestion privately, although he may not publicly; that is to cut out this item altogether and to make a move that will cost this country nothing but will bring about far better results than the expenditure of this $750,000 for trade agencies in foreign countries. Let us treat other countries in tariff matters as they treat us. That is my personal opinion of what we should do. By doing that we would hold the home market, and even if our people did not get the foreign markets because of foreign tariffs, we would get the home market, and in all probability, knowing our attitude, foreign countries would not raise their tariffs so high against us, and we would therefore increase our trade with foreign countries as well, and all that could be done without the expenditure of this money. I am not suggesting cutting out the vote. I am suggesting a method of supplementing the minister's efforts to obtain trade with foreign countries, and that is to treat other countries in tariff matters as they treat us, which would enable us to hold our own home market and get much more of the foreign market than we otherwise would do, because foreign countries then would not treat us with as little consideration as they now do.

Mr. CANTLEY: There is not a man in this house who is better able to protect his business than the minister, and there is no greater protectionist. His business enjoys the highest rate of protection that the Canadian tariff affords. That is true; the minister need not shake his head. In addition to that, he sees to it that a considerable proportion of his raw material comes in free. I do not think that the hon. member who has just spoken can teach the minister very much about protecting the interests of his own business. I leave that for the consideration of the minister and of the committee.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was rather interested in noticing that we had two offices in South America. I have sometimes thought, and I wonder if the minister has, that there are good possibilities of increasing our trade there. It has appeared to me that possibly the South American countries offer the most promising field for our exports in many lines of goods that we can find in the world to-day. While, of course, the minister undoubtedly understands his business a good deal better than I do, still for my part at least I would strongly encourage him to reach out into that field and do as much business there as possible. I think if he established three or more live trade agencies there, it would be money well spent. I think we could build up a very much larger business there than we now have. As a matter of fact, as far as I can see, the countries of South America and the Orient are about the two best directions which are now open to us in seeking new markets or extending the markets we now have.

Mr. BENNETT: I would like to supplement the observations of the hon. member for Red Deer. Looking over the world at large, if we are going to trade we must make up our minds that we can trade only in those countries where there is the opportunity of selling what we produce. That means that we must sell primarily to those countries that do not produce what we have to sell. That seems to be axiomatic. We start with that, and what are we doing? We start two new offices this year in the United States, one in Chicago and one in San Francisco, and the next thing we find is that the United States increases its tariff on many of the goods that we could sell to them. They are increasing their tariff on beef and other agricultural products, on milk, for instance, and cream. By the elastic provisions of their tariff they can raise their tariff without waiting for legislation. All this is going on. I submit to the minister that in South America there is a very great opportunity, and while we are sitting by, the Americans are invading and securing that market. I think it is not too much to say that in a large way the South Americans would sooner trade with the Canadians than with almost any other people they know, or I will put it this way: Other things being equal, they would give us the preference. I think the minister will say that is so. The office at Panama is highly desirable, also at Buenos Aires, Valparaiso, Lima and up the west coast of South America. All these are very desirable, but when we talk of opening offices in the United States I put this to the minister: He is a manufacturer and he heard the hon. member from Lincoln, who is also a manufacturer, give his experience, and while this is not an experience meeting, because the experiences cannot at all be equal owing to the various businesses and the various tariffs imposed against them, may I say that during the last five years we have every evidence that when Canadian manufactured goods have found a market in the United States that market has been closed to them by the United States tariff, either by changing the classification or by a presidential proclamation, under their elastic tariff provisions, that shut our goods out.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is true.

Mr. BENNETT: That was the intention of the tariff act of the United States. It was put there for that purpose. Therefore let us devote our time and our energy and our money to promoting trade in those portions of the world where there is an opportunity for Canadian products to find a ready market. May I suggest to the minister that if he just had the same desire to promote trade in Canada as he has outside of Canada—

[Mr. Speakman.]

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, I have.

Mr. BENNETT: I would like to see the evidence of it.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is not my job with these estimates.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister says that is not his job. Others may think that it is his job. But at any rate I do put this to him: has the time not come when the Canadian government of the day should be considering something in regard to the home market? There is $800,000,000 worth of trade that many people in Canada could get by going after it. We import over $1,360,000,000. Last year alone we imported $420,000,000 of iron and steel products. Take electric goods; we send our copper blister to be refined in the United States, and because we have to pay a quarter of a cent a pound more than their own manufacturers pay for the same copper, we buy electric goods made in the United States. The same thing applies to nickel, to asbestos and to various other materials. The development of export trade is highly desirable; but remember this, in developing export trade we are subject to the caprice and the jealousy and the competition of the countries to which we ship our goods, as well as competition from every other country in the world. On the other hand, we have a market at home which last year we threw away to the extent of $1,300,000,000.

Mr. MALCOLM: Oh, no.

Mr. BENNETT: But that is what it gets down to. Do you realize that last year in duties alone on goods imported we collected $200,000,000. That was half of the entire revenue of the Dominion. If the minister will display the same interest in Canadian trade that he shows in his own business, and see that Canadian trade is protected by a tariff similar to that which he enjoys, then our manufacturers will have the business. I put that to him as a Canadian business man of whom we are proud, because he has succeeded in his business.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You are getting personal.

Mr. BENNETT: No, we are proud of him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: So are we.

Mr. BENNETT: He has succeeded. Why? Because he has had an opportunity of fair competition with the whole world. How did he get it? He did not get it; his business got it. Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave it to his business—a protection of 30 per cent. The minister's steel, his iron, his logs, his raw material come in free.

Mr. MALCOLM: Oh, no.

Mr. BENNETT: Not wholly, perhaps, but partly. The steel and iron from which you make your castors, the logs out of which you saw your ebony, your mahogany, your teak, your oak—these things come in free, and the reason that a profitable business has been built up in Kincardine, of which this country has some reason to be proud, is that the protection given to this Canadian industry has ensured that it will be maintained in this country against the mass production of the world.

Now, I want the minister to spend a little of his splendid talent and his energy and his vision in doing something for Canada; instead of trying to sell goods in the United States by trade commissioners in New York, in Chicago, and in San Francisco, and then when they get the business opened up, "bing," as the boy says, up goes the tariff, and that is the end of it. I know a case where a Canadian manufacturer established a market in Michigan. He said: "Here is my chance for my surplus product." He made his goods in Toronto, but before he could get his order actually delivered in Michigan the tariff classification became such that those goods could not be despatched. Right within five miles of where I now stand is a factory that tried to make aviation suits for sale in the United States, but the classification was so changed that they could not be shipped into that market. The people of the United States are not going to let Canada invade their market. To keep out our goods they change their classification overnight. I suggest to the minister that he devote some of his splendid talent to looking after our home market. He is a protectionist; the Minister of National Revenue is a protectionist; the Minister of Justice is a Genevaite—that is a little different; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a collector of curios—and he would certainly like to have a free trader as a curio; the Secretary of State is a protectionist—

Mr. McINTOSH: Complete the picture.

Mr. BENNETT: Well the member for North Battleford is neither.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the Minister of Trade and Commerce in opening up trade agencies in the United States. Contrary to what has been said by the front-benchers of the opposition, trade has been developed with the United States in spite of their high tariffs.

Mr. BENNETT: In what?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): In certain agricultural products. The export of cream and milk from this country to the United States has increased in spite of the raising of the tariff ever since the defeat of the Wilson administration.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the hon. gentleman know that on the 18th day of this month it will be increased by 50 per cent?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Yes; but the records will show—my hon. friend can get them and they will prove my contention—that in spite of all the tariff increases on cream and milk there has been a steady increase in our export of these commodities to the United States. I cannot understand the logic of the front-benchers of the Conservative party when they claim to be a high tariff party, and yet say that the raising of the tariff in the United States shoots business all to pieces. It must be a poor rule that does not work both ways. They would raise our tariff to a high level, and then our international trade would be shot to pieces. Surely we realize that in this day and age no nation can live unto itself alone, that we have to be traders the world over.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the hon. gentleman realize that we lost $100,000,000 worth of export business to the United States the first year the Fordney-McCumber tariff came into effect?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): I admit that it affects our trade for a certain time.

Mr. BENNETT: It will be four times that now.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But we are still very much alive.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Our exports of certain farm products to the United States have increased steadily in spite of their raising the tariff at different times. I have observed that the leader of the opposition in asking the Minister of Trade and Commerce to apply to his department many of the principles he applies to his own business, said that a lot of

his raw materials came in free. I believe one reason why the business of the minister has grown and prospered is that he has been able to assess the Canadian consumer to the extent of about 35 per cent on his output.

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not think my hon. friend will mind being corrected. There never was a duty of 35 per cent on furniture. It is only 30 per cent. The British preferential tariff is 18 per cent. In a great many instances the Canadian furniture manufacturers take no notice whatever of the duty; they sell their goods on a cost-plus-profit basis, and you will find a great many articles of furniture sold at the same price in Canada as in the United States.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Then why do you need the duty?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): In my speech on the budget I took our imports of furniture and the duty collected thereon—the average duty under all tariffs—and I know that the average duty was over 25 per cent.

Mr. MALCOLM: That may be.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): That was on actual transactions, not figuring out the percentages at all. If that is so, our furniture manufacturers are accorded that amount of protection.

Mr. MALCOLM: I hope my hon. friend is not arguing that because there is a tariff of 25 per cent on a commodity, the Canadian manufacturer takes advantage of that tariff. He must not argue that way. Every automobile tire is about the same price in Canada and the United States, and that can be shown in regard to commodity after commodity. My hon. friend is not fair if he arrives at that conclusion.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): I might be if I did not have specific instances to which I might refer. We know that in 1926 there was a slight reduction of about 10 per cent on automobiles and the price was immediately reduced. Had they not taken advantage of the tariff there would have been no price reduction. Whenever there is a reduction in the tariff there is a corresponding reduction in price. In this house only a short time ago, during this session, the classification of combines reduced the tariff from 10 per cent to 6 per cent. What happened in the west? Many combines had been sold, but the purchasers have received notice that the amount they will have to pay will be less by $60 to $100, although the contract of sale has already been made. This is due simply to the fact that the tariff was reduced from 10 to 6 per cent.

[Mr. B. W. Fansher.]

Mr. BENNETT: Where are they made?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): I can show that on several occasions when the tariff has been reduced there has been a reduction in price, and that to me is proof positive that many of these duties are taken advantage of by the manufacturers. The hon. member for Leeds says that combines are not made here. They are made by the Massey-Harris Company.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Of the United States.

Mr. KAISER: The minister says that the function of his department is to give assistance to exporters—all exporters. Does that apply to those who export Canadian whiskey?

Mr. MALCOLM: If we were asked to assist in the sale of Canadian whiskey in any foreign country the commissioners would be glad to give that assistance; that is their duty.

Mr. KAISER: There is something interesting about this trade and there are some phases of the question on which we should have some information. We export to the United States 1,126,000 gallons of Canadian whiskey valued by the department at $16 a gallon. Let us take now the island of Miquelon. There are 3,900 persons living on that island and they import 170,000 gallons of Canadian whiskey per annum. In other words, they import from Canada 51.51 gallons of whiskey for each inhabitant of the island who is not at school. There are 600 children at school in the island, and if they stayed at home and drank as much whiskey as all the adults of the island there would be consumed 42 gallons of whiskey for each man, woman and child in Miquelon—and this is exclusive of the amount of malt beer and whiskey imported from other countries. In Canada the per capita consumption is .31, or one-third of a gallon per head, as compared with 51.51 per head of the population of that little island. Now the curious fact is that the value of Canadian whiskey in Miquelon is only $5.50 a gallon, according to the reports of the department, compared with $16 in the United States. It seems to me that these trade commissioners must be very enthusiastic when they operate in small islands. For instance, in the West Indies, all the large islands consume only a limited quantity of Canadian whiskey, while the small islands consume about the same proportion as the island of Miquelon; and the price of whiskey in the West Indies is $5 a gallon. The fact is that the further away we get from Canada the lower the value of the whiskey becomes. When we get to South Africa we find that the value of Canadian whiskey there is given as $3 a gallon. That

may account for some of the vast immigration to South Africa instead of to this part of the world. I am interested to know why the whiskey shipped from Canada should fall in value in these distant places. I do not know why the small islands should want to consume so much whiskey, and perhaps the minister can explain this point; but the fact is that the value of the whiskey gets lower and lower the further away from Canada we get. If a gallon of whiskey goes direct to the United States we get an excise duty of $9 per gallon on it; when it goes to these small islands the people there get it without paying this duty, there being no excise nor export duty in this case. In my opinion all whiskey exported from Canada should be on the same basis as the whiskey shipped to the United States, and if we were to get $9 a gallon, by way of export duty, on the liquor sent to these other countries we should very nearly obtain enough revenue from these two sources—the United States and the other countries purchasing our whiskey—to pay the interest on the national debt of Canada. There is something that should be looked into in this connection. Why should we get $9 a gallon on liquor going direct to the United States while liquor going to these other places does not pay any duty? That is one question. Another question I should like to have answered is why these low values should be placed on Canadian whiskey going to every other country than the United States, until, as I have pointed out, the value drops to $3 in South Africa. May I have some explanation of this?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the minister answer the question I asked with reference to the salmon that went to New York?

Mr. MALCOLM: Was it a sample shipment?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister told us that his officers were responsible for the sale of some $4,800,000 worth of canned salmon in New York, and I asked whether that salmon was for home consumption or had been re-exported.

Mr. MALCOLM: I regret having made a mistake in that regard. This salmon was for domestic consumption in New York. The British Columbia salmon packers managed recently to get some New York houses to carry their product, and I read the item wrongly. I wish to correct it in Hansard. They received sample orders of $158,000 worth of biscuits and $4,800 worth of salmon—not millions.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The department publishes a journal known as Commercial Intelligence. Does not that paper continually carry certain inquiries from outside countries asking for agents in Canada for the sale of their goods?

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not know that it does. If it carries import advertisements it is without my knowledge.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I did not say advertisements; I said, inquiries from houses in the old country asking for agents in Canada for the sale of different commodities. Does it not carry such inquiries?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am informed that no agencies are asked for in the journal except agencies for the sale of Canadian goods.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What I want to know is whether this paper carries notices from foreigners who want to sell goods in Canada, asking for importing agents in this country for the sale of those goods.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think not, and I am informed by my deputy that it does not. I have never heard of it.

Mr. BOYS: I should like to ask the minister one question. He made a statement a few moments ago which interested me very much in view of information I have myself and in view of some remarks that were made in the house last year with regard to automobile tires. The minister stated—and I should like to know whether his statement is correct—that all tires in Canada were sold at the same prices as those charged for similar tires in the United States. The information I placed on Hansard last year, which I am confident was correct at that time, was that there were two sizes of tires actually sold in Canada for less than similar tires of that weight and make in the United States. With the exception of two sizes there was a slight variation in price in favour of the American tires, but in no instance was there a difference of 10 per cent, notwithstanding the fact that we have a duty on tires of 35 per cent.

Mr. MALCOLM: Twenty-five per cent.

Mr. BOYS: Certainly it was 35 per cent last year, if my memory serves me rightly.

Mr. MALCOLM: Speaking from memory I think it is 25 per cent.

Mr. BOYS: I do not really care very much; the point is that they are sold in some cases for a little less and in other cases for a little more than the prices of similar tires in the

United States. The minister did make the statement, which perhaps he did not intend to be taken literally, that all sizes of tires were made and sold in Canada as cheaply as similar tires were made and sold in the United States. Is that absolutely correct?

Mr. MALCOLM: No; my hon. friend is quite right in checking me up on the sizes. I believe I used the argument once before. The tire men observe the American schedule on practically all sizes; on some sizes I think their prices are 7 or 8 per cent over the Canadian list, and there are other sizes on which the American list is a little lower. I have not studied the list for some time, but the tire manufacturers claim that with their export business added to their domestic business they can meet American prices. In my opinion the rubber industry in Canada has treated the consumers of its products very fairly. It has reached a production of about $100,000,000 and is exporting about $30,000,000. I only made the statement in reply to my hon. friend from East Lambton when he made the assertion that every industrialist takes full advantage of the tariff. Some may do so; others may not, but I do not think it is a fair statement to say either that no industrialist takes advantage of the tariff or that all industrialists do. There are industries in Canada which have protection but are not trying to get every last cent out of it. Internal competition often controls the price to a very great extent.

Mr. BOYS: I think the fact is that the market is preserved for the Canadian manufacturer, and if the demand is sufficient to keep him working to capacity he can manufacture his product as cheaply as it can be made in the United States. We contend, of course, that protection is not given for the purpose of enabling the manufacturer to make an increased profit; rather it is given to preserve the Canadian market for the Canadian manufacturer.

I should like the minister to say to what extent the tariff is taken advantage of say in the boot and shoe industry, the furniture industry, and the clothing industry. It would be most interesting if we could get some such information with regard to these important articles as we obtained in regard to rubber tires. I have taken the stand with regard to rubber which I took last year, because at that time I went into the matter quite thoroughly. I have not had the opportunity of going into the question with regard to boots and shoes and clothing, but these things are very important to the farming communities. I should be inclined to think that possibly the manufacturers of these articles are doing just as much for the people of Canada as the manufacturers of rubber, who certainly have a very wonderful record. If the minister could give us any information with regard to these products I am sure every member of the committee would be glad to get it.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am not in a position to give my hon. friend the corresponding prices in many commodities, because it is a field of endless study. Rubber tires are on a given list, and it is very easy to make a comparison in that regard, but on the other hand there are many commodities in a different position. There is one particular commodity which was mentioned by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke; silk hosiery is sold at comparative prices in the United States and Canada.

Mr. BOYS: When the minister says "comparative prices" does he mean similar prices?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes. I do not know the situation with regard to boots and shoes but I do know that not many shoes come from the United States; the greater number are imported now from Great Britain. I can tell the committee that in the manufacture of furniture there are some lines where the full 30 per cent is needed, and a couple of million dollars worth of furniture comes in in spite of the duty each year. However, that is a condition of competition which I doubt could be stopped by a duty of 40 per cent. It is worrisome to the factories in the northern United States; Michigan and New York factories cannot meet this competition. On the other hand, I think it is safe to say that in connection with the better lines, Canadian furniture is sold for less than the American price plus the full amount of the duty. I know many lines which do not take advantage of the tariff at all. It all depends upon the kind of furniture.

Mr. BENNETT: There are so many varieties.

Mr. MALCOLM: Style is an important factor. I do say, however, that it is very unfair to industry for any one to state that the tariff is always taken advantage of; that is not always the case.

Mr. MANION: Hundreds of items can be cited in the United States where the price was lowered by the imposition of a tariff.

Mr. BOYS: I like to get things straight wherever possible, and the minister will remember that we had some slight difference of opinion in regard to the tariff on automobile tires. I have the tariff before me and I find that item 592 is as follows:

—tires of rubber for vehicles of all kinds—British preferential tariff 22½ per cent; intermediate tariff 30 per cent; general tariff 35 per cent.

Mr. MALCOLM: I stand corrected.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the discussion which has been going on for the last half hour is not at all relevant to the item under discussion. We are considering a vote for commercial intelligence, but we have been discussing the tariff.

Mr. KAISER: I asked the minister a question some time ago as to why Canadian whiskey is valued at different figures, $16 in the United States, $5 in other countries and only $3 in South Africa. What is the reason for this variation in value?

Mr. MALCOLM: I told my hon. friend that I thought his question should be asked of the Minister of National Revenue when his estimates are up. That question does not come under this department.

Mr. EVANS: I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Fort William say that we should treat others as they treat us. In that case I think we should treat Great Britain as Great Britain is treating us; we should sell where we buy and buy where we sell. I am trying to get at some of the incongruities of this tariff system, and I was rather amused to hear the minister say that the tariff was not used for fixing prices. The minister is establishing a trade agency in the city of Chicago this year, and I would like to ask him how Canada can ship goods into Chicago over the United States tariff wall and still make a profit? The fact then remains that the tariff in Canada is used in order that the consumer may be charged a price which will enable the manufacturer to compete in foreign countries, and that is what I object to. These trade agencies are established in countries which have a high tariff wall against us at the expense of the home consumer. I think this is money wasted and when the manufacturers themselves do not want these agencies established in the United States cities, why not cut out the item altogether?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Mr. Chairman, I was glad to see the minister get up in defence of the tire industry. I rather expected that he would answer the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fansher) with regard to the automobile industry, but he did not. The member for East Lambton said that a few years ago the tariff on automobiles was reduced and the cost to the consumer was also reduced. The minister knows that that is not the fact, and I think the hon. member for East Lambton knows it too. That statement is not correct and it cannot be proved, because the reduction in automobile prices did not amount to as much as the reduction in the sales tax and excise taxes, let alone in the duty.

Mr. BENNETT: All you have to do is to study the figures.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Some time ago the member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) gave us figures which showed that a few days after the tariff had been taken off the consumer had not been benefited by a reduction in the price. The reduction which occurred in the price of automobiles was the amount which was lost to the treasury of Canada through taking off the sales tax and excise taxes.

Miss MACPHAIL: They were that much cheaper.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But the treasury of Canada lost out.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) cannot deny the fact that the price of cars dropped immediately. The consumer was able to purchase them at from $50 for the cheapest car to up in the hundreds less than he would have had to pay had the tariff not been reduced. All the arguments of the hon. member for Lincoln or the whole front row of the Conservative opposition in the house, or of the high tariff men within the Liberal party, cannot convince the purchasers of automobiles that the reduction in the customs tariff did not reduce the price. I can give a personal experience of my own. I had just purchased a Delco lighting plant which bore a duty of 35 per cent. That duty was reduced in the 1926 budget, and the price of the same plant was reduced $90. Other lighting plants are made within Canada, but this particular make is not. The rank and file of the farmers throughout the country had an object lesson in the 1926 budget and one which they are not going to forget. A reduction in the customs tariff will bring about a reduction in the price of these things.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the hon. member can explain why there have been three reductions in the price of motor cars since that time without any change having been made in the tariff.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): I will make this observation—

Mr. BENNETT: Just deal with that one.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): If there is another 10 per cent reduction next year in the customs tariff, there will be a big reduction in the price of automobiles.

Mr. BENNETT: There have been three reductions since without any change in the tariff.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): The manufacturers have been able to sell more cars and have been able to reduce the price.

Mr. BOYS: Does the hon. member contest the statements which have been made regarding tires? Although there is a duty of 35 per cent, 9 per cent is the highest difference there is in the price of tires purchased in Canada and in the United States. In some cases the identical tire is sold in Canada for a little less. Does the hon. member challenge that statement?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): I have not looked into that particular item, but I realize that under certain circumstances a particular industry might be overbuilt. The bonus, so to speak, entices capital into an industry, it becomes overbuilt, and in a short time the promoters of that industry have to put their heads together and take entire advantage of the tariff in order to live. A special committee investigated conditions in connection with the sugar industry a few years ago—I think it was the session of 1922 or 1923—and they found that condition existing in the sugar industry. The industry had been overbuilt, it could not run twelve months in the year, and they had to put their heads together and take advantage of the tariff.

Mr. McGIBBON: How is it that the cost of agricultural implements has gone up since the tariff was reduced?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): The price of practically all commodities has been on the increase during the last few years.

Mr. BOYS: Most of them are coming down.

[Mr. B. W. Fansher.]

Mr. EVANS: As the minister is looking for trade in the United States, and has established agencies in American cities, does he expect to trade in those commodities on which there is a large American tariff against us?

Mr. MALCOLM: Naturally we expect to trade in the items we can trade in; we expect the United States to buy those items which they find it desirable to buy. In all the customs schedules of the world I do not think you will find a country with a longer list of free items than has the United States. They have plently of high items, but they have a very long free list. They do not put duties against the things they need.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly.

Mr. MANION: Anything they cannot produce themselves.

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not know about that. The list of products which we sell to the United States is quite a long one; it covers three or four pages.

Mr. BENNETT: There are five hundred items.

Mr. MALCOLM: There are a great many items. For instance, we sell the United States coal where it is advantageous for them to buy it.

Mr. BENNETT: On the Pacific coast.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is not a large item, but it runs to half a million dollars. We sell them acids.

Mr. BENNETT: Sulphuric acid goes in free.

Mr. MALCOLM: To the extent of $2,000,000.

Mr. BENNETT: It goes in free?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: And they use it for manufacturing and sell the goods to us.

Mr. MALCOLM: They may use it for their own consumption.

Mr. BENNETT: I looked into that matter myself.

Mr. MALCOLM: I contend that this discussion has gone very far afield. Because the United States has raised their tariff wall is no reason why we should stop giving assistance to Canadian business men who desire to sell their products in the United States, and I respectfully submit that this item should pass.

Mr. SPENCER: The minister said that very few manufacturers did not take the full advantage of the tariff, but that sometimes it was found necessary to do so. It seems to me that the only way in which a manufacturer would be able to take advantage of the tariff would be by charging less than the full amount. Just as soon as he charges to the limit of the tariff, there is no protection at all as foreign goods will come in over the tariff wall.

Item agreed to.

Electricity and gas inspection, including International Electro-technical Commission, $231,500.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. MALCOLM: The slight increase in this item is brought about by an increase in the staff, salary increases and the fact that certain new equipment has been required to carry on the work of the department.

Item agreed to.

The Precious Metals Marking Act, 1928, administration of, $6,000.

Mr. SPENCER: I suppose this refers to the administration of the act that came before the banking and commerce committee this year?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand the minister had an objection to that act. Is he quite satisfied with it as it has gone through?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am not quite satisfied with the act, but I think it is nearer what it should be than it was before. It provides for the importer putting his name on the imported article.

Mr. GEARY: And the word "imported"?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: In the administration of this act, do we collect anything towards the expense of administering it?

Mr. MALCOLM: There is no source of revenue from the enforcement of the act.

Item agreed to.

National Research Council, $400,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Has anything been done to increase the salaries of the men engaged in agricultural research? I understand that some recommendations were made to the minister by the Canadian Co-operative Wheat Producers, Limited. Has anything been done or is anything proposed to be done in that regard?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am glad to be able to tell my hon. friend that the salaries that were recommended to the minister by the president of the National Research Council for his technical staff were submitted to the commission which is studying the question of civil service salaries, which I believe it is meeting this week. We shall have a report on the matter shortly.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If the recommendation is favourable to an increase, will something be done during this session?

Mr. GEARY: I presume what the hon. member would like to know is whether there is any possibility of a report from the commission during the session.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend realizes it is not a subject that can be decided in a few days. We shall have to give the commission reasonable time.

Mr. McGIBBON: What progress has been made by the research council?

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend is quite right in asking for a statement of what work has been done. I am afraid I shall have to allow this item to stand until after recess so that I may get a further statement which I thought was in the file. The National Research Council are now established in temporary quarters in one of the buildings in the old Edwards mill, and they are now in a position to function. New quarters are being provided by the Department of Public Works, and construction is expected to start almost immediately on these new buildings. The sum of $300,000 was voted for the work of the research council during the fiscal year 1928-29. They request a further $100,000 for the coming year. This is required for further carrying on the work which they have in the course of preparation.

Mr. BENNETT: How much will be for administration and salaries, how much for researches and how much for buildings, if any?

Mr. MALCOLM: I thought I could get some papers I left on my desk in my office. The grants in aid of research amount to $160,000. Those are the grants to the universities for special work. Scholarships for post-graduate training and research amount to $65,000. The laboratory requires $40,000. An item of $20,000 is set aside for travelling expenses of the

council, staff and also of committees. There is $8,000 for administration and $7,000 for library and publications. Salaries, including all the staff of the National Research Council, are estimated at $100,000.

Mr. IRVINE: I should like to know whether the National Research Council has the expenditure of this $400,000 entirely within its own hands?

Mr. MALCOLM: It is spent on the recommendation of the president of the council, but it must always be, like any of the other departmental expenditures, approved by the department.

Mr. IRVINE: The reason I ask that is that I know the publication known as the Canadian Field Naturalist has been endeavouring to get a very small grant from the council to assist in giving greater publicity to new species. The council, for some reason or another, has not granted the request and I was wondering whether it would be within the power of the council to grant such a request—

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. IRVINE: —or whether we shall have to take some other means of getting assistance for the Field Naturalist.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think the council get requests beyond the amount of money they have to distribute. If my hon. friend has a request for a small or reasonable grant that he thinks is worthy of consideration, and will bring it to me, I shall be pleased to submit it to the council.

Mr. IRVINE: The grant this institution requires is only $200. It is very modest and I think the council should meet the request because it is doing excellent work in the field of research.

Mr. McGIBBON: It seems to me that as regards work of this kind, where an endowment fund amounting to $4,000,000 is being raised in Ontario and the amount at present under consideration is being provided by the Dominion—I am not complaining about the amount, because one cannot have too much money for research—there might be overlapping and lack of coordination which might not be beneficial to the country. Has there been any correspondence between the department and the Ontario government with a view to preventing any overlapping? I commend the minister in regard to this work, as I have commended the government many times in the past for like action. An institution of this kind is the very life-blood of the country, but to get the best out of it we should have coordination and no overlapping.

[Mr. Chaplin.]

Mr. MALCOLM: I am glad my hon. friend has brought up that point of endeavouring in every way to avoid duplication of effort, because it is a subject that is worthy of the greatest consideration. I am pleased to be able to say that Premier Ferguson and Sir Joseph Flavelle, who is at the head of the Ontario Research Foundation, have expressed themselves on many occasions as being only too anxious to carry on the work so that overlapping shall not occur. Doctor Tory has had several conferences with Sir Joseph Flavelle and they have discussed the question of preventing overlapping.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How are the subjects of research allotted? Does the student select his own subject or is it selected for him?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend the exact information that he wants.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There are students in the different universities following up different subjects of research. I brought to the attention of the minister two or three years ago, in connection with the report of the research council, the fact that a subject of research taken up one year would perhaps be dropped for two or three years, and resumed later. The report did not indicate that there was any finality in the action taken on the subjects of investigation and research, and it looked to me. from the outside, as if there were an indefinite system in the selection of the subjects of research and their continuance to a finality. Are the subjects allotted to the students, or do they select them for themselves?

Mr. MALCOLM: Each person holding a scholarship selects his own subject in consultation with the professor supervising the work. So far as publicity is concerned, if my hon. friend will peruse the new research journal which is coming out he will find that there is now a continuity of publicity on the problems which are being undertaken. The council has been very thoroughly reorganized during the last year and is following a definite plan, working in conjunction with the provinces. I would commend to my hon. friend the last issue of the research journal, which will give him much more information than I could do.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I looked over the last journal and the subjects seem to be very academic. I wonder if the minister can tell us what application they would have to industry in the Dominion.

Mr. McGIBBON: Suppose a problem is brought to the research institute by some industry and a solution is arrived at; whose property does that solution become? Is it the property of the government, or can anyone get the benefit of it?

Mr. MALCOLM: Anyone having a research problem to solve could take it to the research council, and could retain the ownership, just as is done in connection with the Mellon institute in the United States and the bureau of standards. On the other hand, if the problem is studied on behalf of the government, the patent or the right to the solution is acquired by the state. The Dominion government would then own it. I believe something comparable with the Mellon institute is contemplated whereby any industry will be able to submit a research problem to the council for solution, and will retain the rights thereto.

Mr. McGIBBON: The industry, I presume, would pay a reasonable amount for that service.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, they would pay for the service.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What has been accomplished along the line of engineering standards during the past year?

Mr. MALCOLM: I have no information on that, but I shall be glad to get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I should like to have it.

Item agreed to.

International customs tariffs bureau, $666.

Miss MACPHAIL: Would the minister give some information on this?

Mr. MALCOLM: This is a contribution which Canada makes to the international bureau for receiving information with respect to tariffs in all countries of the world. The amount paid last year was $588, and this year we are asking for $666.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Who is the head of this bureau, and where is it located?

Mr. MALCOLM: The International Bureau for the publication of customs tariffs was established at Brussels, Belgium, in 1891, as the result of a convention signed by 39 countries. This convention or union provided the means for admitting all nations into membership, and at present the International Customs Tariff Union comprises nearly 200 states or colonies, that is to say, almost every separate customs area in the world. The original agreement among the nations was to continue in force for seven years; then if not denounced, a further seven years, and so on from one seven-year period to another. In this manner, the International Customs Tariffs Union has been continued from its inception down to the present time. Canada has been a member from the beginning.

Miss MACPHAIL: Is the information that is gathered available to the members of the house?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: I understand that item No. 326 for $75,000 for the motion picture bureau has been carried. I wished to speak on that.

Mr. MALCOLM: We can go back to it.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Printing of parliamentary and departmental publications, including the "Canada Year Book", $130,000.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the reason for the increase in this vote?

Mr. MALCOLM: There is an increase of $12,000 over the vote of last year, and it is mainly due to the fact that the estimates were reduced last year from $128,000 to $118,000. Provision is also being made for the enlargement of the Commercial Intelligence Journal, and for two additions to the list of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics publications—the Calendar Year Trade Report, inaugurated last January, and a proposed bimonthly bilingual précis of exports and imports.

Mr. LUCAS: How many copies of the Canada Year Book are printed annually?

Mr. MALCOLM: We print 7,200 in English and 2,400 in French.

Mr. LUCAS: Is there any revenue derived from this publication?

Mr. MALCOLM: The Canada Year Book is distributed without charge.

Mr. FRASER: To whom; to members of parliament?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: I want to register an objection and point out to the minister that this year I did not get a copy of last year's issue.

Mr. McGIBBON: The rest of us are in the same box.

Mr. MALCOLM: Last year's issue is not out yet.

Mr. FRASER: When does it come out? Is it always a year behind?

Mr. MALCOLM: It takes some little time after the close of the fiscal year to get these statistics together.

Mr. FRASER: Will the issue that we have not yet received contain the statistics of the last fiscal year up to March 31, 1929?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. LUCAS: I understood the minister to say that something like 7,000 copies of the Canada Year Book were printed and distributed to members of parliament. Who else are entitled to free copies?

Mr. MALCOLM: They are distributed to the universities, schools and public libraries. Any institution can get a copy on application.

Mr. FRASER: What schools receive copies?

Mr. MALCOLM: Any schools that wish a copy for their libraries are put on the mailing list.

Mr. FRASER: Public schools?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, public schools, high schools, colleges.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To anyone who cares to ask for a copy.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. CANTLEY: I understood the minister to say that the statistics are for the fiscal year ending March 31. Now, it would be much more useful and much more convenient to everybody if calendar year statistics were prepared. We have in the empire more than half a dozen different dates for the close of the fiscal year; we have March 31, we have May, we have June, we have September, and we have December. The difficulty is that anybody who wants to compare statistics over a certain period cannot do so. The most useful ones are those that are compiled for the calendar year. I would strongly impress upon the minister the necessity and the advisability of compiling his statistics to cover the calendar year ending December 31.

[Mr. Malcolm.]

Mr. MALCOLM: I will note my hon. friend's observation. I may tell him that we have a calendar year trade report published now, from which he can get trade figures.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am referring to the trade publication discussed here during the last few minutes.

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend is referring to the year book. It is rather difficult not to have the year book correspond with the fiscal year returns given by the finance department. I will bring the matter to the attention of the head of the Bureau of Statistics; but I would point out to my hon. friend that as the government accounts are all closed on March 31, it does seem advisable to have the statistics for the same period right through the Canada Year Book. For the benefit of the trade papers we have published calendar year figures for some time.

Mr. CANTLEY: In what publication?

Mr. MALCOLM: They are available in the statements which are circulated every month.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is there any good reason why the fiscal year should not be made to correspond with the calendar year? When I came here originally the fiscal year ended on June 30; then for some reason it was changed to March 31. I cannot see any advantage in the latter over the former. Why not make it the calendar year?

Mr. MALCOLM: I know of no reason. It would be a matter of policy which the Minister of Finance would have to consider. I do not know how many years we have been following the present system.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We started it about 1909. I had a discussion with the Minister of Railways (Mr. Dunning) on the same subject, and he strongly advocates that the fiscal year and the calendar year synchronize. Unless there is a good reason for the difference I do not see why it should continue.

Mr. CANTLEY: So far as this matter is concerned there is chaos in the Dominion. In Nova Scotia in the last ten years the fiscal year has been changed three times. The year now ends in September. Go over this Dominion from one coast to the other and I venture to say that in no two provinces will you find their dates corresponding, so that it is practically impossible for any man who wishes to compare statistics in the various provinces to get a resumé of the trade of the

country during any twelve months. I see no reason why the fiscal year of the Dominion and of every province should not end on December 31; it would simplify matters greatly from many points of view

Mr. MALCOLM: There is a good deal of merit in what the hon. member (Mr. Cantley) and my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) have stated. No doubt it leads to a great deal of confusion having a different fiscal year in each province and in the Dominion, and it would make for a clearer understanding of the figures if there were uniformity in the matter. I am afraid however that my hon. friend's problem would not be made any easier of solution unless the provinces agreed to compile their statistics as from the same date as the Dominion.

I thoroughly agree with the suggestion and I think it might be made a matter for provincial and federal consideration; it would make for facility in the comparison of statistics. I shall be glad to submit the matter to council.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If the minister would start with the Dominion of Canada before waiting for the provinces to take the initiative, and if he would see that our fiscal year ended December 31, it would be of great advantage to us and others would see the wisdom of it. It must be apparent to the minister, and no doubt it is, that if the fiscal year ended with the calendar year your balance sheet will be out and all your records will be in hand so that we may start business with a clean sheet. As it is now no one knows what will happen at the end of the year. The Minister of Finance does not make a budget any more in this country; he does not know what the previous year has done for him, and he does not make a budget at all for the next year. He does not even make a guess at it. We have stopped budgeting so far as this parliament is concerned.

Mr. CANTLEY: I wish to thank the minister for the very sympathetic view he takes of the matter. No doubt he will recall that at an annual meeting of the manufacturers' association six or eight years ago this matter was discussed very fully and a strong memorandum was directed to the various governments. If the minister would take such action as he suggests, and call the attention of the various provincial governments to the desirability of a uniform system in this regard, the reform could be affected within a reasonable time, to the great advantage of trade and to the satisfaction of all who are in any way interested in statistics affecting the commerce of the country.

Mr. MALCOLM: So far as trade figures are concerned, there is a publication which has been issued for a good many years now giving the figures annually.

Mr. BENNETT: The real truth is, as the hon. member for Pictou has pointed out, that people abroad find it difficult to follow our statistics. Our railway accounts end with the calendar year, and our public accounts with March 31. The result is that the House of Commons will not be in a position for another year to discuss the expenditure made by this government for the year ended March 31, 1929. That is the real difficulty. The minister will recall that we changed it once from October, and then to June and back to March. Certainly in the provinces the same difficulty has been experienced—and it relates to the calling of parliament or the legislature. The real reason behind the present system is that the Auditor General's report may be available in order that the accounts may be as fresh as possible. The fact of the matter is that we have not had a budget speech since Mr. Fielding made his last. Mr. Fielding of course always made a budget speech; he budgetted for the year ending March 31 of the next year. The present Minister of Finance will not take a chance and estimate what his revenue and expenditure will be; he votes his money, but he has never made an estimate of the revenue since Mr. Fielding's budget of 1923. In British Columbia they estimate their revenue by departments, and they deal in the same way with their expenditure. They make a complete budget statement showing the expected revenue from each department of the public service, together with a statement of contemplated expenditures of each department, and their public accounts are prepared accordingly. In recent years the Dominion government has not been doing this and the situation is getting worse, with the result that people outside the country find it difficult to follow our accounts. The League of Nations has been endeavouring to secure uniformity in this matter. The Minister of Labour, through the representation which Canada will have, should be able to secure a system of uniform accounts, particularly with the aid of the Minister of Justice. But this has not been done. All we have been able to do is to get a uniform policy with respect to free trade, which some hon. gentlemen say it is desirable to follow but which the Minister of Finance says is no good. Cannot the Minister of Labour do something for us?

Mr. SPENCER: I suggest to the leader of the opposition that we need not go to British Columbia to find an up to date system; we have one in Alberta along the lines he has pointed out.

Mr. CAYLEY: To whom are copies of the year book issued? I have not received one.

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend was not in the house when a similar question was asked and answered. These publications are distributed to members of parliament. The particular book to which he refers is not yet ready. All the publications are distributed to schools, colleges, libraries and any other institution which is on the mailing list.

Item agreed to.

The weights and measures inspection service, including the International Bureau of Weights and Measures, $345,000.

Mr. LUCAS: Is there a revenue from this department?

Mr. MALCOLM: The expenditure for the past year was $326,773 and the receipts were $399,308, leaving a surplus of $72,535.

Mr. LUCAS: There is an increase in the vote this year; what is the reason?

Mr. MALCOLM: It is due to increased business—increased fees collected.

Item agreed to.

Motion picture bureau, $75,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister make a statement on this item?

Mr. MALCOLM: This increase of $25,000 over the amount voted last year is necessary to meet the requirements of the bureau due to the expansion of its activities. The director of the motion picture bureau has estimated that an increase of $25,000 is necessary to provide for the following:

Growth of bureau, expansion of activities and increased volume of production	$ 5,000
To defray travelling and other expenses incurred in the performance of work for other departments and not refundable to the bureau under present regulations	3,000
To provide for the seasonal appointment of temporary employees whose salaries are paid from contingencies	1,000
To defray customs duties, et cetera, heretofore not provided for	3,000
To purchase additional equipment to meet increased needs of bureau	3,000
To provide for the production and distribution of 16 mm. films	10,000
	$25,000

Mr. BENNETT: How many people are employed in that bureau; how are the pictures distributed and how are the subjects selected?

Mr. MALCOLM: The Canadian government motion picture bureau was organized in 1917 and operates as a branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce. Its functions are: To produce and circulate throughout the world motion pictures and photographic material designed to disseminate information about Canada, its resources, opportunities, scenic beauties, attractions, basic industries and so on, and through this means encourage development, trade, settlement and tourist travel; as a central organization for the production of technical, instructional, advertising and other such types of films and pictorial material for all federal government departments; to cooperate with the provincial governments, the national railways and steamship lines and other organizations in the production of all types of pictorial matter used for the general development of the Dominion's interests, welfare and progress; to cooperate with the motion picture industry in matters pertaining to the general development, welfare and progress of the Dominion.

Since its organization in 1917 the bureau each year has shown steady and substantial development, both in the scope and extent of its activities and the volume of pictorial matter produced and distributed. During the present fiscal year the bureau has shown the greatest growth in every branch of its work of any year in its history. The total volume of motion pictures prepared and processed will, it is estimated, exceed the previous year's total by approximately 20 per cent, and the total amount of other photographic material produced and distributed will exceed the previous year's total by approximately 25 per cent. The total number of films in circulation throughout the world on January 31 of this year is approximately 80 per cent greater than at the same date a year previous. The extent and coverage of territory, while not definitely estimable, is vastly greater than for any other year.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister need not trouble himself further in that connection, but I should like to know how the subjects are selected and how the films are distributed, because I have seen some of these films which I thought were taken for the purpose of illustrating—because there is no other way by which they could be known—the performances of the Liberal party.

Mr. MALCOLM: My deputy points out that the subjects are really selected by the provinces who ask us to film them and we look after the distribution of the films.

Mr. BENNETT: Is that so in every case?

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not think it is true in every case but I believe it is the general practice that we do this work for the provincial governments. We do agricultural pictures and studies of industrial and mining developments, and we also do work for all the departments in Ottawa.

Mr. BENNETT: The last part of the answer covers everything, I think.

Mr. MALCOLM: Some of the work performed for the departments in Ottawa is as follows:

Department of Agriculture, $3,183.05.
Department of the Interior, $4,754.96.
Department of Marine and Fisheries, $7.15.
Department of Labour, $24.95.
Department of National Defence, $851.13.
Department of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment, $7.92.
Department of National Revenue, $10.80.
Department of Insurance, $17.90.
Department of Immigration, $306.30.
Department of Mines, $762.48.
Post Office Department, $687.20.
Canadian Forestry Association, $145.95.
Canadian National Railways, $597.10.
Canadian Exhibition Commission, $1,650.

Additional revenue was received from other sources. From First National Pictures of Australia, Limited, we received $2,451.41 for films leased; from the Canadian Universal Film Company, Toronto, we received $1,224.14; from the Film Exchange, New York, we received $341.20; from a firm in Paris we received $117.08, and there were other small amounts received from various sources. The total revenue amounted to $14,583.48.

Mr. BENNETT: That was just for work done?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, work done for the departments. The total revenue, including rental of films leased, amounted in the last year to about $18,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Under what principle are they distributed? Supposing someone in Calgary wanted to obtain one of these films; how would that be done?

Mr. MALCOLM: My deputy has just pointed out that these films are highly inflammable, and of course they cannot be shown except under the proper auspices, in a place which complies with the provincial regulations.

Mr. BENNETT: I am asking these questions because I was requested to do so and I should like to get it on Hansard. Supposing a theatre in Calgary desired to show one of these films; how would they go about it?

Mr. MALCOLM: If any theatre wants to show these films we make no charge; they have to pay just the carrying charges. We are very glad to have these films shown in any good theatres desiring to use them.

Mr. BENNETT: They just pay the express and freight?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, that is all. I think the same rule applies in the Ontario motion picture bureau, which spends much more money than we do.

Mr. SPENCER: This item calls for an increased expenditure of $50,000. I heard the minister's explanation for part of that increase, but I should like to hear an explanation as to the other $25,000. Then I would point out that this vote calls for publicity and advertising in Canada and abroad, other than countries of Europe. Is there another vote to cover European countries?

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend is on the wrong item; we referred back to item 236.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: We are properly at vote 330 now.

Mr. SPENCER: Was vote 329 called?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, and declared carried.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, 329 was not called; 328 was passed and we reverted back to 326.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am quite sure vote 329 was not called, because I intended to ask the minister the reason for the increase.

Publicity and advertising in Canada and abroad, other than countries of Europe, $100,000.

Mr. MALCOLM: I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend the reason for the increase, but he will really see the reason in the wording of the vote. Last year the vote was for publicity in Canada, but we have had a great many applications for publicity in South America. It has been held that we can spend money very advantageously in the Latin-American countries, perhaps by supplementing the work of the motion picture bureau in advertising Canadian products there and so on, so this vote now includes advertising and

publicity in countries other than European countries. This will permit us to spend any portion of the $50,000 for publicity in these countries to which I have referred.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I should like to ask if any portion of this vote is allocated to publicity in the United States?

Mr. MALCOLM: Not a dollar of it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am very glad to hear that because I agree with some of the members who expressed the view this afternoon that there is a reasonable chance of doing business in South America. Those who are in business in that country and know something about it can tell the minister that. As I said this afternoon, there is very little chance of our doing business in the United States; we might as well save the advertising.

Mr. MALCOLM: I can assure my hon. friend that the countries to which I referred are those in which our publicity department would like to spend some money.

Mr. EVANS: This vote for advertising has been increased $425,000 this year. Last year votes 319, 329, 330, 331 and 332 totalled $950,000, while this year the total is $1,375,000, an increase of $425,000. I think the committee should have some explanation for this large increase, as these votes are all part of what may be taken as advertising for Canada.

Mr. MALCOLM: If the hon. member desires to consider the items together I shall be very glad to answer his question. The increase in the vote which we have been discussing is explained by my previous remarks. Publicity and advertising in the British Empire is increased by $50,000 because we feel that the work we have done in promoting publicity in regard to Canadian products has been very beneficial and we thought that the work should be continued and increased. I think the hon. member will realize that in a business amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, which we are doing with Great Britain, the money spent for publicity is a relatively small amount. If we can acquaint the people of the British Isles with the products which we have to offer them and which they need, I do not think that money could be spent in any better way. A comparison with the expenditures made by other countries, such as Australia, will show that our expenditure is indeed rather modest.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I have one criticism to make which applies not only to this department, but to others, and I think it is one to which the minister will listen with sympathy. It is very advisable that our advertising should preserve a continuity regardless of administration; whether a Liberal government be in power, or a Conservative or Labour government be in power, is not a matter of importance. The Empire Marketing Board has been doing some very wonderful advertising in connection with Canada through the medium of hampers which are packed with Canadian goods and which can be purchased at the corner grocery. In each basket or hamper there is a statement as to how much Great Britain purchased from Canada, and how much Canada purchased from them; the number of men who went to the war from Canada, and other interesting information. While in England I took the trouble to go into this matter very carefully and I was struck with the character of the advertising and the appeal it must make to the people interested. Certain departments have been issuing advertising with the name of the minister or the deputy minister attached, and I suggest to the minister, in the best spirit in the world, that these advertisements which are issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce of Canada should be issued by the department and should not contain any person's name. In England they have found that the preservation of the continuity of the advertising is the one thing to be observed and when, in a very short time, the people have an opportunity to place another government in power these advertisements will be issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce of the Dominion of Canada. These advertisements are really to advertise the products and not the individuals. This matter has been brought to my attention on more than one occasion and it has been said that the Department of the Interior, the Department of Trade and Commerce, and one or two other departments have issued advertisements of that character. At times the Post Office Department has done so, but it is advertising of another character. I trust the minister will see my point and that he will endeavour to eliminate the individual from these advertisements and speak only of the country or the department charged with the responsibility.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am very glad to have my hon. friend make that suggestion, because in making it he has found only one very small matter to criticize. I do not mind my name being on the advertising because I was rather proud of one thing in connection with it, namely that it has never been political advertising. I should like to remind the com-

mittee that in the distribution of our advertisements we have gotten away, I hope for all time from partisanship with regard to the press.

Mr. BENNETT: You are bound to.

Mr. MALCOLM: Our advertising appears in the Canadian press from the Atlantic to the Pacific; in the daily press twice a year and in the weekly press twice a year, without regard to the political leanings or the political viewpoint of the papers. I appreciate what the hon. leader of the opposition has said with regard to the continuity of the advertising. If the insertion of the name is the only part of our advertising which is worrying my hon. friend, and he can assure me that when that wonderful day comes of which he speaks, his minister's name will be left off—

Mr. BENNETT: Absolutely.

Mr. MALCOLM: —I shall be very glad to consider his suggestion.

Item agreed to.

Publicity and advertising in the British Isles, $150,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the increase in this vote due to the activities of the Empire Marketing Board?

Mr. MALCOLM: It is due to a closer cooperation with the activities of the Empire Marketing Board. That board is doing what might be termed sentimental or general advertising, trying to create in the minds of the British people the idea that they can procure within the empire the major portion of the goods they need. The board finds it rather difficult to refer to specific items with reference to one particular country; because they may be competitive with another part of the empire and we endeavour to supplement the work of the board by specific advertising. For instance, last fall we tried out an advertising campaign in the Midlands. This campaign was recommended by Mr. Forsythe Smith and Mr. Gerahty, and it proved very successful as it increased the sale of Canadian apples to an enormous extent. The publicity department proposes extending the scheme to various other districts in England, and it is the extension of general schemes to supplement the work of the Empire Marketing Board which necessitates the extra expenditure.

Mr. CAYLEY: Is the Dominion represented on that Empire Marketing Board?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, Mr. Wilson of the Department of Agriculture is a member of the board; Mr. H. Watson, our senior trade commissioner in London is a member; and Mr. Gerahty, the director of publicity in London, is a member also.

Mr. CAYLEY: Do we make any contribution to the upkeep of that board?

Mr. MALCOLM: No.

Mr. SHORT: As very good results were obtained from the advertising of apples in England last year, I would suggest to the minister that he use part of this increased amount in continuing that advertising this year. There is an abundance of blossoms this year and if Providence gives us the right kind of weather we will have a very good crop. If good results have been obtained from the advertising of Canadian apples last year in the old country, does the minister not think it would be a good idea to extend that advertising and to increase the sales as much as possible?

Mr. MALCOLM: What my hon. friend is asking for is just what I have explained, namely, that where we have found the scheme profitable we want to enlarge it. With regard to apple advertising, we are not paying all the money. We are offering any group of Canadian producers assistance in their publicity if they will contribute. We spent in the apple campaign in the Midlands, $30,000, of which $15,000 is to be paid by the producers' association, so that the scheme is doubly beneficial. The producers do not feel that as good results can be had from the amounts which they are willing to vote as can be obtained when the campaign is handled properly by a publicity department in London, and much of this increase will go to an extension of the apple selling campaign.

Mr. ARTHURS: Votes Nos. 329, 330 and 332 appear to be votes which should be chargeable, to a great extent at least, to the Department of Immigration. It seems that the Department of Immigration is disguising a good deal of its expenditure under other departments and, particularly, under this department.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend is hardly fair in that. This money which is spent in publicity through the Department of Trade and Commerce is entirely for publicity in connection with marketing. None of this money has been spent in immigration offices at all.

Mr. ARTHURS: Am I not right in connection with vote No. 332, which reads:

Exhibitions and state fairs in Great Britain and the United States, amount required for the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Mr. MALCOLM: The moneys have all been spent on state fairs at which we exhibit Canadian products. We have now a very fine collection of Canadian products being exhibited.

Item agreed to.

Exhibitions—exclusive of the requirements of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, $265,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the minister will give us an explanation of this item; it looks very strange.

Mr. MALCOLM: The exhibition branch, as my hon. friend recalls, was under the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Mr. BENNETT: At one time under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MALCOLM: It has now been taken over by the Department of Trade and Commerce and is being looked after by Mr. Turcotte, whose department has been transferred from here to London.

Mr. BENNETT: Vote No. 332 refers to exhibitions and state fairs in Great Britain and in the United States. Vote No. 331, which refers to exhibitions exclusive of the requirements of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, is the one about which I am trying to get information at the moment.

Mr. MALCOLM: Those are for our state fairs in Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. BENNETT: Vote No. 332 refers to exhibitions and state fairs in Great Britain and the United States. Vote No. 331 refers to exhibitions exclusive of the requirements of the Department of Immigration and Colonization. That is why I am asking about it. The amount is more than a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. MALCOLM: There is an increase of $65,000 in this item. This amount is required for shows and window displays when space has to be purchased in the British Empire; for the purchase of goods in Canada for exhibition purposes; for the purchase of materials used in exhibition displays, including lumber, paint, oil, and so forth; for the removal of goods from Canada to London; for the salaries and travelling expenses of the staff; the rental of the site for the exhibition warehouse and cold storage plant. The details are as follows:

Permanent salaries, $43,020.
Purchase of goods in Canada, $15,000.
St. Catharines warehouse—

Which is for the collection of fruits.

—$9,000.
Ottawa office, $4,000.

This office is being run on a very small scale now.

London exhibitions, British Industrial fairs, $8,000.
Ideal homes, $15,000.
Cookery and food, $3,000.
Birmingham British Industrial fairs, $4,000.
Portsmouth British Industrial Fair, $1,500.
Aberdeen British Industrial Fair, $2,000.
Cardiff British Industrial Fair, $2,000.
Aldershot British Industrial Fair, $1,500.
Manchester British Industrial Fair, $1,000.
Liverpool British Industrial Fair, $1,000.
Belfast British Industrial Fair, $1,000.
Edinburgh British Industrial Fair, $1,500.
Bristol British Industrial Fair, $1,500.
Dublin British Industrial Fair, $1,000.
Smaller exhibitions in the British Isles, jointly, $5,000.
Continental fairs, $25,000.
Window displays, $6,000.
Imperial Institute, $25,000.
General expenses, including wages of temporary staff in London, $87,680.
Rental of site for warehouse, $1,300.
Expenditure to January 31, 1929, Advances, $85,562.02.

Mr. BENNETT: From April 1, 1928.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, until January 31, 1929.

Printing and stationery, $678.67.
Rents paid, $9,490.29.

That will be to some extent eliminated when we have our new warehouse.

Salaries, $20,962.32.
Special assistance, $9,361.64.
Travel, $5,874.70.
Sundries, $45,873.81.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister will admit that we are spending $87,000 in salaries and wages.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, that is general expenses. The permanent salaries amount to $53,000.

Mr. BENNETT: But the minister has an item of $87,000.

Mr. MALCOLM: I can give my hon. friend the salary list.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not want to trouble the minister in regard to that, but it seems questionable whether he is getting adequate returns in view of the expenditure. It looks like spending $100,000 for the sake of getting $165,000.

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend realizes that it is essential to maintain the nucleus of an organization. We are not spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps a million dollars, as we did when a large fair like the one at Wembley or some other world fair happened to be taking place. But as long as we keep the organization together, we are always in a position, should it be advisable to go, for instance, to Antwerp to the fair which they propose holding. If we could have exhibitions commensurate with the staff, we would be voting more money than we are. The staff is large but, as I say, it is essential to maintain the organization. It is not so large as my hon. friend might think. Mr. Turcotte, the director, gets $4,125; Mr. Buckle, the departmental accountant, $3,180; Mr. Dalglish, chief of mineral exhibit division, $3,360. We have vacant the positions of chief of designing and decorating; chief of agricultural and commercial exhibit division; assistant to the chief designer. These positions have been vacant for some little time. Then we have two men at St. Catharines and five at Winnipeg preparing the grain and fruits exhibits, so that it is really just a nucleus of an organization that we have. I can tell my hon. friend that it would be very hard to do without it, even if it does cost us $87,000.

Item agreed to.

Exhibitions and state fairs in Great Britain and the United States, amount required for the Department of Immigration and Colonization, $110,000.

Mr. MALCOLM: In respect to this item the hon. member for Parry Sound is correct.

Mr. BENNETT: Is there not a duplication of our activities with respect to items 331 and 332? Here is the Department of Immigration and Colonization doing certain work in displaying our products, and my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is doing the same thing, exclusive of the Department of Immigration, in items 331 and 332. He is going into state fairs, and the Department of Immigration is doing the same thing. This is a joint exhibit apparently.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is not in reality, but the Department of Immigration had been handling the whole exhibition branch and we felt that the Department of Trade and Commerce should not be loaded with the whole of the charge. In this item there is $50,000 for the collection of exhibits, $54,000 for state fairs and $6,000 for general exhibits. The state fairs cost last year $40,000, and the Winnipeg collection of exhibits, $38,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Where were these state fairs held?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am very sorry I have not the list here, but I am prepared to let the item stand and give my hon. friend the list.

Mr. BENNETT: Are the appointments to these various positions, one or two of which still strangely seem to be vacant, made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MALCOLM: In every instance.

Item agreed to.

International customs tariffs bureau—further amount required, $659.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was one of those who chorused "carried" when we passed a small item of $666 for this same purpose about an hour ago. What is the explanation for this further vote?

Mr. MALCOLM: A letter was recently received from the Consul General of Belgium advising that the extension of the Dominion's external trade would justify its inclusion in the first class group of states that are parties to the customs tariffs union, and that the contribution from the 1st of April would be increased by the amount we are here asking for. It is rather difficult for Canada to refuse to pay her proportionate share while securing all the benefits. It is only a small amount in any event. I do not think it is held by anyone that we should not pay $1,200 or $1,300.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Although it does not come under this item, I would ask if the minister has considered the question of the violations of our coasting law, and whether the same conditions will be allowed to prevail this fall to the disadvantage of our boats.

Mr. MALCOLM: I shall be glad to discuss that matter when the steamship subvention items are up.

Item agreed to.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Atlantic ocean, Pacific ocean, and local services, $1,070,050.

Mr. BENNETT: To shorten the discussion of this item, will the minister say whether there are any new subventions over last year, and give the reason for the decrease?

Mr. MALCOLM: On the Atlantic there are no changes. The three services are the same as last year, and the vote is the same. On the Pacific we are asking for a grant for a new service between British Columbia ports

and the antipodes, largely for the assistance of the lumber trade. That item is in the supplementaries. There is no change in the main estimates so far as the Pacific service is concerned. On the local services there is an increase on the Halifax and Bay St. Lawrence service of $1,200; on the Mulgrave and Canso service a reduction of $725; on the Murray Bay and north shore service a reduction of $7,100. I think that covers the changes.

Mr. SHORT: I desire to draw the minister's attention to the freight rates on apples charged by the Atlantic steamship federation. I spoke about the matter when I made a few remarks on the budget. The minister was not then in his seat. The rate on apples from Nova Scotia to European ports is 90 cents per barrel, provided the shippers sign a contract with the federation that they will use no outside steamers. If they do not sign that contract, the federation insists on a rate of $1.10 per barrel—a discrimination of 20 cents per barrel. The Nova Scotia shippers resent this discrimination very much indeed, and if the Minister of Trade and Commerce can remove this injustice his action will be very much appreciated by those shippers.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the hon. member say that that steamship federation is getting a subvention from the Dominion government?

Mr. SHORT: I presume that some of the lines in the federation are subsidized.

Mr. MALCOLM: These are not subsidized lines. I assume my hon. friend is referring to the North Atlantic conference rates. I should like very much to be able to assure him that I could dictate to the conference, but I do not know any minister of trade and commerce in the past who has tried to do it and not come to grief.

Mr. STEVENS: You tried it a couple of years ago.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would point out to the minister that in 1925 his right hon. leader in his celebrated declaration from Richmond Hill told the country that there would be no monopoly on land or sea, that the north Atlantic conference would be brought to account at once, and that there were to be fair rates accorded to everyone on land and sea. Since then I understand the Canadian government merchant marine has twice increased its rates, cooperating with the conference. Now we have my friend from Digby (Mr. Short) complaining of a situation which the government, I am confident, is powerful enough to counteract, and if it will address itself to that purpose I am satisfied good results will follow.

[Mr. Malcolm.]

Mr. BENNETT: Before the minister answers, I would suggest that there is no good reason why he should fear the fate that overtook his predecessor in office in an endeavour to deal with this problem. His desire for office is not so great, I am sure, as to discourage him from venturing upon the field where a certain distinguished gentleman met his Waterloo. But may I observe that the way the situation was dealt with, on the great lakes as well as on the Atlantic ocean, reminds one of Mrs. Partington; and the result was about the same. The minister should deal with the point brought up by the hon. member for Digby. That is, if apples are shipped on a through bill of lading the rate charged is fixed by the north Atlantic conference, and if the shipper does not avail himself of a vessel within that ring, he has to pay two rates instead of the through rate. The other day I was talking to one of the leading citizens of Nova Scotia who had resisted this discrimination. Surely the minister is powerful enough to deal with that situation. Knowing his ability to secure appropriations for North Bruce to provide steamship connections from the most remote ports in that peninsula with the outside world, surely he is not going to neglect the apple shippers of Nova Scotia for the sake of the local traffic of North Bruce. If he displays the same energy in dealing with that situation as he has in securing rebates on coal used in the salt works in his constituency, and in securing appropriations for public works in the most remote part of the North Bruce peninsula, I am sure he will be able to secure substantial results for the Nova Scotia apple shippers.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition must realize the situation relative to the north Atlantic conference rates as well as any hon. member of this house. It has often been held that we would be much better off if the Canadian government merchant marine did not observe the conference rates, but I am not of the view that that is necessarily the best course to pursue. The shippers of apples from Nova Scotia enjoy the same rates under the north Atlantic conference as the shippers of apples from the United States to Great Britain. When we consider that we are put on an even footing with the shippers of American apples, I think we ought to be reasonably satisfied. The Nova Scotia apple shippers can always charter a ship if they so choose.

Mr. BENNETT: But they have to have refrigerator space.

Mr. MALCOLM: Probably so; but I firmly believe that if we get into a rate war

we would not fare as well as we are faring at the moment. The country to the south of us is willing to spend money to subsidize steamship services for low rates, and I rather fear that if we took action we would put our shippers at a disadvantage.

Mr. BENNETT: But there was to be no monopoly on sea or land.

Mr. MALCOLM: There has been no monopoly; the north Atlantic conference rates have been reasonably low. In conjunction with those rates shippers have the advantage of warehouses and docks for handling their freight.

Mr. BENNETT: And through bills of lading.

Mr. MALCOLM: Which are a distinct advantage. The north Atlantic conference lines are endeavouring to secure trade, and therefore it is reasonable to assume that they are not going to quote rates which will not develop traffic. The minute their rates become too high, chartering will immediately take place. I am not inclined to think that my hon. friend from Digby is working in the best interests of the apple growers of Nova Scotia in making his request.

Mr. SHORT: The apple growers of Nova Scotia think so, because they have passed a resolution condemning that discrimination.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, I know a lot of people who theoretically condemn the conference rates. But I have very grave doubts whether their position in relation to the United States shippers would be improved if such action were taken.

Mr. BENNETT: But the major part of the United States traffic out of New York is carried in British bottoms.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. SHORT: They do not object to the rate of 90 cents per barrel, but they do object to being penalized if they do not use the federation steamers exclusively. For instance, if a shipper wants to ship his apples this week by the federation boat, and next week desires to ship by another line, he is charged $1.10 per barrel instead of 90 cents unless he gives them the entire shipment. That is what they complain of. They are not complaining of the rate of 90 cents, which is a fair rate and is the rate paid by the United States shippers. But they do object most strenuously to having to sign an agreement to give their entire shipment to the federation steamers.

Mr. RYCKMAN: If the statement made by the hon. member is correct there is an instrument ready to hand for the minister to wield. He might consult the Department of Justice and find out whether action can be taken under section 498 of the criminal code which has recently received a reinforcement from the Supreme Court of Canada in a case laid before it. I submit that the situation indicated by the hon. member is intolerable. One resents an injustice. If A is charged half what B is compelled to pay then B has a right to insist upon fair treatment; and the government is there to see that fair treatment is meted out. The matter now is with the minister. This is a matter of transportation, a matter of trade and commerce, and it is within his jurisdiction.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister has a remedy in his own hands in connection with the use of the facilities in the harbours of Halifax and St. John and other ports. The case referred to by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) is one in which the apple grower in Nova Scotia would not sign an agreement "all or none". That is the whole story—all or none. Can a free Canadian citizen be compelled to accept this situation. If I do not ship all my apples one way I am to be penalized by paying twenty cents a barrel more in order to get them to the other side? We have wharves and railways, and we should teach these people that, while we will utilize their facilities for the purpose of shipping apples, when it suits us, if someone else comes forward who will take our apples at the same rate, we will use the facilities they afford, and no one shall put a pistol to our heads and say, "All or none."

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend has put the case clearly. The north Atlantic conference give the conference rate to a whole shipment. They say, "If you cannot give us all your business we cannot give you the conference rate." Whether or not the parliament of Canada can say to a British shipping company that they must not discriminate between the shipper who gives them half his cargo and one who gives them his entire shipment, I am not prepared to say. I appreciate the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Ryckman), and the matter is one that has been given consideration. But I am just cautious enough to be unwilling to promise my hon. friend that anything can be done.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The minister will promise further consideration?

Mr. MALCOLM: I shall certainly be glad to go into the matter, but I will not promise that something will be done because the north Atlantic conference is not very easily dealt with.

Mr. SHORT: Do I understand that the minister promises that the department will look into the matter?

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): If the minister will look at item 150 he will see a vote of $3,600 providing for a service between Halifax and Bay St. Lawrence, while there is another vote of $18,000 for a steamship service between Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence. There seems to be a duplication here; that vote of $3,600 should be eliminated, should it not?

Mr. MALCOLM: There is an increase this year of $1,200 to make up the $3,600 subsidy which we have agreed to pay for the service, and there is a supplemental item to meet last year's deficit.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): But is not that $3,600 unnecessary?

Mr. QUINN: We have heard of the freight rate on apples from Nova Scotia to England. Can the minister give us an idea of the freight rate on apples from New Zealand to Canada?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry I have no freight rate schedules with me.

Mr. QUINN: I have just received information that a cargo of apples—twelve thousand boxes, an hon. member informs me—is about to arrive at Halifax for distribution in the eastern provinces. There would seem to be some advantage to the New Zealand shipper when he can ship apples half way round the world to eastern Canada at this time of year. To me it looks very much like carrying coals to Newcastle to ship apples to Nova Scotia. What is the advantage to the New Zealand shipper?

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend has mentioned something of which I had not previously known. He realizes of course, as we all do, that this time of year is fall in New Zealand. Their apples are ripening and going on the market, and I presume they have chartered a steamer to take an entire shipment, with no doubt a very favourable rate.

Mr. BENNETT: The rates are so low that on a through bill of lading from New Zealand to Calgary butter comes in at only a few cents per hundred pounds more than the rate from Vancouver to Calgary.

[Mr. Ryckman.]

Mr. SHORT: The express rate on apples from Windsor, Ontario, to St. John and Halifax is $1.20 per hundred pounds, while the express rate on apples from the Annapolis valley to Windsor, Ontario is $2.50 per hundred pounds. While Ontario is an apple-growing province, there are grown in Nova Scotia varieties of apples which are very much in demand in the cities of the upper provinces. Now with a discrimination against our maritime, or Nova Scotia, apples of $1.30 per hundred pounds we cannot expect to build up a trade in Nova Scotia fruit. Is there anything that the minister can do in the way of having these rates regulated? It surely does not cost any more for the express companies to carry apples from Nova Scotia to points in Quebec and Ontario than it does for them to bring apples from those same points to Nova Scotia. Why there should be this discrimination against our Nova Scotia apples I cannot understand, and I should be glad to have the minister look into the matter.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister promised a few minutes ago to explain a matter I brought to his attention.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think my hon. friend is referring to the waiving of the coastal regulations in the fall to permit the storage of grain in boats over the winter. All I can say to the house is that every fall there has been a pressure brought by those moving grain to take advantage of all the available space that can be found. That pressure undoubtedly comes from the shippers who wish to allow American boats to load grain and hold it in storage at the bay ports for unloading during the winter or spring. The coastal regulations call for the unloading of the boat during the season of navigation; to allow the boat to remain with a cargo is a violation of the coastal regulations and requires the passing of an order in council. These orders in council have been passed for the last several years on the recommendations of the Board of Grain Commissioners, in an endeavour to provide additional space, and the Lake Carriers' Association, which I believe has made complaints to the hon. member for Kingston, naturally objects to this practice.

So far as my department is concerned, and so far as I personally am concerned, I do not see that any great harm has been done to the Canadian shippers; as a matter of fact I think some good has been done the handlers of grain by allowing them to take advantage of this extra space. It is quite possible that it is a mistake to let so much grain come down; it is quite possible that the opinion held by some that there is altogether too much grain in our

show window and not enough back in the warehouse, to use the vernacular, is well taken. Perhaps it might be very much better if we had more grain in the country and less at the front, but I can only tell my hon. friend that we will have to look at it from year to year and consider the circumstances that exist at the time. If there is a tremendously heavy pressure for storage space and the shippers of grain want this privilege, we might be inclined to grant their request, but unless there is a heavy movement and a great need for storage space I would not be inclined to permit this to be done. I wish my hon. friend would not ask me to make a promise with regard to the matter until such time as the request is made, but since he always has taken such an interest in the matter I would say that before we grant the request another year I shall be glad to discuss the matter with him in order that he may defend himself with those who press him on behalf of the lake shippers.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister does not appreciate the objection I raised. The shippers make no objection to the violation of the coastal laws with regard to the retention of grain in vessels; their objection is that after that privilege has been granted these vessels have returned to the head of the lakes for another cargo. There is no objection at all from the transportation people in regard to the storage of grain in vessels; that is quite reasonable and helps everyone, but the objection is that after they receive that privilege they violate the provisions of the order in council by returning to the head of the lakes for further cargoes.

Mr. MALCOLM: I had forgotten about those two or three cases to which my hon. friend refers, but I can assure him that they will not be repeated.

Item agreed to.

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions

British Columbia and Australia, service between, $80,000.

Eastern Canada and Brazil, Uruguay and the Argentine, steam service between — further amount required, $20,000.

Halifax and Bay St. Lawrence, service between—further amount required, $1,200.

Mulgrave, Arichat and Petit de Grat, steam service between — further amount required, $2,000.

Rimouski and Pointe aux Outardes, service between—further amount required, $2,500.

Victoria, Vancouver, way ports and Skagway —steam service between — further amount required, $892.—Total, $106,592.86.

Mr. STEVENS: I have just one very brief observation to make in reference to this item. I am very glad to note the subsidy which is to provide for service between British Columbia and Australia and to assist in meeting the unfair competition we are up against with the subsidized service from Washington, Oregon, to Australia. I have just one point to draw to the attention of the minister, a point which I mentioned to Sir Henry Thornton in the railway committee when we were discussing the estimates of the merchant marine.

The government merchant marine gave a very excellent service on the Atlantic; that service was quite satisfactory and I believe it stimulated business, but it did not pay. I suggested that it might be possible to use those ships on the Pacific, if we had close collaboration between the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Canadian National Railways. If this subsidy were paid to the merchant marine it would be so much money saved, in a sense, so I would suggest to the minister that when this matter is being considered the government merchant marine should have the advantage, if there is any, and if it is found impossible to use those ships in this service the subsidy should be given a Canadian company rather than an American company if an American company should tender for the service, having in mind the danger of subsidizing a service which might be prejudiced through its very close association with the United States service from the Pacific coast to Australia.

Mr. MALCOLM: I did discuss with Sir Henry Thornton and the officers of the Canadian National Steamships whether or not they would be in a position to tender for this service. I am afraid they will not be able to do so. Hon. gentlemen will notice that the next item in the supplementaries shows an increase of $100,000 for our river Plate service to South America from the Atlantic coast, due to the fact that the traffic has increased and it is necessary to use more ships. I do not think it will be possible to make very much use of the older vessels of the Canadian government merchant marine. Tremendous changes have come about in shipping during the past decade, as my hon. friend well knows; the 9 and 10 knot boat built some years ago is not profitable at present and it is not satisfactory to shippers. The cost of operation of old boats is so excessive that the newer types of ships with Diesel power plants are driving them off the high seas. The Canadian government merchant marine, if parliament felt that we should increase our expenditure on ships and go into the business with new and up-to-date boats, of course could carry out this service as my hon. friend suggests. It might be good business, but unless the Depart-

ment of Railways and the Canadian National Steamships decide on a program calling for the yearly construction of three or four modern freighters with modern power plants, they will not be able to compete with the newer boats which we can secure under subsidy. The best of the government ships are now on the Atlantic; some of the unprofitable ships are being taken off and sold, and I think that is a wise move. The United States Shipping Board has disposed of all its unprofitable boats, some of them at very low prices.

I can assure my hon. friend that this service, for which we are asking $80,000 for the remainder of this year and for which we may require $100,000 next year, will do what the old merchant marine service did in connection with the transportation of lumber. The lumbermen on the coast are all behind this service; perhaps we have taken longer to consider it than we should have taken, but I wanted to be sure that we would not do an injustice to the existing service. However, I am quite convinced that the existing service cannot do for British Columbia lumber shipments what can be done by this new service, and I can assure my hon. friend that of course British shipping will receive the preference when tenders are considered. Last year we were offered a very good service for the river Plate ports by some motorships, but they were of foreign registry and we felt that if we were subsidizing at all we would prefer to subsidize ships under British registry. We felt that the merchant marine had two or three boats which would be suitable for that service, and therefore they received the subsidy. I am glad to say that these boats have left the Atlantic seaboard loaded on every occasion, and I believe the proposed service will also prove profitable.

Mr. LADNER: What services are now in operation which would be capable of rendering the service which is being provided for in this item?

Mr. MALCOLM: If the hon. member will look at item 150 in the main estimates he will see an item, "Canada and New Zealand, on the Pacific, service between." That service has been in existence for some time and is operated by the Union Steamship Company.

Mr. STEVENS: That is a mail and passenger service.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is really a mail and passenger service, and, as I remarked a moment ago to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, I am quite satisfied that the shippers are right when they say that this service cannot transport the lumber as well as give a proper freight service.

[Mr. Malcolm.]

Mr. LADNER: It really means the establishment of a new freight service in order to assist the lumber trade?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, the lumber trade will receive the greater benefit from it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How did we come to get into a local service in Argentine with this river Plate service?

Mr. MALCOLM: That is a through service from Canada.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why do you call it the river Plate service?

Mr. MALCOLM: Calls are made at river Plate ports.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Do I understand that the service starts at Buenos Aires and continues up the river?

Mr. MALCOLM: The service is from Canada to Brazil, Uruguay and the Argentine Republic.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The reason you refer to the river Plate is because that is the end of the route?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: You are not interested in giving a service up the river at all?

Mr. MALCOLM: Oh, no.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): I notice an addition of $1,200 is being asked for the Halifax and Bay St. Lawrence service, which in my opinion is absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. MALCOLM: Under vote No. 167 for 1928-29 the sum of $2,400 was voted to provide a subsidy for a motorship service between Halifax and Bay St. Lawrence, and other ports in northern Victoria county, Nova Scotia. A contract was entered into with the Nova Scotia Shipping Company, Limited, Halifax, covering three trips in the spring and three trips in the fall of 1928, at a subsidy of $400 per trip. The report of the royal commission investigating the fisheries of the maritime provinces and the Magdalen islands, 1928, recommended that this service be assisted by a subsidy to such an extent as would ensure its operation at regular periods during the whole season of open navigation; that is to say, throughout the summer months, as well as during the spring and fall. The con-

tinuation of the service during the summer months was strongly supported by the Department of Marine and Fisheries and by petition from the fishermen of Neil's Harbour, South Ingonish and other points in northern Victoria county; and the fish dealers of Halifax, and the Halifax board of trade. An agreement was arrived at by correspondence with the Nova Scotia Shipping Company, Limited, who undertook to make one trip each month during the summer, or three trips in all, at the rate of $400 per trip. This additional service is being provided, on the recommendation of the fishermen and the boards of trade, for an added period of three months.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): The next item provides for $2,000.

Mr. MALCOLM: The hon. member probably knows the boat which was on that service, the Prince Albert, which was sunk by ice. We made an agreement with the contractors to build a new boat and put it on the service. The new steamer will cost from $40,000 to $45,000 to build and the contractors, therefore, ask for a slight increase in their subsidy, amounting to $2,000. Previous to 1927 the provincial government contributed a subsidy of $3,000 to this service, but this was discontinued in 1927 and the contractors are entirely dependent upon the Dominion subsidy to make the operation of this service possible. It is, therefore, proposed to increase the Dominion subsidy to $15,000, and in view of the construction of an entirely new boat to grant a ten-year contract for this service to the Albert Steamship company.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Who comprise that company?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry I cannot tell the hon. member anything about the personnel of the company.

Item agreed to.

Trade and Commerce—salaries, $572,625; contingencies, $40,000.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Chairman, I observe with pleasure that the salary of the deputy minister has been increased from $8,000 to $10,000, and I make that observation because I think that in most cases the higher government officials who are vested with great responsibilities in administering large departments do not always receive the renumeration their work warrants. I do not recall the exact instances, but I believe there are other deputies who have not received corresponding increases, and it seems to me that this is a question which should receive the consideration of the government. The decision to grant these increases must have been arrived at through the application of some principle, and I should like to ask the minister what that principle was and on what basis the increases were made; whether or not the question of the length of service was involved, and whether or not all the deputy ministers received an increase.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend any information as to the representations made by my colleagues on behalf of their staffs. I was of the opinion that my deputy minister was entitled to a slight increase in his remuneration, and when the request went to the treasury board I was very glad to know that they had acceded to my recommendations. Whether or not the other ministers asked for the same increase for their deputies, I am not prepared to say. I think perhaps the right hon. the Prime Minister would be able to answer that question.

Mr. LADNER: One will observe that these increases are uniform, and to that extent there must have been some effort made to apply a principle. If we accept the minister's word that there was no principle at all, then it must have been just a guess. I think my question is a fair one; I do not ask it with respect to any particular deputy as I do not recall who did not receive increases, but probably it is unfair that any discrimination should be made in this regard. I think the committee is entitled to know if there was some basis which governed the increases. If the uniformity of $2,000 in the increases has any significance then the minister would have the information.

Mr. MALCOLM: Not being a member of the treasury board I do not know what arguments were used with regard to the deputy ministers in the various departments. If the hon. member desires to know to what extent the treasury board considered length of service, and what other matters were considered, I think he would be well advised to direct his question to the chairman of that board, because I am not in a position to give that information.

Mr. LADNER: Was the minister's request for an increase of $2,000?

Mr. MALCOLM: I may say frankly that when I was consulted with regard to the matter, I said that I thought my deputy was worth $10,000.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MALCOLM: If my hon. friends are agreeable, I should like to take up the item dealing with the Canada Grain Act.

The Canada Grain Act, including management, operation, maintenance, and equipment of elevators, administration of, $2,618,570.

Mr. SPENCER: Does the revenue derived from the charges made equal the expenditure in this case?

Mr. MALCOLM: The revenue this year has exceeded the expenditure. I can give my hon. friend the latest figures:

	Receipts	Expenditure	Surplus
Grain inspection, weighing, etc.	$2,179,435 23	$1,856,202 06	$323,233 17
Management, operation and maintenance of elevators	807,435 27	430,384 38	377,050 89
Equipment of elevators	.....	16,056 35	(deficit of) 16,056 35
Totals	$2,986,870 50	$2,302,642 79	$684,227 71

The apparent surplus is $684,227.71.

Mr. COOTE: Was sufficient money voted last year to carry out the administration of the act?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, we had sufficient voted last year for that purpose.

Mr. COOTE: I should like to bring to the minister's attention the accommodation provided for the grain inspector at Calgary. I mentioned it before. I think better accommodation should be provided for the grain inspector at that point. The premises he has at the present time are too small to enable the staff to work satisfactorily. They have not enough window space. It will be realized that grain inspectors always want a north light.

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend brought this matter to my attention and the accommodation which he wanted is being provided at the present time.

Item agreed to.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and icebreakers, $1,650,000.

Mr. McGIBBON: I have been taking up with the minister a number of times a matter in connection with the tax on canoes, rowboats and motorboats in Muskoka. If the minister will be good enough to tell me that he will repeal the order in council in question, I shall have nothing more to say.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Unfortunately I am not in a position to be as generous as that in regard to my hon. friend's request. I should like to hear his reasons.

Mr. McGIBBON: I am sorry the minister cannot give me that assurance. I will ask him another question, because I do not want to say anything that is unnecessary with regard to this matter. Has the government determined to leave that order in council in force?

Mr. CARDIN: That is practically what has been decided. There may be a discussion and a reduction of the rates, but I am afraid we shall have to stand by the order in council.

Mr. McGIBBON: Then I shall have to enter a protest against the discrimination that is being exercised in connection with the riding which I have the honour to represent. I do not know why my riding should be singled out from all the ridings of the Dominion of Canada and an order in council passed imposing a tax of from $1 to $8 on all canoes, rowboats and motor boats. I know what the minister will say, namely, that this has been asked for by a tourist association some of whom, I am free to admit, are Conservatives, but I humbly submit to the minister that it would be better to take advice, if he is going for advice to Conservatives at all, from those who represent the people rather than from those who do not represent anybody. I submit that this tax is unfair and discriminatory, because in the whole Dominion of Canada it is only my riding that has been singled out. Moreover, this is a tax which it is impossible to enforce. Let me read for the minister's information his own order in council, so that I shall have a basis for the remarks I intend to make:

His Excellency the governor general in council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and under the provisions of the Government Harbours and Piers Act, chapter 89 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that the regulations made and established by order in council, P.C. 1170 dated 12th July, 1928, be applied to the following waters to be known as the harbour of Muskoka lakes—

To be defined as follows:

All the waters of lakes Muskoka, Rousseau and Joseph, including their connecting and tributary waters.

I wonder if the minister has ever considered what that means. We have three lakes there with a coastline of possibly 200 miles that he is going to make into a harbour. More than that he is taking in all the tributary rivers and the connecting waters—for example, the south branch of the Muskoka river, which runs away back into the district of Haliburton, and the north branch, which runs away up into the district of Parry Sound. The other outlet from the lake runs into Georgian bay. Taking it all in all, I think his order in council is making a harbour that will have from 1,000 to 1,500 miles of coastline. If that is not a ridiculous thing to do, I do not know what would be. Moreover, it is an infliction that is going to penalize not only the ordinary residents of Muskoka but tourists as well. The tourist trade is bringing a large amount of money into this country every year; in a former debate it was estimated at $275,000,000 a year. If these regulations are going to be enforced, every tourist who comes to this country will have to hunt up some person, take an affidavit, go and get a license, put number plates on his boats or canoes, and equip them with lights. That will be a real annoyance to the many tourists who come into our country, many of them bringing a canoe on the side of their car. It will be a real annoyance also to the farmers and other residents of Muskoka living near the Muskoka lakes.

If the minister will read the regulations he will find that they require a light to be carried in the stern of a boat or canoe that will be visible from all sides. If the minister has ever been in a row boat or a canoe, he must know that that is impossible. No man could fix a light in the stern of a boat so that it would be visible from all sides on a dark night. These regulations are going to be a worse nuisance than the luxury taxes which the Conservatives put on years ago, and they are bound to cause an immense amount of trouble. Only one man is appointed to issue the licenses; he lives in Toronto nine months out of twelve, and during the other three months he is located in the little village of Port Carling. People will have to go miles and miles to get their number plates and licenses. It will mean that some people will have to go from fifty to sixty or seventy miles.

The minister has been very generous in saying that he will reconsider this matter. I am going to be frank with him: he could not put in my hands a better instrument to get votes than these regulations if they are to be enforced. But I am not looking at it from that point of view; I am looking at it from the point of view of the good of the country. The tourist trade is rapidly growing, and petty annoyances of this sort will disgust those who come to visit this country. The tax, it is true, runs only from $1 to $8, but it is heavy. The government does not get a cent out of it, because all the money is turned over to a man who is appointed as harbour commissioner, a man who is an outsider and the people up there are estimating that he will draw from $6,000 to $10,000 a year.

The regulations are going to be a real nuisance, and will not react to the credit of this government. Many of my people, farmers scattered along the shore line of the lakes, miles and miles away from a village, have two or three canoes or rowboats, and they have to go to all this trouble simply to appease Sir Thomas White and other people like him who were instrumental in persuading the government that this was the right thing to do, when it is really the wrong thing to do. I am not blaming the government for it, but they should not have listened to this advice. The object of making these boats carry lights is, of course, the protection of life, but I submit that under the law as it stands everything can be obtained that the minister is seeking to obtain here, and with a great deal less trouble. I am going to ask the minister and the government to repeal these regulations.

Reducing the cost of the license will help some, but that is not all the trouble. When you look at the penalties that are attached, you will see that a man may be imprisoned for not carrying a license number on his boat or canoe or motor boat. When a man brings his canoe or rowboat in to the shore at night he invariably turns it upside down to let the water out. If there are electric batteries in the boat they are likely to tumble out and get wet unless they are permanently fastened. As I said a few minutes ago, if I were seeking my own political advantage I would say nothing and let the government proceed to enforce these regulations, and the more strictly they were enforced the better it would be for me politically. But I say I am looking at it from the point of view of the good of the country, especially a country so closely tied up with the tourist traffic as Muskoka is. I hesitate very much to accept even in a

modified form anything that is going to be such an irritation. I ask the minister and the government, who have been very kind and considerate with regard to all my requests, to see if they cannot cancel this order.

Mr. BENNETT: May I direct the minister's attention to what I conceive to be the legal position in connection with this matter? The order in council purports to be made under the provisions of chapter 89 of the revised statutes of Canada. The title of that chapter is "An Act respecting the government harbours, piers and breakwaters," and the act may be cited as "the Government Harbours and Piers Act." In this act, "minister" means the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Section 3 reads:

> Nothing in this act shall apply to the harbour of Toronto, Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, Pictou, or St. John, New Brunswick, or any harbour under the management of commissioners appointed under any act of the parliament of Canada.

That in itself indicates the meaning that is to be attached to the word "harbour" generally. Then section 4 says, with respect to works under the control of the minister:

> Excepting such wharfs, piers and breakwaters as are on or connected with canals, the use, maintenance and ordinary repairs of all harbours, wharfs, piers and breakwaters constructed or completed at the expense of Canada, or in any way the property of Canada, and the making and enforcing of regulations concerning such use, maintenance and ordinary repairs, and the collection of tolls and dues for such use, shall be under the control and management of the minister.

The powers of the governor in council are set out in section 6:

> The governor in council may appoint or direct such officers or persons as he thinks proper, who shall have, under the direction of the minister, the charge of the works by this act placed under the management and control of the minister, and who shall collect the tolls and dues to be paid in respect thereof.

That refers to tolls and dues in connection with harbour works. Subsection 2 of section 6 reads:

> The governor in council may determine the remuneration to be allowed them respectively for such services, and such remuneration shall be retained from the tolls and dues collected.

Then section 7 provides that the governor in council may make regulations. Section 8 deals with the publication of the regulations, section 9 with the collection of tolls, and how enforced, and section 10 provides that no clearance shall be granted to vessels unless the tolls are paid. I think the Minister of Justice, who is beside the minister, will agree that unless there is a grant of power by parliament upon the minister and or the governor in council to make regulations no regulations may validly be made. That is clear. There must be a grant of power to permit the regulations to be legally made.

Under the order in council the minister purports to convert one thousand miles of lake and river front into a harbour. These words occur in paragraph (1) of the order in council:

> That the regulations made and established by order in council P.C. 1170 dated 12th July, 1928, be applied to the following waters to be known as the harbour of Muskoka lakes:

Imagine, Mr. Minister of Justice, an order in council purporting to convert a river and lake shore front extending over one thousand miles into a harbour to be called the harbour of Muskoka lakes, the description being as follows:

> All the waters of lakes Muskoka, Rousseau and Joseph, including their connecting and tributary waters.

That becomes the harbour. The whole basis of this new regulation is that a harbour has been established with respect to which these tolls may be applied. Certainly there is no grant of power by this parliament to the governor in council to make that regulation. There is nothing within the four corners of this statute that confers upon the governor in council power to make a harbour, and much less would council have power to make a harbour of the Muskoka lakes. The word "harbour" must have the ordinary designation attaching to it, as is shown in the use of the expression "harbour of Montreal, harbour of Quebec," and so on. Now the government is going to make three lakes and the connecting rivers into a harbour called "Muskoka harbour." The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a professional man, and he has beside him the departmental adviser. I think he will agree that the leading cases in the privy council hold that parliamentary authorization is necessary to the validity of an order in council.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no doubt as to that.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course not. Then I just make this request of the minister, and he and I will have no further argument about it: show me within the four corners of the statute the power to make this order in council.

Mr. ARTHURS: Before this discussion closes, I should point out that there are a number of people interested besides the member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. McGibbon). The minister attempts to call the Muskoka lakes and their tributary waters a harbour. Well, a part of those waters extend up into Algonquin park and into my riding. Mani-

festly it would be unfair that a man travelling along the highway beyond, say, Parry Sound, carrying a canoe on his car, should be compelled to have attached to that canoe one of the lights suggested by the minister and to buy a license for his craft if he wants to use it on any little stream tributary to the Muskoka lakes. If the minister wanted to do it piecemeal he could have secured orders in council dealing with the Trent river, the Muskoka river and the French river systems. Therefrom he would derive an unwarranted revenue for the government. It is absolutely right that regulations should be made to provide that motor and other boats carry lights at night when they are running through crowded or dangerous waters; there is no objection to that at all. But if a farmer in that country has some ten, fifteen or twenty canoes that he hires out during the tourist season, and perhaps a few motor boats, he is taxed between $20 and $150 under this order in council as now proposed by the minister. The whole proposal is absolutely unfair, it is class legislation, and there is no justification for it. I agree with the leader of the opposition that no such proceeding is authorized by statute.

Mr. CARDIN: This is not a new question. For over ten years representations have been made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to take action to prevent the possibility of accidents on these lakes where there is a somewhat heavy traffic of motor and rowboats, particularly at night. Representations have also been made to the department by people who are interested in navigation on the Muskoka lakes. A few years ago the petitioners were supported by the municipal bodies of the localities surrounding those lakes. The government did not act on its own volition with a view to imposing nuisance taxes, as my hon. friend from Muskoka said. We simply desired to meet a request which has been made to us on many occasions. I can see now that the opinions of certain people have changed since that time, but I think that everybody will admit it is quite proper to take the necessary steps to protect life on these lakes, particularly at night when very fast motor boats are likely to place in a very dangerous position those using canoes, rowboats and even small motor boats.

Mr. ARTHURS: I do not think that either the member for Muskoka-Ontario or myself has any objection to a regulation to safeguard the public or the users of motor and rowboats and canoes. What we are objecting to is that the government in passing this order in council went further than any request that they received from any organization in Muskoka or any other part of the Dominion, and imposed a very substantial tax upon the owners and users of boats in that section. If the government want to appoint a man to enforce the present law regarding the carrying of lights at night by motor and other boats, I shall be satisfied as I am sure will be my hon. friend from Muskoka.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister elaborate the point raised by the leader of the opposition? What is his authority to declare any body of water a harbour? The act does not give him any power. Here are three or four large lakes and adjacent rivers. We know they do not constitute a harbour. Under what authority does the minister declare those large bodies of water to be a harbour? Parliament might do it, but he has no power.

Mr. CARDIN: May I say in reply that a large body of water may be termed a harbour, as well as a small body. The extent of the water does not signify.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Who has the right to declare it to be a harbour?

Mr. CARDIN: We have the right according to the law under which we have acted.

Mr. BENNETT: What section?

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend the leader of the opposition stressed certain words, "piers and breakwaters." But he left aside the general wording of the act respecting government harbours.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, he mentioned that.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, but he argued more particularly that piers and breakwaters referred to works which have been constructed.

Mr. BENNETT: Where is the power to make this body of water a harbour?

Mr. CARDIN: The power under which we acted is contained in section 7:

> The governor in council may, on the recommendation of the minister, make rules and regulations for the use and management of such harbours, wharves, piers and breakwaters, and a tariff or tariffs.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Manifestly this area is not a harbour unless it is so declared by some power. The word "harbour" has a definite meaning in the English language. Parliament might do it.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Have the law officers of the crown been consulted about this matter? As the Minister of Justice knows, the only harbours that the Dominion has any power over at all are the "public harbours" as described in the third schedule of the British North

America Act. My hon. friends the two ministers ought to know the situation very well in view of the Montreal harbour commissioners' case which went through the courts here and then to the privy council. I wish I had had an opportunity of looking up that case; but the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will find that the word "harbour" is discussed in that very case. Certainly a series of lakes is not a harbour. But where do you get your authority? It must come from the British North America Act, and the specific description there is "public harbours." What is a harbour? A harbour is a place where ships ride into anchor. It is not a lake over which ships ply; it is not a sea over which ships ply; and to undertake to pass a law of this description, and then visit penalties if it is not kept, seems to me, frankly, ridiculous. I cannot believe that any law officer of the crown has been consulted in reference to this order in council. I respect law, and I sometimes think that even a poor law should have some respect; but I tell you plainly that I would advise any of these men in that district, in this great series of lakes, who found themselves offended by this order in council to disobey it and to take the government of the country, at the expense of the government, through the law courts. It has been done before. I think that before this is relied upon we are entitled as a parliament to have the statement of someone learned in the law who will say that this is a proper order in council and within the power of the Dominion of Canada. You cannot deal with anything but public harbours because you have not property in anything else, and the British North America Act is specific.

Mr. CARDIN: Not to prolong the discussion, or to expose the government to the possibility suggested by my hon. friend, I am ready to look into the matter again and to submit the case to the Department of Justice.

Mr. McGIBBON: I thank the minister.

Mr. SHORT: How many icebreakers are there and where are they in use?

Mr. CARDIN: We have the Lady Grey, the Mikula, the Montcalm and the Stanley. The Stanley, as my hon. friend knows, operates in Nova Scotia.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to replace three Dominion steamers which are no longer serviceable, $550,000.

Mr. CARDIN: As the item indicates, this vote is to replace three obsolete boats, the Newington, the Scout and the Shamrock.

[Mr. Ryckman.]

Mr. SHORT: What is the size of the steamers that will take the place of these old ones and what will be the cost of each one?

Mr. CARDIN: They will be 175 feet long.

Mr. QUINN: Have the contracts been let?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. QUINN: Does the minister propose calling for tenders from firms outside Canada?

Mr. CARDIN: No, in Canada only.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister has promised to use his good offices to see that more ships are built in Canada, because our shipyards are not in use. Tenders in this instance will be called for only in Canada?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: One of the boats mentioned by the minister is the Newington, which operates on the Pacific coast. I want to make sure that the boat which will replace it will be no smaller, because the work is constantly increasing and the boat is overworked as it is.

Mr. CARDIN: We are trying to have a better boat.

Mr. CAYLEY: What are the boats for?

Mr. CARDIN: Lighthouse and coastal service.

Mr. BRADY: Will the minister give us some particulars about the boat which will replace the very obsolete Newington?

Mr. CARDIN: I am not in a position to gratify my hon. friend's legitimate curiosity; the plans and specifications have not yet been completed. The idea is to get boats capable of giving a better service.

Mr. BRADY: Where is the boat to be built?

Mr. CARDIN: It will certainly be built in Canada because I propose to ask for tenders only in Canada.

Mr. BRADY: Are all the various units, such as the dry docks in Prince Rupert and Vancouver, within the scope of these tenders?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, certainly.

Mr. BRADY: And the lowest tender—

Mr. CARDIN: That is always the case.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What is the nature of the service?

Mr. CARDIN: It is a lighthouse and buoy service, supplying materials and everything necessary for lighthouses.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Will any of these boats be on the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Item agreed to.

Investigation into wrecks, $6,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: How much of the vote was spent last year?

Mr. CARDIN: $4,921.

Item agreed to.

Navigation schools, $9,000.

Mr. BRADY: The minister might tell us where these schools at present function, what is the probability as to their extension, and the scope of the work they perform. If we are going to conserve one of the greatest industries that Canada possesses to-day, then I should like to know from the minister exactly what we may expect from these schools, and what his intention is in regard to their future development.

Mr. CARDIN: These schools are located at Halifax, Yarmouth, North Sydney, St. John, Quebec, Charlottetown, Collingwood, Vancouver and Prince Rupert. At present we do not see any need for increasing the number, but we propose to maintain them as profitably as possible for those who desire to study navigation.

Mr. SHORT: How many certificates were issued by these schools last year, and was there any increase last year over the year before?

Mr. CARDIN: These schools do not issue certificates.

Mr. SHORT: The men passed their examinations; surely they must issue certificates.

Mr. CARDIN: Not at the schools.

Mr. SHORT: The schools recommend them?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes. They may give the men certificates that they have completed the course, but the masters' and mates' certificates are issued by the department after examination.

Mr. BRADY: I know these navigation schools are most essential and that they form part of the scheme for conserving our fisheries, but what is their definite purpose? What does a young man really get when he enters one of these schools? Does he get a certificate, and if so, what is the nature of it? There are many men very anxious to have the opportunity of entering a school of this kind. Canada is very fortunate in having not only a great seaboard but also a large number of young men who are ambitious and wish to get all they can from such schools. I should like the minister to tell me what a young man gets when he attends one of these navigation schools.

Mr. CARDIN: They get instruction with regard to seamanship and navigation which permits them to qualify as masters and mates.

Mr. BRADY: And under what conditions are these certificates granted?

Mr. CARDIN: These schools do not issue certificates; they give the young men the necessary instruction which allows them to pass an examination held by a board of examiners appointed by the department, and the certificates are granted by that board of examiners. At these schools they only receive the instruction necessary to enable them to pass the examination.

Mr. BRADY: It seems to me that $9,000 is a very small sum for these navigation schools, of which I think the minister said there were five or six. Perhaps he might give us the details of this expenditure.

Mr. CARDIN: At Halifax we pay the instructor $2,100; at Yarmouth the instructor receives $1,620; North Sydney, $600; St. John, $2,100; Quebec, $440; grant to Queen's University, Kingston, for lessons in navigation, $500; Charlottetown, $500; Prince Rupert, $1,000, and in Collingwood the instructor is paid as an examiner for the lectures he gives. The same system is followed in Vancouver; Captain Elliott Lindsay is paid for his lectures out of the salary he receives as examiner.

Mr. SHORT: How many persons took the examinations for masters and mates in each of these schools?

Mr. CARDIN: I cannot tell my hon. friend how many of these pupils have passed the examination, but I have before me the average attendance, as follows: Halifax, 16; St. John, 6; Yarmouth, 7; Charlottetown, 3; Quebec, 34; Kingston, 29; Prince Rupert, 15; Vancouver, 14; Collingwood, Ontario, 19.

Mr. CAYLEY: Does the instruction consist only of lectures, or is there practical instruction as well?

Mr. CARDIN: Lectures only.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I should like to ask the minister if the examiners at

North Sydney, Halifax, Yarmouth and St. John are the same people who give the instructions?

Mr. CARDIN: No, they are not the same; the instructor at Halifax is Captain H. M. O'Hara, while the examiner is Captain Michin.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Would it not be a saving to the government to let the schools issue the certificates? In votes 153 and 155 we have some $29,500, and I think if those two items were combined we could save money.

Mr. CARDIN: That is worth looking into.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Who is the examiner and instructor at Kingston?

Mr. CARDIN: This is a grant to Queen's university.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is it Captain Barrett?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN: I should like to draw the minister's attention to a matter which arose out of the wreck of the Manassoo, on Georgian bay. The mate had his papers taken away from him and a great many citizens feel that they should now be restored. Has the minister considered this matter?

Mr. CARDIN: I am giving consideration to that representation.

Item agreed to.

Registration of shipping, $3,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister explain what is covered by this item?

Mr. CARDIN: This appropriation is for the purpose of defraying such costs as may be involved in the registration of Canadian shipping. Part I of the Canada Shipping Act provides that Canadian ships must be registered before engaging in trade. The greater part of the expenditure is in connection with the printed forms and certain appliances. As the principal customs officers at ports of registry act as registrars of shipping, no salary expenditure is involved.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Has the minister anything to do with the law concerning the directorships of steamship companies? Of course the minister has nothing to do with the American law, but under their law a Canadian cannot be a director. In the formation of the board of directors of Canadian steamship companies this same rule does not apply, and I know of one case where only one Canadian is on the board. I think the time has come when we should insist that the boards of directors of Canadian steamship companies should consist entirely of Canadians.

Mr. CARDIN: As long as the company is incorporated under British law and the principal place of business is in Canada, we register the ship. We do not have the same regulations as exist in the United States.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does not the minister think that it is about time we protected our own shippers and insisted that the boards of directors should be Canadian?

Mr. CARDIN: It might be a good suggestion.

Item agreed to.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $5,000.

Mr. BRADY: What navigable waters are included in this grant?

Mr. CARDIN: All navigable waters within Canada.

Mr. BRADY: I should like to know just what navigable waters are to be cleared of obstructions.

Mr. CARDIN: The rivers and lakes where there is a wreck or in which navigation is blocked.

Mr. STEVENS: It is a contingency fund.

Mr. CARDIN: Where navigation is impeded through some obstacle in the river.

Mr. BRADY: I should like to direct the attention of the minister to the Skeena river, in British Columbia. This river is navigable for many miles, but there are a few rocks in the river near the village of Usk, and when the flood waters rise each year the surrounding property is inundated, with consequent danger to the inhabitants of that place. This town is on the Canadian National railway, about 12 miles from Terrace and 100 miles from Prince Rupert. Has the minister received any requests for the removal of these rocks? I think $1,000 would cover this work.

Mr. STEVENS: Give him $1,000.

Mr. CARDIN: No representations have been made to the department up to the present time.

Mr. STEVENS: You have a request now.

Mr. NEILL: What is the policy of the government with regard to the removal of Ripple rock in Seymour narrows? The tide

there is very swift, running about 4 knots per hour and this rock is about 16 feet below the water at low tide. The American boats en route to Alaska are forced to lie up for five or six hours to wait for the tide to turn, and on one or two occasions a wreck, with possibly a large loss of life, has been barely averted. I am afraid that this will occur some day and I think the government should give this matter some attention. There seems to be some divergence of opinion about it; some people think it may be useful whenever a railway is built across the narrows, as the rock might be used as a base. However, that time is very far distant and if the rock were removed it would only mean that the piers would have to be sunk a few feet deeper. Of course this work could not be completed out of this vote, but I would ask the government what steps they intend to take in regard to this matter.

Mr. CARDIN: I am not in a position to state the policy of the government in that regard. That work would come under the Department of Public Works rather than the Department of Marine and Fisheries, because that department has the administration of what is known as the Navigable Waters Protection Act. I will pass on the request of the hon. gentleman to my colleague, the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. NEILL: This vote is for small items only?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Inspection of live stock shipping, $4,500.

Mr. LUCAS: What is this item for?

Mr. CARDIN: The inspection of ships carrying live stock to European ports.

Mr. LUCAS: Very little live stock is being shipped at the present time.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. LUCAS: What amount was spent last year?

Mr. CARDIN: The amount was $3,644.

Item agreed to.

To continue subsidies for wrecking plants—Quebec and British Columbia, $45,000.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to renew my annual request that the government consider the increasing of this amount for British Columbia. The government subsidizes a very good wrecking plant, one of the best in the world, but it is stationed at Esquimalt all the time. Esquimalt is at the south end of Vancouver island, and the plant is available for any part of the Pacific coast. But this plant is needed to a greater extent, especially in the winter months, on the west coast of Vancouver island, which is known as the graveyard of the Pacific. The government has attempted to meet this situation by maintaining a small gasoline lifeboat at Bamfield, and have supplemented that service in the winter months by maintaining one of the fishing patrol boats or one of the navy boats at that point. These boats are much too light for the work. They were mine sweepers during the war, but it would be useless for them to go out in a heavy sea and attempt to pull a steamer out of danger by towing it, or anything of that kind. The plant at Esquimalt is admirably suited for this purpose, and if a few thousand dollars were added to the vote a suitable plant could be maintained at Bamfield and the government would have a life-saving service of which they would be proud. The crews of the boats which are located there at present are very capable, seafaring men and I have no doubt that they would answer a call of distress under any conditions, and might possibly lose their lives. The fear has always been on my conscience, that we are asking these men to go out in boats which are not safe. This condition could be overcome by the government providing a few thousand dollars to meet the extra cost of keeping one of these fully equipped salvage boats on the west coast. Even if it were kept there for only two months it might provide valuable service, as the other boats could serve for the remaining two months.

Mr. SHORT: Why is it that this vote includes only Quebec and British Columbia? Does the minister not realize that a little shipping comes in and out of the ports in the maritime provinces? Why are they neglected in subsidies of this kind? We have several wrecking plants in the maritime provinces, but I understand they are not included in this subsidy at all. If the maritime provinces can maintain wrecking plants, why cannot Quebec and British Columbia maintain their own wrecking plants without a subsidy; or if we are going to give a subsidy to those two provinces, why not give a subsidy to the maritime provinces? Why discriminate against them? Personally I do not think it is necessary for either Quebec or British Columbia to receive a subsidy. They could very well go without it and we could use that $45,000 for some better purpose. But if it is necessary to subsidize wrecking plants in those two provinces, it is just as necessary to subsidize

similar plants in the maritime provinces. I think gross discrimination is being shown in this regard.

Mr. CARDIN: We are not subsidizing wrecking plants in the maritime provinces because the private companies there have enough work and a revenue large enough to take care of their plants and to operate them successfully. In British Columbia and Quebec they have not enough revenue to maintain the wrecking plants required for the safety of navigation, and that is why we give a subsidy to those companies.

Mr. SHORT: With the shipping that goes in and out of the Pacific ports and up the St. Lawrence river, I think wrecking plants should be able to be maintained there as profitably as they can be in the maritime provinces. I do not think the minister's answer is satisfactory at all. I know a number of wrecking plants in the maritimes have made no money whatever in the last few years; in fact several of them have been obliged to go out of business.

Mr. NEILL: I suggest to the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis that British Columbia might forego a share of that $45,000 in favour of the maritimes if they would give us our share of the $160,000 annually they have been keeping from our fishermen for the last forty years.

Mr. SHORT: That was threshed out before the committee on marine and fisheries.

Item agreed to.

Life-saving service, including rewards for saving life, $80,000.

Mr. BRADY: There is no increase in this vote and nevertheless we are faced with an appalling loss of life among our fishermen every year. Anybody who knows of the loss of life last year on the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards must realize that as regards our life-saving appliances, we are hoplessly, I might truly say, wilfully negligent. On the Pacific seaboard to-day, along Hecate straits, where the greatest fishing industry in Canada exists, where the majority of the fishermen who are the producers in this important industry are toiling, there are no life-saving facilities. I want to drive this home to the minister: We who represent the fisher-folk do not stand up in the House of Commons just for fun; we are here to advocate what we believe is essential, and I wish to say now that, as regards life-saving along the Pacific coast, the government has not done its duty to the men who go down to the sea in ships. There should be a further increase in this all-important vote and the British Columbia coast should be included in it. It is natural for those who live in the eastern provinces remote from the sea to think the man who comes here and presents a picture of marine life, which is not merely wonderful in itself but which is full of the greatest dangers, adventures, and risks, is speaking of something which is trivial. Such is not the case. It is a great question and worthy of the consideration of every member of this House of Commons. What I want to bring out is this: we are voting $80,000 for life-saving for all Canada. I should like to ask: How many members in this chamber can tell me the loss of life that has taken place in the last twelve months on the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards? I challenge any hon. member to give me the answer. There has not been one month from October, 1928, to January, 1929, in which each day did not see the loss of three or four human lives. From the Lunenburg fleet alone last year there were lost scores of men. The Pacific waters likewise took their toll. I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give life-saving appliances for the fishing fleet of Prince Rupert. Along the Queen Charlotte islands, where thousands of our fishermen toil to give revenue to Canada, there is sore need of life-saving stations. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows what I am talking about better than any other man in the House of Commons. He knows that in the waters of the Pacific coast right from Vancouver sweeping north, there is not one life-saving station that will help the fishermen when in distress. Will the minister promise that he will do something in that regard?

MR. SHORT: I should like to refer to the life-saving station in my constituency and the condition of the boat they are using there. This station was built, I think, in 1912 or 1913, I understand they are using the same boat to-day and I believe there is in that boat the same engine that was in it originally when it was placed there in 1913 or 1914, although the boat was a secondhand one then. The boat is totally incapable of performing the work that she is expected to do. If we are to operate these life-saving stations they should be equipped with suitable boats to weather the storms in which they are required to go out. I am calling the minister's attention to this. I know nothing whatever about the other stations, but I know that at Bay View, Digby county, the equipment is totally inadequate for the services that it is expected to render.

Mr. CARDIN: A new engine is being installed this year.

Mr. SHORT: I think a new boat is needed too. The present boat is about twenty years old.

Mr. NEILL: I was promised a new engine for the life-saving station at Bamfield; does this vote include provision for it? It is worn out and never had sufficient power.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Has anything been done towards improvement of the life-saving station on the island of Scatarie? I brought this matter to the attention of the house in 1926, 1927 and 1928.

Mr. CARDIN: I am sorry to say that nothing has been done up to the present time.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I cannot understand the attitude of the minister when he makes such a statement, after we have brought this matter to his attention and the attention of the house on so many different occasions. Scatarie island is known as the graveyard of the Atlantic. There have been more wrecks on the island of Scatarie than on any other portion of the north Atlantic coast. Shipping going east and west along our Nova Scotia shore must pass the island of Scatarie, and in the fog Scatarie island seems to be the graveyard of most of our Atlantic shipping. I brought this matter to the attention of the minister as recently as last session, when the whole crew of a boat was lost on Scatarie island. When I was campaigning in 1926 I viewed the remains of a ship and saw five bodies representing lives that could have been saved if we had had a proper life-saving station on Scatarie island. I also saw the life-saving station at that time. There was a boat that I could put my fingers through. There was not even a gun to fire a line on the island. Human lives are worth more than the dividends of corporations and companes to which this government hands out subsidies, such as the salvage companies for Quebec and British Columbia, and yet the government cannot find money to save human lives. We demand a proper life-saving station and proper life-saving equipment for Scatarie island, and I am going to stand up in this house and fight for a life-saving station on Scatarie island and continue to fight for it until I get it. I would like to have a definite answer from the minister as to what he intends to do about it.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the house, I beg leave to present the fourteenth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the house.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. W. F. KAY (Brome-Missisquoi): With the unanimous consent of the house, I beg to present the fourth report of the select standing committee on agriculture and colonization, and to move that the report be concurred in. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the report of the subcommittee was unanimous, and the report of the main committee was unanimous. I think it would expedite the business of the house if the discussion could take place on the bill instead of on the report.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Mr. BENNETT: I think we should agree to the report being concurred in now if it is distinctly understood that we are not committing ourselves either to approval or to disapproval of the report.

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly.

Motion agreed to.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, June 6, 1929.

The house met at eleven o'clock.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier) presented the fourth and final report of the select standing committee on public accounts as follows:

Thursday, June 6, 1929.

The select standing committee on public accounts beg leave to present the following as their fourth and final report:

Your committee have examined witnesses and taken evidence respecting the following:

A payment of $72,138.39 to A. S. MacMillan, Halifax, in connection with construction work at Bedford Basin, Nova Scotia, as set out at page O—27, vol. II, of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1927; and also,

A payment of $88,989.72 to A. S. MacMillan, Halifax, in connection with the Hudson Bay Expedition, as set out at page O—27, vol. II, of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928; and also,

A payment of $13,038.50 to S. Cunard & Company, Halifax, in connection with supplies to the Hudson Bay Expedition, as set out at

page O—26, vol. II, of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928.

Eleven meetings of your committee have been held at which meetings twelve witnesses were examined, and the proceedings and evidence adduced therefrom, printed.

Your committee append herewith a copy of the said evidence for the information of the house.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) S. W. Jacobs,
Chairman.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS OF PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar) moved:

That for the remainder of the session all private bills from the Senate, when received from that house, be read a first and second time and be referred forthwith, and that standing order 105 respecting the posting of bills be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise to a point of order. Standing order 116 states:

Except in cases of urgent and pressing necessity, no motion for the suspension or modification of any standing order applying to private bills or petitions for private bills shall be entertained by the house until after reference is made to the committee on standing orders or to one of the committees charged with the consideration of private bills, and a report made thereon by one of such committees.

I submit that under this standing order the motion is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under ordinary circumstances I should say that the point was well taken; but the hon. member must read carefully the first line of standing order 116 from which he has just quoted:

Except in cases of urgent and pressing necessity.

The raison d'être of the present motion is that the session will soon conclude, and if these bills are to be entertained by the house, standing order 105 must be suspended. Notice was given of this motion, and in my judgment, reading standing order 116 as it should be read, I rule the motion in order. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

FISH TRAPS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA WATERS

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): A few days ago the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) asked me to table the report of Judge Ellis in regard to fish traps in the northern waters of British Columbia, I am pleased to be in a position to comply with his request, and I now table that report.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Howard, that the third report of the select standing committee on industrial and international relations, presented to the house on Friday, May 31, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

SENATE BILLS—FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Bill 344, for the relief of Kenneth Blackwood Gibb—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill 345, for the relief of Edith Spencley.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill 346, for the relief of Annie Farrow.—Mr. Boys.

Bill 347, for the relief of Evelyn Mae Warren.—Mr. Speakman.

Bill 348, for the relief of Louis Coit Dargavel.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill 349, for the relief of Vera Maud Gendron.—Mr. Hepburn.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—MR. W. J. THIBEAU

Mr. JOHNSTONE (Cape Breton-North Victoria):

1. Is one W. J. Thibeau in the employ of the Customs department?
2. If so, what is his salary?
3. What commissions or expenses have been paid to the said Thibeau during the past year?

Mr. EULER:

1 and 2. Mr. W. J. Thibeau is authorized to act as a customs excise enforcement officer, without salary.

3. He was paid no commissions or expenses but was paid $223.26 as his share of awards in customs seizures.

GRAND TRUNK STOCKHOLDERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to a cable which I have received from a friend in London, stating that the Grand Trunk perpetual stockholders offered to send a deputation to Ottawa to negotiate a friendly settlement of their difficulties, but that nothing came of the offer. He requested me to ask whether or not the government intended to take any action in the premises during the recess towards carrying on such negotiations.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): These so-called negotiations were commenced when a previous administration was in office; I think Mr. Meighen was Prime Minister at the time. I had gathered that they had been ended some time ago.

YUKON QUARTZ MINING ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill No. 343, to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Location valid, etc.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the minister give us some explanation?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The object of this amendment to the Yukon Quartz Mining Act is to assist in the better administration of the act and to prevent action being taken by claim jumpers where very substantial compliance with the regulations has been undertaken by the lessee. One case arose in the Yukon over the fact that the location was not quite accurately described, and there was some slight difficulty with regard to payment. I am not quite clear as to all that happened, but I understand that the judge sustained the lessee. Another action is about to be commenced dealing largely with the size of the stakes, and this amendment is designed as a direction to the court that where substantial compliance with the regulations has been undertaken and carried out, the full and minute compliance with the regulations as provided in the act will not entitle the court to give a decision cancelling the lease.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

MARINE AND FISHERIES

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Life-saving service, including rewards for saving life, $80,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond-West Cape Breton): Would the minister advise the committee of his intention as to placing a life-saving station at Scatarie island?

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Chairman, I realize the importance of the matter which was raised by my hon. friend last night, but I doubt very much if he appreciates the extent of the expenditure necessary were the government to accede to all the representations which are made in regard to the establishment of life-saving stations. The government last year considered the matter of placing a life-saving station at Scatarie island, and it also considered the placing of similar stations at Whitehead and Halifax. When the matter of costs was looked into it was found that it would cost $550.000 to set up these three stations with modern life-saving equipment. The committee will realize what it would cost if this service were extended all over the country. I must confess that when my officers submitted that figure I was somewhat frightened, and I hesitated to ask parliament to vote such a large sum for the establishment of these life-saving stations. The department is not losing sight of the importance of such stations at certain points, but we must realize that it would be impossible for Canada to meet all the requests which have been made for the establishment of life-saving stations. During the last session hon. members from Toronto complained because the department had not established sufficient life-saving stations on the great lakes and that we were not fulfilling our duty in protecting life on these inland waters. If we were to establish modern life-saving stations all over the country it would cost millions of dollars. The United States has been cited as an example, but I visited one of their life-saving stations last year and as far as efficiency is concerned I do not think they are very much ahead of Canada. In that country the life-saving organization is joined with the coast guard service and Canada might consider the joining of our life-saving service with the protective and patrol service of the National Revenue department and the Fisheries department. I was told by the man in charge of this station which I visited that he had been there for twenty-five years and during that time he had not used the devices which were placed at his disposal. A small gasoline boat on the great lakes would be of very little assistance to a vessel which might be in difficulties in the middle of the lake or at the opposite end, and to give effective service it would mean

the establishing of a very expensive organization, and I think we should hesitate before entering into such a large program.

The case of Scaterie island is still being considered by the department. At the present time the deputy minister is in England investigating the system which they have there, and I would advise the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton (Mr. Macdonald) that the case of Scaterie island is very well known to the deputy minister. After giving this matter very careful and full consideration I came to the conclusion that if these requests are to be met it will be necessary for me to come before parliament and ascertain if it is the desire of the house that we have a yearly expenditure of over $1,000,000. The amount for which we are asking is not very large, $80,000, when one considers the extended service which is provided. Our object always has been to meet the conditions which arise at particular points which we consider to be the most important as far as protecting life is concerned. I realize that Scatarie island is an important point and I can assure my hon. friend that that matter is not being lost sight of.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, the minister has made reference to the great lakes and to the city of Toronto, and before this vote is passed I would like to refer to the complaints which have been made as to the inspection service of passenger boats on the great lakes and the inadequate supply of rafts and life-saving apparatus on those boats. Some of the boats are from twenty to thirty years old and they are still carrying very heavy passenger lists across the great lakes. Perhaps the minister would make a few observations with regard to this particular inspection service over which he has control and as to the adequacy of the life-saving apparatus on these vessels.

Mr. CARDIN: What my hon. friend has mentioned was the subject of certain study, but one of the hon. members representing the city of Toronto made a direct observation with regard to the life-saving stations that we have around the lakes. With regard to the last point raised by my hon. friend, this is the business of the ship inspectors, and the instructions which they receive from the department are very strict. If my hon. friend has any case in which the inspector has not been fulfilling his duty, I shall be glad to hear of it and to take the necessary means to correct it.

Mr. MANION: I took some part in that discussion last year when one of the Toronto members brought up the matter. I suggested at the time that the department or the government should have some form of meeting with the vessel owners and the employees on the boats in order to discuss the question of curtailing the movements of vessels to a certain extent for the last few days at least of the season's navigation. My recollection is that the minister at that time said that such a proposal was intended to be carried out. What has been done in that regard?

Mr. CARDIN: We have always made representations to the ship owners to cease navigating the lakes when the season was reasonably closed. We find that most of the accidents happening on the lakes occur after what we call the regular or reasonable close of navigation. But we have always been making representations to these companies that they should not take upon themselves the great risk of navigating the lakes when the reasonable season is closed. They are not always disposed to act upon the representations we make. We are trying to curtail as much as possible the risks they are taking in navigating too late on the lakes.

Mr. MANION: I entirely agree with the minister that the danger is after the reasonable season of navigation is over. At times an attitude of carelessness has been taken towards the lives of the men employed upon vessels. I wish again to impress upon the minister the reasonableness of endeavouring to have what has been suggested carried out. I do not wish to suggest an unreasonable curtailment of the season of navigation, but certainly it should be the duty of parliament as far as possible to preserve the lives of the seamen from any absolutely unnecessary dangers to which they are exposed by an unreasonable extension of the navigation period.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I note that the minister objects to improvement of the life-saving station at Scatarie island, and I am very sorry that he takes this attitude. He claims that if we are going to establish one station we should have two or three. Anybody acquainted with conditions on the Atlantic coast realizes the dangers to which shipping is exposed and I am sure that if the minister and the deputy minister had taken the interest in this matter that they should have taken in the past, they also would be cognizant of the situation at Scatarie island and would have taken steps to provide the remedy. The cost of giving them at least some form of life-saving station would not amount to more than $25,000, and I claim that Scatarie island is second only to Sable

island in being the most dangerous point on the north Atlantic coast. During the last five years there has not been a year without at least twenty-five or thirty lives having been exposed on that coast. Last year thirty lives were lost off that very island and the previous year five lives were lost. During the last five years not one year has passed without four or five lives being lost. These men were not all Canadians, it is true, but if the government takes the attitude it does, I cannot see how we are going to relieve the existing situation. We spend enormous sums of money for other things, but we cannot find a dollar to spend for the saving of human life. Would it not be better for the department and the deputy minister to take the money they are now spending in other directions and utilize it for the establishment of a proper life-saving station at Scatarie island? It is my intention to bring this matter up on every occasion and I am going to press for it because I consider it essential in the interest of the country. It is one of the most humane things we can do. The poor sailor who goes out to sea is risking his life at all times, and it should be our duty to furnish him with every possible safeguard and to do everything we can to minimize the risks of his hazardous calling.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): I wish to join with the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton in impressing upon the minister the necessity of some improvement in the life-saving service at Scatarie island. It does not form part of my constituency, but it is perhaps the most dangerous point on the Atlantic coast and the equipment there now is totally inadequate. It would not cost anything like a million dollars to equip the station properly. If the minister secured a vote of $10,000 or $15,000 for a proper boat there, that would fulfil the requirements at the present time, but something is urgently needed at that point.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: Has any provision been made for life-saving at Sable island?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed there is a life-saving station there.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: If Sable island has a life-saving station, there is certainly every necessity for one at Scatarie island.

Mr. CARDIN: There is also one at Scatarie island. The complaint is that it is not big enough.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: I think Scatarie island, more than any other island on the Atlantic coast with perhaps the exception of Sable island, is entitled to a life-saving station. I certainly agree with the hon. member for Cape Breton South and the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton that the government should do something at once to provide means there of protecting the lives of the sailors. The sum need not necessarily be a large one. Disasters of all kinds are happening every year and have been happening for many years around that island.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The minister said there was a life-saving station at Scatarie island. If he calls the present equipment that the government has placed on Scatarie island a life-saving station, it is a disgrace to the government and the country. Scatarie island is in my constituency and I have visited it on more than one occasion. The island is situated nine miles from the mainland of Main a Dieu and I would not for a minute go into a pool the size of this parliament building in the lifeboat that is now at Scatarie island. You can see daylight through the bottom of the lifeboat. We have no life-saving crew on Scatarie island. The government supplied a boat there some years ago and that is as far as the government has gone in that regard. The only time the lifeboat was ever used was when volunteers went out in it and the government pays them the paltry sum of a dollar or two when they go out. I do not believe there is a man on the island who would risk his life by going out in that boat. It is up to the government to give the matter some consideration. The minister cannot understand the seriousness of the situation when he stands up in this house and makes the statements he does. It would pay the minister if he or his deputy or one of his officials were to visit that spot and see the wrecks that are strewn around that coast, and let him ask any of the men in the vicinity as to the number of human lives that have been lost there in the last five years. If the minister would only look into the situation, I am sure he would not make the statements he does.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder if the minister has ever been down by the Atlantic ocean when there was a storm. I recall being on the Atlantic coast when one of those fierce storms came in from the sea, and when you observe what takes place around any of these small islands, and especially if there happens to be a fog, as there frequently is—well, I should not like to be the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and feel that I had not utilized the public exchequer to provide facilities there for life-saving. I say that to the minister very seriously. I travelled along that coast last

year by motor. Part of the time it was very foggy, and once there was a very heavy storm. There are wrecks of ships along that Nova Scotia shore and skeletons are sometimes washed up of men who have lost their lives. Scatarie island has been responsible for the loss of a good many vessels and many lives, and I suggest to the minister that he could provide at least reasonably decent life-saving facilities out of the miscellaneous vote. To carry into effect the suggestions that have been made would not cost I should think more than $2,500 at the moment. I think you could get a lifeboat and small station with that much money, or with $5,000, say, you could provide a gun and a decent boat. I made some inquiries about what these things cost; I am only speaking from memory that is now eight or ten months old, but I think $5,000 would defray the cost of a gun and a decent lifeboat. Now I put this to the minister: Can he rest quietly with the thought that we are voting $100,000 for advertising, $150,000 to do this and $50,000 for something else, when for $5,000 he could provide facilities which might save the lives of half a dozen people, or even only one life? I cannot think that Canada is doing its duty in leaving that island in its present condition, and I do press the minister to say now that he will provide these life-saving facilities out of the miscellaneous vote. I am sure that the Prime Minister would not baulk at a governor general's warrant, if it became necessary, to provide a few thousand dollars for a cause such as that. I do press the minister not to leave this over for another year. I remember the head of a great shipping corporation telling me that when there were storms and his ships were passing along a certain dangerous shore, he could not sleep at night. That was before the days of wireless. Here we have that condition intensified, and I do press the minister to provide these life-saving facilities.

Mr. CARDIN: The hon. leader of the opposition may rest assured that we are not losing sight of the importance of the service that has been suggested.

Mr. BENNETT: But you have.

Mr. CARDIN: The lives which have been lost in that vicinity are not due to the lack of what may be called proper life-saving appliances. They are due to accidents which the ships have met with, and nobody can contend that the lives that were lost would have been saved if instead of having one life boat we had two or three.

Mr. BENNETT: But you cannot call this a boat at all. It is useless; it is unsafe.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. CARDIN: It is used once in a while at all events.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): That boat has not been in the water for years. It is there for ornament.

Mr. CARDIN: Apparently the boat has not been needed. I would not like to be taken as minimizing the importance of the life-saving service. I quite agree with the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton and the hon. leader of the opposition that it is important to have life-saving facilities even if they are not used, because of the greater confidence and the greater sense of security they give to navigators and the crews of vessels. They feel that there is something there to take care of them if an accident does come.

Mr. BENNETT: You certainly could buy a gun to shoot a line across to a ship.

Mr. CARDIN: There is one there already.

Mr. BENNETT: It is no good, I am told.

Mr. CARDIN: Certainly it is good, but I have no objection to meeting the reasonable request that has been made by the hon. gentlemen, and I will see if I cannot take something out of the general vote to meet the situation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The minister states that there is a gun on the island. Where is it placed, and when was it placed there?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that the gun was placed there in 1927.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): After the wreck of 1926.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): After I had brought the matter to the attention of the house. What class of gun is it?

Mr. CARDIN: It is a line throwing gun.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How large?

Mr. CARDIN: It is the standard size.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): For the benefit of the minister I may say that the gun that is on the island is of absolutely no use to the people on the island. This is a fishing community, with twenty-five families living on the island, and they have no roads over which they can transport the gun which the government has supplied. That just shows the information which the government has as to conditions there. They have a gun that cannot even be transported from one

place to another. The government should send someone to that island to make an inspection and see just what is necessary. The minister says that no lives were lost as a result of there not being proper life-saving devices. I tell him that five lives were lost in 1926 as a result of not having the equipment to fire a line aboard a ship. The captain of that ship told me personally—I was with him for five or six days both on Scatarie island and in the town of Louisburg—he waited all night for a line to be fired aboard his ship, and all the time his ship was breaking up and the timber was going mountains high, huge timbers were being crushed to splinters, while he and his crew of thirty men watched the fires burning which the fishermen had lighted on the shore. Those five human lives could have been saved if there had been equipment on the island to fire a line aboard that ship, and I say it is up to this government to look into this situation and provide these life-saving facilities. The facilities could have been used every year in the last five years if they had been there, but there are not proper facilities on the island at the present time. What is there is wholly inadequate.

Item agreed to.

Hydrographic and tidal and current surveys, and to provide for the maintenance and repair of hydrographic steamers, $495,000.

Mr. BRADY: How many vessels are engaged in the hydrographic service at the present time and where are they stationed?

Mr. CARDIN: On the Pacific coast we have the steamer Lillooet and the auxiliary house boat the Somass. On the Atlantic coast we have the Acadia, the Cartier and the Bayfield.

Mr. BRADY: Have you any engaged in the Hudson bay?

Mr. CARDIN: The Acadia is going up there this summer.

Mr. BRADY: Have you any on the great inland lakes?

Mr. CARDIN: We have none.

Mr. BRADY: I notice in the supplementary estimates there is a vote of $400,000 for a new hydrographic survey boat. Is that right?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. BRADY: On what part of the coast will that boat be put in service?

Mr. CARDIN: It is for general work on the Pacific coast.

Mr. BRADY: We find along the British Columbia coast—and I refer now particularly to the waters north of Vancouver and extending along the whole of Hecate strait, including the Queen Charlotte waters—that there is the greatest need for hydrographic survey work. Let me give an illustration of the hopeless lack of these surveys. A few weeks ago a large company engaged in very extensive logging operations on the Queen Charlotte islands entered into a contract with a transportation company to take out some million logs. The contract contained a clause which had been overlooked by one of the parties; it was to the effect that before the vessel would go into Moore channel the survey chart would have to be produced. There was no survey chart for this channel. Telegrams were sent to Ottawa, and I took the matter up with the Department of National Revenue, thinking it came under that department. Then I went down to the hydrographic branch and found that the admiralty charts which were supposed to cover these waters had not been printed for years; in fact they are practically out of print and useless. This is the telegram that I received:

On account of extensive activities now going on west coast of Queen Charlotte islands the Queen Charlotte City board of trade request you immediately to take up matter of surveying Moore channel by steamer Lillooet to check up and supplement chart number two one six eight.

It was impossible for the Lillooet to be put on this survey work. The man concerned, had he failed to take out the logs, would have lost thousands of dollars. Therefore he had to go down to San Francisco and buy a steamer to carry out his contract.

At this moment I am not blaming anybody, directly, but I do wish to bring this home to the minister. The Lillooet, an eight hundred ton boat is not fitted to go out into the rough waters contiguous to the Queen Charlotte islands; in a word, she is not capable of doing the hydrographic survey work along that coast. We are sadly lacking in up-to-date hydrographic survey boats capable of carrying on the work in those dangerous waters. I would impress upon the minister the urgent necessity of setting aside a boat exclusively for this work of charting the waters of the Hecate strait and the adjacent waters. Since the Lillooet cannot be spared from the Vancouver coast, I would recommend to the minister that now he is organizing and extending this very important survey work he should take steps to place a suitable hydrographic survey boat in these waters and keep her there for the next seven years on intensive hydrographic survey work.

Mr. CARDIN: It is precisely because we realize the importanace of what my hon.

friend has referred to that in the supplementary estimates we are providing for a new boat.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, the member for Skeena does not tell the house that the hydrographic survey boat has been operating off the Queen Charlotte islands for years and years, to the neglect of the interests lower down the coast, and if the boat has been transferred to Vancouver Island such transfer was long overdue. I am glad to hear that a new hydrographic survey boat is being provided for in the supplementary estimates, and I do hope that it will be in addition to the Lillooet and not to replace it. That perhaps in some way explains why this vote is smaller than it was last year. It was small enough then, and I am sorry to see it reduced. The members from eastern Canada do not appreciate how urgent is the need for this survey work. I recall a year or two ago that Sir Henry Drayton suggested the cutting down of this vote. That is very easy for an eastern man to say, for such survey work has been carried on in eastern waters for a hundred years, but we on the Pacific coast are only now waking up to the absolute necessity of these hydrographic surveys.

This house will perhaps be interested to know that in many places still our seamen are operating by the aid of charts made by Captain Vancouver when the western Pacific was first discovered, so to speak. Vancouver's charts have proved to be very good so far as they go, but he only did his work at wide intervals. Now, there is a peculiarity in the Pacific coast waters that does not obtain elsewhere to the same extent; that is, there are large numbers of what is known as pinnacle rocks. A pinnacle rock is a small narrow rock which may be only a few yards wide, but it has a point on it that will rip the bottom of a boat just like a knife will cut into cheese. Any general survey is totally inadequate to detect those rocks. To establish their location it is necessary to sweep from point to point. This involves a far more expensive survey than any provided by the old charts made by Captain Vancouver.

I agree with a great deal of what my hon. friend from Skeena has said with regard to the growing necessity of this work, but I am talking now more in the interests of my own district. On the west coast of Vancouver island in the last three years there have been established fishery reduction plants costing between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000, and bringing an enormous return to the general public in the shape of fish meal and fish oil.

It has made a new trade of very great and valuable importance. Necessarily these plants are located in new and untried, so to speak, locations, in remote inlets. Now, the fish oil and fish meal must be taken away as soon as available. A small boat is of no use on that exposed coast. These reduction plants need boats fitted up with tank equipment. They go into one of these uncharted channels and sometimes strike an uncharted rock. The underwriting companies will not allow boats to go into these places on account of the waters being uncharted. That is the necessity, the growing necessity of the work in which this steamer Lillooet is now engaged. To give you some idea of the general benefit of that work I might mention a specific instance. Here is a vote for $495,000. This seems a large sum and there is apparently no return. But the return, though indirect is very great. I know of one place where there was a cannery and the owner chartered a boat to come and take a few thousand cases of salmon. The master, a Norwegian, looked at his chart, saw that the place was not properly charted according to the old chart, and he refused to come in. The result was that it cost the canner a thousand dollars to have the salmon taken by lighter to a spot where it was considered safe for the steamer to load. A few months after that I got the government to send the Lillooet to chart the place, and at the cost of a few hundred dollars a very valuable service was rendered. That one undertaking alone more than justified the expenditures over a period of months in connection with the Lillooet. I have not a list before me showing the actual work done from year to year by this hydrographic survey, but I can give an idea of the development that is taking place along that line on the west coast. I might quote half a dozen figures showing the increase in the aids to navigation which have been provided in the last eight years. In 1921 there were eight lighted buoys; to-day there are twenty-four. In 1921 there were one hundred and fifty-two unlighted buoys; to-day there are two hundred and three. In 1921 there were eighty-three lighted beacons; to-day there are one hundred and twenty-four. In 1921 there were thirty-three fog alarms, of which twenty were of the diaphone type—very expensive; to-day, instead of thirty-three, there are forty, twenty-four being diaphones. This gives a vague but significant idea of the development that has taken place in these few years. This work naturally requires a good deal of money to provide expert mechanics, and supplies have to be taken by steamer. This is taken care of

in part by the vote for lighthouse tenders. I am merely trying to convey to the house some idea of the development that has taken place in the last few years, and there is not the slightest suggestion that the Marine department has been too quick to realize our needs; because getting money out of that department is like getting blood out of a stone. There is not much danger of their indulging in waste and extravagance. If they spend a nickle, you may rest assured that they should have spent a dollar. I wish to give them credit if credit is coming to them in that regard, for no man could be more careful of the public purse than the minister of this department. So that if he has put his hand into the treasury to that extent the committee may be assured that it was more than needed. We did particularly need this extra new boat and I am more than pleased to see an estimate to provide for it. I hope it is the intention of the department to keep the Lillooet on as well as the bigger boat, which can do the heavier outside work, the Lillooet being available for necessary operations in more inland waters. I trust the minister will assure me that the Lillooet will be kept in commission as well.

Mr. CARDIN: Certainly.

Item agreed to.

Radiotelegraph service and to provide for the construction and maintenance of radiotelegraph ship to shore stations and the general administration of the provisions of the Radio Act and regulations throughout the Dominion, $843,505.

Mr. CARDIN: This appropriation is to provide for the maintenance and operation of government radio stations and for the general administration of radio in Canada, including the licensing and inspection of ship stations, private and commercial land stations, broadcasting and receiving stations, and the examination and certification of commercial radio operation. The vote does not include the amount necessary for improving reception.

Mr. HEAPS: I presume the minister has reference to ordinary broadcasting stations. I do not intend to ask any questions in that regard, but I desire some information in reference to government-owned radiotelegraph stations. The government own stations in the east and west and, I believe, on the lake shores as well. I understand that they own radiotelegraph stations which transmit commercial telegrams and also give weather forecasts. In eastern Canada the stations are operated by the Canadian Marconi Company, which I understand is given a subsidy each year. I wonder why in one case the government deem it necessary to give a subsidy to a private company to operate a system which they own themselves, while in the other case, on the Pacific coast, they operate the government-owned system themselves. Why is it not possible for the government to operate all its systems?

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend is correct; the government own stations on the Pacific and on the Atlantic coast, the system on the Atlantic being operated by the Marconi Company. We are not making any money in the operation of our stations on the Pacific, and I am informed that the Marconi Company is not making money either in the operation of our station in the east.

Mr. HEAPS: Is the government losing money in connection with the Pacific service?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, we are.

Mr. HEAPS: What is the loss?

Mr. CARDIN: These stations are used as aids to navigation and the revenue derived from them is far from being sufficient to meet the expenditures.

Mr. HEAPS: Is there not some way of separating the costs of the various services, as between commercial service and the service given to ordinary ships sailing into and out of the ports in British Columbia?

Mr. CARDIN: These stations have to be maintained as aids to navigation and the transmission of commercial messages is only incidental.

Mr. HEAPS: Does that apply to the eastern service as well?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, it does.

Mr. HEAPS: But why cannot the government operate its own system in the east?

Mr. CARDIN: We have a long term contract with the Marconi people, covering a period of eighteen years, which I am informed will expire in 1931. I suggest that it will be opportune then to take into consideration the suggestion made by my hon. friend.

Mr. HEAPS: The government have no control over the men who work in the stations in eastern Canada. These men have to work seven days a week, whereas on the Pacific coast employment conditions are much more satisfactory. Is there anything the government can do to have the eastern men given one day off every week? I do not think I am asking anything out of the way for these employees.

Mr. CARDIN: I am afraid we are not in a position to impose our views on the Marconi Company at present; we can only make representations to them.

Mr. HEAPS: In view of the fact that the agreement expires in 1931 and that a new agreement will have to be made, perhaps it might be just as well to take up the question next session, but I have a further matter which comes under this vote. I believe the Department of Marine and Fisheries granted a license to the Marconi Company to operate a beam service from the Pacific coast of this country. I would like to know the terms and conditions of that license.

Mr. CARDIN: I might say to my hon. friend that the Marconi Company has been given a license to operate a beam service from Drummondville, Quebec, to Australia, and also from Drummondville to England. The ordinary fee of $50 was collected for that license. No station has been established on the Pacific coast; the company asked for a license but no station has been erected.

Mr. HEAPS: The point is that the Marconi Company was given a license by the Department of Marine and Fisheries which enabled it to compete with the government-owned Pacific cable system. I want to know from the minister whether, before that license was issued, his department took up the matter with any of the other departments of the government.

Mr. CARDIN: This license was not issued during my time as minister, so I am not in a position to give the details, but I should think it would have been submitted to the Post Office Department and other departments interested in the cable. In any case, apparently it was thought that we should not refuse to issue a license which would permit of a very important experiment being carried on. I feel sure that the other departments interested were consulted.

Mr. HEAPS: This is a very important point. This beam service came into operation within the last few years; it began after I became a member of the house. I do not know exactly how long the minister has been in charge of the department, but I think the beam service between Australia and Canada was established in 1926. I am under the impression that the present minister was in charge of the department in that year, so that I do not think the reason he gave just now is valid. If possible I would like to obtain these particulars from the minister, because I think it is a very important matter when one department issues a license to a private company which enables that company to compete with a publicly owned utility. In addition to that, so far as I have been able to ascertain we have received no concessions as a result of this service. All other countries which have the advantage of this new system have had their rates lowered by approximately one-third, but no reduction has been made in Canada.

I do not concede that it was necessary to issue this license; I believe the government could have operated the beam system as easily as it operated the cable system, but if the government was determined to issue the license I think it was the duty of the department to secure for this country the concessions which were obtained in other countries. I am afraid the minister is not very well acquainted with the affairs of his department in this regard, but I would like some information as to whether or not the other departments were consulted when the question of issuing this license to a private company was under consideration.

When the bill approving of this cable merger was before the house some time ago the Postmaster General said the license had been granted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and he had very little information to give the house. I think we should have all the information available on a question of this kind. It may be said that the matter has been disposed of, but in one sense that is not the case, because some time ago the Labour party in Great Britain stated that if they were returned to power they would repudiate this contract between the new corporation and the government. I am rather disappointed that the minister is not able to give us some information on an important question of this kind.

Item agreed to.

Radio service—to provide for the general improvement of reception conditions to licensed broadcast listeners, $237,160.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not wish to delay the minister's estimates in any way, but I would suggest that the wording of this vote is rather strange.

Mr. SPENCER: I would like to ask the minister if he can give the house any information as to when the report of the radio commission will be presented?

Mr. CARDIN: I am not able to give that information just now; the commissioners are still working and I cannot say when the report will be ready, but I do not think it will be very long now. I hope to have the report

in perhaps six weeks or two months, but the commissioners have not visited the maritime provinces as yet.

Mr. SPENCER: Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation at the next session of parliament based upon the report which will be presented by the commissioners?

Mr. CARDIN: I think at the next session we will be in a position to deal with the report, and we will have time to consider any legislation which may be made necessary by the report.

Mr. HEAPS: Referring again to the license issued to the Marconi Company for the operation of a beam service, is that an annual license?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. HEAPS: I wonder if the minister will be good enough to have a copy of that license laid on the table?

Mr. CARDIN: With pleasure.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the construction of an icebreaker for the Hudson strait, $759,000.

Mr. MANION: Has the contract been let for the construction of this icebreaker?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. MANION: To whom?

Mr. CARDIN: The Halifax Shipyard.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the construction of a new icebreaker for service in the St. Lawrence river, $359,000.

Mr. MANION: Could we have the same information on this item?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, the St. John Dry Dock.

Mr. MANION: They have the contract?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: Why this great difference between these two items?

Mr. CARDIN: One icebreaker is to be much stronger and larger than the other because it will be used in the Hudson strait, while the other is to be used on the St. Lawrence river.

Item agreed to.

Amount required for expenses of Canadian delegates to the international conference on safety of life at sea, $25,000.

Mr. SPENCER: When did this conference take place?

Mr. CARDIN: It was concluded two or three days ago.

Mr. SPENCER: How many delegates went from Canada?

Mr. CARDIN: The delegates were the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Johnston; Commander Edwards, director of radio; F. McDonnell, the chairman of the board of steamship inspection; Captain Dixon and Mr. Bain.

Item agreed to.

River St. Lawrence ship channel—maintenance, operating, repairing, dredging and providing necessary boats, vessels and equipment, also maintenance, operation and repair of Sorel shipyard, $3,108,000.

Mr. CARDIN: This appropriation is for the continuance of the operations in connection with the deepening and widening of the St. Lawrence ship channel between Montreal and Father Point, including the maintenance and operation of the Sorel shipyard which is used for the building and repairing of all ships, dredges and tugs which are used in the service. The increase is due to the expenditures necessary in order to build two dredges which were used in the service.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the construction of regulating and retaining dams in the St. Lawrence river, $1,100,000.

Mr. CARDIN: This is a revote from last year. This matter was first suggested in 1911 and it was said that the level of the river could be materially improved by building what is called submerged dams at certain points. This vote came before the house last year and was approved of but the department was not in a position to start work.

Mr. GEARY: Am I right in inferring that this will deprive the port of Quebec of a great deal of its just due?

Mr. CARDIN: These dams are to be constructed about midway between Quebec and Montreal, but there is nothing included in the vote for the port of Quebec.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They do not need any dam in Quebec.

Mr. GEARY: They are slowly deteriorating, I expect.

Mr. CARDIN: What is deteriorating?

Mr. GEARY: The port of Quebec.

Mr. CARDIN: I do not think my hon friend the Minister of Justice will agree to that.

Sir EUGENE FISET: The moss and grass will always appear.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and allowances to light-keepers, $750,000.

Mr. SHORT: Mr. Chairman, I think the committee should have an explanation of this item, as there is no increase over the vote of last year. A delegation from the light-keepers met the minister and the government some time ago and requested that something be done in the way of granting an increase in salaries. These light-keepers have received no increase in their remuneration for a number of years, and they are the lowest paid officials of the government and do the most hazardous work in the service. I notice there is an item of $25,000 in the supplementary estimates, but I do not know whether or not that is to take care of these increases. If it is, it is a very small amount considering the number of lighthouses and lightships which we have along the coasts of the Atlantic and the Pacific. These men receive a much lower remuneration than is paid to men performing a like service in the United States. This matter has been brought before the house for the last three or four years and representations have been made that a reclassification of these light-keepers should be made by the department and an increase granted, but up to the present time nothing has been done. I think the minister should take into consideration the representations which have been made to him by different members on both sides of the house, and also the representations which were made to him by the delegation of the light-keepers association, and grant substantial increases to these men. I know of some light-keepers who have to walk from one to three miles at night to light their lights, who cover the same distance in the morning to turn them out and who receive the magnificent sum of $200 per year. Some of these men have not had an increase for twenty years and everyone knows the cost of living has almost doubled in that time. These men are performing a valuable and hazardous service and I submit, Mr. Minister, that the time has arrived when their salaries should be increased. If the minister can increase the salary of his deputy minister and other officials in his department, surely some consideration should be given to these light-keepers who are giving such valuable service to the country.

Mr. CARDIN: We have listened to the representations made and we have decided to grant the requests which have been preferred to us. The amount of $25,000 which is provided in the supplementary estimates is to cover increases in salaries of the light-keepers. The lightkeepers were represented by members of their organization, and the amount we are providing in the supplementary estimates is satisfactory to them for the present.

Mr. SHORT: Is the amount sufficient to cover the increase they ask for?

Mr. CARDIN: I understand they were, as many people do, asking for more than they probably expected to get, but a compromise was reached between them and the department.

Mr. SHORT: On a fifty-fifty basis?

Mr. CARDIN: They agreed to that.

Mr. SHORT: This amount of $25,000 is sufficient to cover the amount agreed upon?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. SHORT: It takes in all classes?

Mr. CARDIN: No, more particularly the low classes.

Mr. SHORT: Do the ones in the higher class receive any increase?

Mr. CARDIN: Not this year.

Mr. SHORT: Is it the intention of the government to give them an increase next year?

Mr. CARDIN: If they press the request, I am ready to listen to them.

Mr. SHORT: I have no doubt they will.

Mr. CARDIN: I may say I expect them to do so.

Mr. BANCROFT: Has any arrangement been made for providing superannuation for lighthouse keepers when they retire from the service? I understand from experience I had with the department in the past, that no superannuation is provided for them because they are classed as part-time employees. This works quite a hardship upon some of the men when they become old in the service. Some provision should be made in regard to superannuation.

Mr. CARDIN: Those who are giving only part of their time to the service are not entitled to superannuation but those who are giving their full time are entitled to superannuation, and they receive it.

Mr. MacLAREN: The question perhaps does not come directly under this item but, as it concerns lighthouses, the minister might

shed a little light on it. When may we expect to receive copies of the report of the St. John harbour commission?

Mr. CARDIN: I am not responsible for the delay. I have asked for the report and I am informed that it has not yet been printed. It may reach me this afternoon or to-morrow, I do not know, but St. John is not the only harbour which has not sent in a printed report. I have not yet received a printed report from Vancouver, but I expect these reports any day.

Mr. MacLAREN: I understood that a written report had been received by the department.

Mr. CARDIN: A typewritten report.

Mr. MacLAREN: Then the report is now in the department?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, but not in printed form.

Mr. MacLAREN: I presume it is now being printed.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, but not by the department; the reports have to be printed by the harbour commissioners themselves.

Mr. MacLAREN: Perhaps the minister will inquire by telegraph.

Mr. CARDIN: I will.

Mr. MacLAREN: Will he inform the house to-morrow?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: When the delegation of lighthouse keepers waited on the minister last winter, another question was taken up which more particularly concerns the lighthouse keepers of British Columbia and which has not been dealt with to-day. I gather from the officials that they were going to meet the situation, and I should like the assurance of the minister that I am correct in so stating the situation. The question was in connection with annual leave and sick leave. There seemed to be the idea among some of the lighthouse keepers that they had to provide their own substitutes if they went on annual leave and that the same thing applied in connection with sick leave. I understand from the officials—and I would like confirmation from the minister—that the situation is that as regards lighthouse stations that maintain more than one man, arrangements will be made that the head man can take his holiday at a slack time of the year, such as when there is no fog, and leave his deputy in charge. Of course he gets his full pay while he is away. I understand that in the case of one-man lighthouses the department will get and pay some local man to substitute for him without going to the expense of sending in a man from a distance. As regards sick leave, of course while they cannot give sick leave just for a few days' illness, in the case of a man being seriously ill and having to go away for an operation, the department is willing to provide and pay a substitute to do the work. If that is the situation I would only ask that it be confirmed by the minister, because many men seem to have the idea they are not getting the arrangement that I have suggested.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that such is the practice.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister speaks of the low class. Does that mean those who are temporarily employed on inland waters, for instance, on the great lakes, because their pay is disgraceful? I do not know how they manage to live on it.

Mr. CARDIN: The expression "part time" means employees who are giving, for example, one hour or two hours' service a day.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does this take in the man who is employed on the great lakes for just so many months in the year?

Mr. CARDIN: There are on the great lakes a number of men who are what we call full-time employees; they are on the most important lights that we have, but we have others that are only part-time employees.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is on a shore light where they put in an hour or so a day?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What I referred to was a man who goes out on a small island where there is a small light and stays there for four or five months in the summer. Will he benefit by this increase?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that he will not. The men at the docks are what we call full-time employees.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The man I mean is the one who goes out to a light on an island or on a point of an island and who is there for three, four or five months in the summer. His pay is certainly a pittance. I do not know how he manages to live and feed himself on the amount he receives.

Mr. CARDIN: I understand that a certain number of these lightkeepers in the position indicated by my hon. friend from Kingston are also doing other work. Their time is not entirely taken up by looking after the light. They light it when necessary; they take care

of it, but they engage in other work. Some of them engage in fishing and other occupations.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Where a returned man has to go periodically to his unit centre for an examination, is it the practice if that period occurs during the time of his employment, to deduct the pay for the two or three days he is absent?

Mr. CARDIN: We make no deduction from his salary for that. We arrange to let him go.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Of this appropriation of $25,000, what percentage is to be allowed to the more poorly paid lightkeepers throughout the country?

Mr. CARDIN: Practically the whole $25,000 goes to the lower paid lightkeepers.

Mr. SHORT: Will this include the part time lightkeepers, some of whom are getting as low as $60 a year?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is the kind of men I meant.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, they are included.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): We have along the Atlantic coast lightkeepers working on full time and receiving four or five hundred dollars a year. What increase are they to get? They are situated in positions where they cannot do anything else, and they must remain there the whole year round.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that the $25,000 takes care of the class indicated by my hon. friend drawing $400. In regard to the higher class, the suggestion which has been agreed upon is to reconsider their classification. They may be changed from one class to a higher class, and the higher class will, of course, carry a higher salary. That is the idea in regard to the second group of lightkeepers. They may receive their increase through a change in their classification. That is what we propose to do.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): For years the lightkeepers on the Atlantic coast, both the full time and the part time men, have not been receiving adequate recompense for their labour. Many of them are placed in practically impossible situations, out on islands where they have no communication with the mainland, and they must remain there the year round. I consider that $25,000 is not adequate to give these men the increased salaries which they should be receiving. This government is expending huge sums of money for other services, and this is one of our very, very important services; it is an aid to navigation. I consider that it is the duty of the government to enable the men they hire to earn a decent livelihood so that they may have the comforts of life that are enjoyed by the people in other communities. I would urge the minister to take seriously into consideration the recommendation of the committee that met him last year and give the lightkeepers not merely this $25,000 but the full amount they asked for.

Mr. BRADY: The higher paid lightkeepers are in grade 1. These men must have assistants in looking after the larger lighthouses. At Cape Race, for instance, the lightkeeper has four assistants. At Estevan Point there are also four assistants. The principal lighthouse keeper, drawing $3,060 must support, feed and maintain four other persons. They may not be members of his family. I should just like to be sure about that. Are there any cases where the assistants at these large lighthouses are not members of the principal lighthouse keeper's family?

Mr. CARDIN: I am not in a position to say as to that because the lighthouse keeper is not supposed to make a report to us on that point.

Mr. BRADY: I know that in many cases they have to pay out money to assistants who are not members of their family, practically $600 a year. I think that consideration in the way of increased pay should be given to these permanent men who are working in these isolated places, doing wonderful work under very hard conditions. That applies to grades 1, 2 and 3. Consideration also should be given to the part time lightkeepers where the lights have not to be looked after daily. But as regards the permanent lighthouse keepers I do think that if the people of Canada as a whole realized the service these men are performing and the conditions under which they work there would be a real protest at the parsimonious treatment that is being given them in the supplementary estimates. It was only last year that one of these lighthouse keepers situated at a very lonely lighthouse along the British Columbia coast lost his life, foully murdered by some person. It comes as a shock to the community when instances of that kind arise. I am pleased to hear that an annual vacation will be given to the lighthouse keepers and that they will not have to pay out of their own pockets for an assistant to take their place while they are on holiday. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, we are doing that.

Mr. BRADY: That is fine.

Item agreed to.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, $900,000.

Mr. SHORT: I would like to refer to a matter which I brought up last year when this item was under consideration. Has the department given any further consideration to equipping these lighthouses with hydro-electric light wherever it is available? This would reduce the cost very much and would certainly assist the lighthouse keeper very materially in his work. I have in mind particularly a lighthouse in my constituency at Point Prim on the Bay of Fundy. It is a very important light. The Digby county hydro-electric system has extended its line within half a mile of this lighthouse, and it would be very much more economical for the department to use the hydro-electric light instead of oil-burning lamps, and it would be very much more satisfactory. I think the matter has been brought to the attention of the agent of the department at St. John, who is in charge of that district. Has the department given the matter any serious consideration? If not, I think it would be in the interests of the service for them to do so.

Mr. CARDIN: The department is doing precisely what the hon. gentleman is advocating. Wherever we can be sure of an unfailing supply of electric light we take advantage of it for the lighthouses.

Mr. SHORT: Then I presume that as the hydro-electric line has been extended to within half a mile, arrangements will be made with the power board to give the service to Point Prim.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Construction of lights and aids to navigation, including regulation of traffic at such places as may be found necessary, $930,000.

Mr. BANCROFT: What progress is being made with respect to providing aids to navigation required in lake Winnipeg? During the summer of 1927 I was asked to meet a number of captains and mates who operate ships there. About forty of them were in attendance and they outlined a number of aids that were needed in the shape of lighthouses and buoys. I took the matter up with the minister at the time, and last summer he was good enough to send an inspector there to report on the situation. I understand the inspector was of opinion that certain lighthouses and buoys were needed. Is any provision being made for these aids?

Mr. CARDIN: There is no special provision, but the matter can be taken care of in the general vote.

Mr. BANCROFT: That is what I understood; it will be done this year out of the general vote?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: There is quite an increase; what is the reason?

Mr. CARDIN: It is a general increase. Provision is made in this estimate for the construction of a pier, light and fog alarm at Ile aux Coudres, at a cost of approximately $100,000; and for the construction of piers and the installation of lights at Brulé Bank, at a cost of approximately $176,000. Both these stations are in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. SHORT: I notice there is an increase of $205,000 over last year's appropriation for the construction of lights and aids to navigation in such places as may be found necessary. Let me again call to the attention of the minister what I have brought up from time to time—the necessity of a light on the breakwaters at Tiverton and East Ferry in the bay of Fundy. This is a most important fishing centre. A ferry operates across there throughout the day and night, and a pole light on each of the breakwaters would be of great assistance to the ferry service and also to the fishermen. The cost would not be great. There are such lights on a great many of the government breakwaters all over the bay of Fundy. I hope the minister will consider the advisability of doing this.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose it had under consideration item 175, $930,000, for the construction of lights and aids to navigation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was not here; was anything said about salaries for lighthouse keepers, as to the prospects of their being increased?

Mr. CARDIN: That discussion took place on a previous item in connection with salaries, and I stated that we had in the supplementary estimates $25,000 for increases in the salaries of the lower class lightkeepers. I also intimated that there was provision for a reclassification of other classes.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): Is the minister going to reclassify the lower paid officials?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): That is the best news that has come to the house for a long time. These men are certainly underpaid, and if there is any man in the whole government service who is working for very little money and in the most remote and lonely part of the country it is the lighthouse keeper. I am delighted to hear the announcement of the minister.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to pay pensions to pilots, $9,900.

Mr. GUTHRIE: These are all pensions?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Administration of pilotage, $250,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: A royal commission under Mr. Justice Morrison has made an inquiry into pilotage in British Columbia, and the report has been brought down. I suppose something will be done this year to carry out the recommendations in that report?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, we are doing that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I presume that some of the officials of the department will be in British Columbia?

Mr. CARDIN: An officer has been there already.

Mr. McQUARRIE: And will be there later on?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In that connection I would ask that the proper official, whoever he is, be instructed to assist the New Westminster harbour commissioners in the matter of the drawing-up of bylaws and so forth as recommended by the commission.

Mr. CARDIN: Certainly, he will.

Item agreed to.

Meteorological service, including magnetic observatory, grants of $500 each to Kingston and Montreal observatories, and allowance of $400 to L. F. Gorman, observer at Ottawa, $330,000.

Mr. SHORT: There is an increase of $30,000; why?

Mr. CARDIN: It is to provide for statutory salary increases and for necessary expansion of service. Several new wireless reporting stations have been established in the far north together with a number of balloon stations for obtaining upper air data for aviators, and numerous fire and weather reporting stations have been established in conjunction with the provincial forestry departments. All of this involves additional expense.

Item agreed to.

Marine and Fisheries—salaries, $546,920; contingencies, $90,000.

Mr. BENNETT: This involves an increase of $2,000 in the salary of the deputy minister?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: We pointed out the other evening that we could not agree to these increases in the salaries of deputy ministers while other salaries had been left as they were. It will be recalled that Mr. Fielding stated the policy of the government, in connection with matters of this kind, to be that deputy ministers should have been ten years in the position before provision was made for increases in their salaries. It is not desirable to take up the time of the committee discussing the matter at great length at this moment. We shall probably have to move a motion that will cover the question, because it is felt that with conditions as they are—large numbers of people receiving less than $100, and the status of the technical service being still unsettled—to increase the salaries of deputy ministers is not in accordance with what we conceive to be the real justice of the case. Some of these increases are $2,000, some $1,500. Then there is the further question in connection with those who have the rank of deputy minister. I have looked up the statute since we discussed the matter last, in connection with the estimates of the Prime Minister, and certainly the position of the Speaker, and the position of the Clerk of the Senate, of the Clerk of the House of Commons and of the Clerk of the Privy Council are exactly the same and dealt with in the same statute. There is also the question of the librarian, and, I think, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who is in a somewhat different position from the others. But some principle should be observed. Mr. Fielding made the statement some years ago that service for a period of ten years should be regarded as the guiding principle, thereafter salaries being increased as occasion necessitated. I take this opportunity to mention the matter because there are other estimates which will be discussed in the same way.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is it not a fact that this deputy minister is also provided with a government car—

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): —an automobile at the government's expense?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I rather think that some statement to that effect was made in a return brought down to myself.

Mr. CARDIN: If such a statement was made, it is an error. He uses the car which is supposed to be for the minister; he has no separate car for himself.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): He uses the minister's car?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: It will be recalled that this deputy minister left the service and was reappointed within a period of ten years.

Mr. CARDIN: He resigned in 1920 and came back in 1921, and that was considered at the time to be continuous service.

Item agreed to.

To provide for a refund to the Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Company, Limited, of an amount paid to the government out of net profits, in excess of amount required by contract, $4,139.75.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. CARDIN: This is the result of a misunderstanding as to the terms of a contract between the Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Company and the government for the maintenance of a salvage and wrecking plant at Quebec. The contract provided that each year the company should refund to the government 50 per cent of their net profits on operations to offset the subsidy which they were entitled to receive. In determining their profits for this purpose in 1920-21 the company neglected to deduct the usual 5 per cent for depreciation, in consequence of which their refund to the government for that year was excessive by this amount.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the minister give the committee the amount paid by the government as a subsidy and the amount paid to the government by this company as part of the profits?

Mr. CARDIN: During the past five years there were no profits; the losses were as follows:

1922-23	$47,776
1923-24	14,671
1924-25	27,996
1925-26	25,136
1926-27	7,187

The subsidy amounts to $35,000.

Item agreed to.

Hydrographic and tidal and current surveys, and to provide for the maintenance and repair of hydrographic steamers — further amount required, $65,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I notice that last year we voted $530,000 for this work. In the main estimates this year there was an increase of $35,000 and now we are asked to pass this supplementary vote of $65,000, making a total increase over last year of $100,000. In addition, the next item is for the construction of a new hydrographic service steamer, to cost $400,000. What is the reason for these substantial increases?

Mr. CARDIN: This supplementary appropriation is to provide for the reconditioning of the steamer Lillooet at a cost of $35,000. This is a revote from last year; the work was not done although the money was voted. This also covers the replacement of the house boat Somass, at a cost of $30,000. Both these boats are on the Pacific coast service. Provision was made for the reconditioning of the Lillooet in the main estimates last year, but the proposed work was unavoidably delayed and accordingly the sum provided lapsed. It is hoped to keep this steamer in commission this year, but she cannot continue longer without reconditioning, and it is proposed that this work should be done next fall. The house boat Somass has been in the service for a very long time and is worn out beyond repair; she cannot be used beyond this season.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is not shown to be a revote.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the construction of a new steamer for hydrographic surveys, $400,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister tell us what this steamer is for?

Mr. CARDIN: This steamer is to take care of the hydrographic surveys on the British Columbia coast. It has been represented to us, as was stated in committee this morning, that the Lillooet, which we have there now, is not able to cope with the situation. There is much work to be done and representations have been made to the government that we should go more extensively into this service. That is why we propose to add this new steamer, and we will also retain the services of the Lillooet.

Mr. MANION: Have tenders been called for in this case?

Mr. CARDIN: No, not yet.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the expenses of a commission to inquire into the radio broadcasting situation throughout Canada and to advise as to the future administration, management, control and finance thereof — further amount required, $15,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is another increase. As the minister knows, under item 165a we have already voted $10,000 for this purpose and now we are asked to vote another $15,000. Surely that amount is excessive.

Mr. CARDIN: The explanation I have here is that this supplementary appropriation is in part a revote of item 475 of last year. The commission did not commence functioning until late in the year, with the result that the amount appropriated to provide for their expenses was in excess of their requirements by approximately $4,000; which excess amount lapsed at the close of the year, of course. In addition, the time required by the commission to complete their inquiry will be longer than was anticipated when the main estimates for this fiscal year were prepared, and this further sum is required to enable them to complete their work.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then I understand that last year only $6,000 was spent; they did not complete their work and now they are asking for an additional $25,000. That seems an extravagant amout of money for a single commission which has no very great amount of work to do; its work is largely technical, carried on in one centre, and I should think they could make a very intelligent report for about half this amount.

Mr. CARDIN: I think my hon. friend is under a misapprehension.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Tell us how you are paying the members of the commission.

Mr. CARDIN: This commission is inquiring as to conditions with regard to radio all over Canada, and they have also gone abroad to obtain the benefit of the experience in European countries; they have been in England, in Germany and other countries.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How many are there?

Mr. CARDIN: Three.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What amount of remuneration are they receiving?

Mr. CARDIN: The commissioners are Sir John Aird, the chairman, and his remuneration has been fixed at $50 per day—

Mr. GUTHRIE: And expenses?

Mr. CARDIN: And a living allowance of $25 per day. Mr. C. A. Bowman is the next commissioner, and his remuneration is fixed at $35 per day.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is that Mr. C. M. Bowman?

Mr. CARDIN: No, it is Mr. C. A. Bowman of Ottawa.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is that the journalist?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, he is with the Ottawa Citizen.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What does he know about radio?

Mr. CHAPLIN: We are paying him to find out.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They seem to be real experts.

Mr. CARDIN: The third commissioner is Dr. A. Frigon of the technical school at Montreal. His remuneration is fixed at $35 per day with a living allowance of $20 per day. The secretary of the commission is an officer of the department, Mr. Manson.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How does it come about that it costs Sir John Aird $5 per day more than the other men to live?

Mr. CARDIN: He is the head of the commission and most of the people address themselves to him.

Mr. SPENCER: It is $15 per day more.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, $15 per day more.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Have Sir John Aird, the banker, and Mr. Bowman, the journalist, any technical knowledge of radio, or are they just finding out?

Mr. CARDIN: I am not in a position to say whether or not they have any technical knowledge. I contend that is is not absolutely necessary to have that knowledge in order to inquire into a matter of this kind. A judge can sit in court and hear the argument of counsel and the evidence of expert witnesses and is able to give a judgment on a technical matter, and these men are sitting as judges in this inquiry. It has been my personal view that as far as the granting of licenses for broadcasting is concerned I prefer to grant them to the newspapers, because they are trained in the business of advertising.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Such as the Toronto Star.

Mr. CARDIN: I contend that there is no necessity for a man being an expert to inquire into such a situation in this or any other country. Furthermore, the commission has the services of the experts in the department.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is there not such a thing as people in Canada doing a job of this kind without receiving remuneration?

Mr. CARDIN: I think the remuneration which has been allowed to these commissioners compares very favourably with that granted to other commissioners who have been appointed from time to time. The treatment they are receiving is not exceptional; other commissioners doing work of no more importance have received practically the same remuneration and same living allowance.

Mr. JACOBS: How many free jobs has the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) done?

Mr. CHAPLIN: I have been doing one for twenty years without receiving any remuneration at all, and it has been just as important as this one.

Mr. BENNETT: In view of what took place at the last session I cannot understand why this commission was not appointed at an earlier date. The report should have been before the house at this session, but as it is the report will not be available until another year has passed. In other words, two years will have elapsed instead of the one which was indicated by the ministry when we were dealing with this question as being the time necessary to look into this matter. Perhaps the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) was right when he said that the country is getting sick of being governed by commissions. It struck me the other day that there was considerable truth in what he said, because he has appointed most of them and he had appointed one two or three days before that time. In view of the difficulties which arose in connection with the utilization of our air channels by our great neighbour to the south, and the impossibility of arriving at an arrangement, I am sure that the majority of the Canadian people are becoming rather apprehensive about this matter and most anxious that some report be brought down which would indicate just what our position is to be with relation to the use of air channels, particularly as it concerns the United States.

Mr. CARDIN: I am not in a position to answer the question of my hon. friend as to the date when the report may be expected. I understand that the commission has not sat as yet in the maritime provinces. They are concluding their sittings in the province of Quebec and will then go to the maritime provinces to complete their investigations. I expect that the report will be in within two months and we will be able to deal with this matter at the next session of parliament. The commission did not neglect the starting of their labours and they have been working quite hard.

Mr. BENNETT: When was it appointed?

Mr. CARDIN: December 6.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly, and the report will be in in two months. Had they been appointed as promised two months after the house rose last year, we would have had the report for this session. The minister has proved my case. In other words, they were appointed in December and the report will be ready in two months from to-day, or in August, and had they been appointed in October, instead of December, we would have had the report for this session.

Mr. JACOBS: You must not undermine their health, whatever you do.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not see anything in the vote to provide a doctor for them.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the construction of an icebreaker for the Hudson strait—further amount required, $205,000.

Mr. MANION: We had a similar item this morning asking for the amount of $759,000 for an icebreaker for the Hudson strait, and now we have this item in the supplementary estimates. I notice that the next item is for $440,000 for an icebreaker in the St. Lawrence river, and we had a similar vote this morning for $359,000. How much do these icebreakers cost, and will these votes complete them?

Mr. CARDIN: It was estimated that the icebreaker to be used in the Hudson strait would cost $1,269,000.

Mr. MANION: This will not complete it?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes; the contract with the Halifax Shipyards is for $1,220,000.

Mr. MANION: Is the same thing true of the next item?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. MANION: It will complete it?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. SHORT: Was not the contract let to the Halifax Shipyards before the main estimates came up? Did not the department

know what the cost of this icebreaker would be at that time, and why do they consider it necessary to make two items of the one matter? Why was not the whole matter put in the main estimates?

Mr. CARDIN: When the main estimates were framed we were not in a position to determine what amount would be spent during the present year.

Mr. SHORT: I understand that the contract has been let?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. SHORT: It must have been for a specific amount.

Mr. CARDIN: The main estimates provided for what it was thought would be necessary for the current year, and we did not provide for the whole amount in those estimates.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Is the minister able to report on conditions in Hudson bay and strait? Evidently we had a certain investigation carried on last year and I should like to know what conditions were found there.

Mr. CARDIN: Generally speaking it is reported that navigation is possible in the strait, but the details can be found in the report of the expedition which has already been tabled and which is available to hon. members.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): For how long is navigation possible?

Mr. CARDIN: Somewhere around three or four months.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Is that navigation free from icebergs? Is it safe during the three months' period?

Mr. CARDIN: It is not entirely free from ice, but it is represented to us that it is possible to navigate the strait safely.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Does the minister consider to-day that with three months' navigation it will be a good business proposition for us to open up that country?

Mr. CARDIN: It is not for me to express an opinion, but I think this will be sufficient to meet the requirements.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is the report to which the minister refers, that of the aviators who have been watching the strait?

Mr. CARDIN: It covers the whole thing.

[Mr. Short.]

Mr. CHAPLIN: Was this report from the aviators' camp itself?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Who made the report?

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. McLean, the officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries who was in charge of the expedition there. This report includes the work of the aviators; it includes everything.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How long was he there?

Mr. CARDIN: The summers of 1927 and 1928.

Mr. CHAPLIN: All the summer?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is the full report of the aviators covered by this?

Mr. CARDIN: Everything is covered by the report. All the work which has been done there is given in detail.

Item agreed to.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—Marine department—river St. Lawrence ship channel—maintenance, operating, repairing dredging fleet and providing necessary boats, vessels and equipment, also maintenance, operation and repair of Sorel shipyard—further amount required, $67,297.

Mr. MANION: Did we not have an item dealing with that this morning?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes. This appropriation constitutes a revote of the unexpended portions of appropriations Nos. 219 of the main estimates and 481 of the supplementary estimates for the last fiscal year. The purpose of these appropriations was to provide for the reconditioning of wharf No. 4 and for other work of a similar nature, but more particularly of the reconditioning of the wharf. When this work was put in hand during the summer, it was disclosed that the condition of the wharf was such as to necessitate a modification of the original plan for the wharf. The result was that the work was delayed beyond the season when it could be done to advantage and the money lapsed in large part with the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. MANION: This is the same as appropriation No. 169, $3,108,000, in the main estimates, making the total amount, roughly speaking, $3,200,000.

Item agreed to.

Lighthouse and coast service—salaries and allowances to lightkeepers—further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How many lightkeepers are there, that is those permanently and those part-time employed?

Mr. CARDIN: The total number is 1,179, but in the list that I have before me there is no division between the lower class and the higher classes. I can later supply that information.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister does not know how many there are in the lower class?

Mr. CARDIN: I cannot say just at the moment, but I can get the information.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Could the minister give a guess?

Mr. GUTHRIE: This item of $25,000 which appears in the supplementary estimates is to increase the salaries or the pay and allowances of these lightkeepers. Last year I had the honour of bringing to the attention of the house and the minister the situation that has existed for a long time with respect to these lightkeepers, and perhaps the statement I made was sufficient to shock the minister himself. These men are grossly underpaid. The session before last I performed the same work or at all events I made an effort to secure increases for these men. I had the pleasure of seeing a deputation of them again this year. I am glad to see that the minister has now shown some regard for the representations which have been made to him from time to time and that some slight increase will be granted to these lightkeepers. I wonder if we shall be as successful with the Postmaster General. We tried last year, the year before and again this year to get a little increase for the underpaid postal workers. Perhaps there is still room for hope that next year he will be able to do something.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What is the minimum salary paid to a lightkeeper?

Mr. CARDIN: In connection with certain lights the salary is only $60 a year, but it must be remembered that these people are not giving their whole time to the work. All they have to do is to go to the lighthouses in the evening and light the lamps and, if necessary, to clean the lights.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What is the minimum salary paid to those engaged full time in the work and what holidays do they get?

Mr. CARDIN: It is around $400.

Mr. ADSHEAD: A year?

Mr. CARDIN: For the season they are occupied.

Mr. ADSHEAD: How long is that?

Mr. CARDIN: It depends. It may be five or six or seven months.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What do they do the rest of the year?

Mr. CARDIN: I do not know.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I think that ought to be considered. I think they should receive a minimum salary of at least $100 a month.

Mr. JACOBS: It must be remembered that they are enjoying the sea air while they are carrying on their duties.

Mr. CHAPLIN: They also do some fishing.

Mr. McQUARRIE: They are not the only employees of the government who receive less than $100 a month. On the Pacific coast the fisheries patrol men working on the boats receive less than $100 a month; as a matter of fact, they receive $90 a month, and out of that they have to pay their board while out on patrol, which it is estimated costs them at least $25 or $30 a month. There was a time when they received board in addition to their salary, but now they have to pay for their board out of their salary. I have from time to time protested to the minister in the house and outside of it and to the deputy minister and I have presented petitions from the men and from various organizations pointing out the injustice under which these men are suffering owing to the small salary they receive. A man who has to keep a wife and a family on the salary a patrolman receives in British Columbia has not got very much chance. I know that the minister has refused to entertain the suggestion that has been made that these men should have their wages increased. He says that he has looked into the matter and that they are getting paid the same amount as men working on privately owned boats. Personally I think these men have been badly treated. I quite agree that the lighthouse keepers should have their salaries increased, but I think the minister should go a little bit further and treat the patrol men in the same way and give them an increase. A great many of these men are returned soldiers, as the minister knows, and it is absolutely impossible for them to live with any degree of comfort on the wages they are receiving.

Mr. SHORT: I understood from the minister this morning that this $25,000 was the amount that was agreed upon when the delegation from the lighthouse keepers' association met the government, and that the arrangement

made at that time was satisfactory to them. I understand that the delegation asked for increases that amounted to $134,000, but that the department decided that that was too much to grant them this year, but they made them the sporting offer that they would grant fifty per cent of what they asked, and I understand that the delegation were satisfied with that for this year and went away thinking that they were going to get increases amounting to $67,000. There is only $25,000 in the estimates, and therefore it does not provide for the general increase that they expected and were promised.

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend refers to the delegation of last year?

Mr. SHORT: They met the minister again in February or March of this year.

Mr. CARDIN: This year the representatives of the lightkeepers came to the department and discussed the matter again. As a result of the discussion it was agreed that for the present the changes proposed would require an expenditure of $25,000, and that was satisfactory to them for this year.

Mr. SHORT: I understood that the changes that they asked for represented an increase of about $134,000, that the government considered that was too much for the present season, that they were not disposed to grant the request of the lighthouse keepers in full, but they made them an offer of fifty per cent of what they asked for this year, and said that they might do something more next year. The lighthouse keepers accepted that offer and went away satisfied. That would have involved an expenditure of $67,000.

Mr. CARDIN: When the first request was made involving an expenditure of over $100,000, it was recognized at once by the lightkeepers that such a figure could not be considered at the present time, so there was no discussion at all about reducing that amount. However, they wanted some increase, and after discussion they agreed on the changes that we proposed. They agreed that this $25,000 would be sufficient for the present year. They have not abandoned their claims for greater remuneration, but for this year they are satisfied.

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps I might explain a little further. When the delegation met the minister, the suggestion was thrown out by one of the delegation that they might be satisfied with fifty per cent. The minister did not definitely promise it, although he held out some hope that he would consider it. Then it was left to a smaller delegation, including myself and one of the organizers of the Civil Servant's Associations, to look after the matter for these lightkeepers could not stay here indefinitely. We continued the negotiations and had several meetings with the officials. The suggestion outlined to us was this—I do not think we accepted it, except for the very good reason that we had to, and certainly we did not accept it as an abandonment of the claims of the men. It was recognized that the lower paid men I think from grades 16 to 19 ought to have their pay increased, for after twenty years they certainly had an increase coming to them. It was arranged that their pay should be increased. I forget the actual increase that was proposed, but it was a substantial increase for each of these grades. Then it was claimed that if they went into a consideration of the claims of all the lighthouse keepers, more particularly those of the part time men on the Atlantic, it would mean a reclassification of all these positions, which would take a year's time, and inevitably the result would be that some men would have to accept a lower rate of pay because conditions had changed since they were first appointed. Perhaps railways had come or villages had grown up and made the conditions very different from what they were many years ago. It was shown to us to some extent that if such a general reclassification took place some of these men would have to have their salaries reduced, and it was felt that that was not desirable from the men's point of view. So the suggestion that was made was this: If we would accept, or rather if we would be quiescent over this increase for the lower grades, then any individual in the higher grades who felt that he had a specific complaint, that he was not being fairly dealt with as compared with other lighthouse keepers in view of the special circumstances of his position, could have his case considered, and I think the language that was used was that it would receive "the sympathetic consideration of the department." So while the lower grade men are sharing in this increase in any case, none of the higher grade men will have to be demoted, and if any one of them feels that he is being discriminated against or that his position has become more difficult by reason of changed conditions he can bring his case up and, to quote the language of the official, it will receive sympathetic consideration by the department.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Was any minimum salary suggested?

Mr. NEILL: There was no question of minimum salary because of the difficulty of fixing a specific salary that would fit all conditions. The conditions of the lighthouse ser-

vice are peculiar. A salary that would be perfectly adequate in one place would be perfectly inadequate at, say, a point 50 miles away, due to difficulties of communication and other factors. Therefore it is not possible specifically to lay down a salary that would be fair to one and all; each case must be considered by itself.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does the hon. gentleman say there is a minimum salary for a man permanently engaged?

Mr. NEILL: It was arranged that the minimum salary for the lower grades should be substantially increased.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): A new situation has arisen. The minister said the deputation was satisfied. I understand from the last speaker that the deputation appointed a subcommittee and they are not satisfied. Is that the situation?

Mr. NEILL: We were satisfied—

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister will answer the question, please.

Mr. CARDIN: I understood they were satisfied with what we were ready to do this year. It is true they were asking for more. They did not abandon their claim. I may have been mistaken, but I understood from their declaration that they were satisfied to have the low salaries taken care of for the present.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is a flat increase to be given to each one of the low salaried men, or are the increases to be varied? I have been trying to figure out what each one might get. The increase might amount to $40.

Mr. CARDIN: I might read for the benfit of the committee a brief explanation which I have among my papers:

It is proposed to grant definite increases to the lowest paid group, which are classes 19 to 16 inclusive, averaging between $26 and $27 per annum. This group is now paid a minimum of $80 per annum and a maximum of $150. It is proposed to increase the minimum to $100 and the maximum to $180. There are approximately 390 in this group. It is not proposed to grant definite increases in classes 15 to 11 inclusive, but to consider each individual case with a view to granting promotion instead of changing the classification of the station, which will give them a higher salary. There are approximately 380 in this group. It is estimated that approximately 25 per cent of each class will be promoted to a higher class, and the additional annual expenditure involved will approximate the above sum.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Has the position of lightkeeper at Fourchu, in the county of Richmond been filled?

Mr. CARDIN: I am sorry that I have not the information before me.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The minister should be aware that the position became vacant through the death of the lightkeeper, and that an appointment was to be made. I should like to know if the man now employed there has been permanently appointed. If so, how so and why so?

Mr. CARDIN: I will undertake to get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. DICKIE: I did not happen to be in the house, Mr. Chairman, when the item for the administration of pilotage was before the committee. Is it the the intention of the government at an early date to provide the necessary machinery for putting into effect the recommendations of Commissioner Morrison and the committee on Marine and Fisheries with respect to pilotage matters on the Pacific coast?

Mr. CARDIN: We are doing it now.

Mr. DICKIE: There have been disconcerting rumours that a high official in the minister's department does not view with approval the by-laws which were agreed to by the shipping federation and the pilots of Vancouver. The pilots are a little bit perturbed, and they wish to be assured that the necessary order in council will be passed and that the minister will proceed to establish a pilotage board along the lines suggested by Commissioner Morrison and the committee.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that these by-laws are now before the Justice department for approval.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Referring to my question in reference to the lightkeeper at Fourchu, I may say for the information of the minister that this is a very important matter. A vacancy occurred some time last year, and I understand that a minor is now holding the position. I have had a good many communications in reference to the case. I do not know whether it is due to the fault of the Civil Service Commission or not, but I understand notices advertising the vacancy were not posted in the vicinity. We have in that district quite a few returned soldiers, and my information comes from them. These men claim that they have not been given a proper opportunity to apply for the vacancy. As is well known, we have in Nova Scotia a system of party patronage. To-day it is uncertain whether the position is actually held by the father or by his son, but I know the father holds every important

government position in the district. He is the local patronage dealer. Three or four of the returned soldiers to whom I have referred are invalids as a result of their war service in the cause of freedom and the vindication of British principles of justice and fair play. These men desire to know whether or not this 18- or 19-year old son is the lightkeeper of Fourchu or whether his father holds the position. They cannot find out.

Mr. CARDIN: I will secure the information and give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Furthermore, I would ask the minister to make an investigation and ascertain whether or not the Civil Service Commission or his own department failed properly to advertise the vacancy; and if an appointment was made, how it was made. If the returned soldiers in the district were not given an opportunity to apply for this position, I claim the case should be reopened. As I have said, three or four of these returned soldiers are invalids, they are not able to work, and their pensions are not sufficient to enable them to maintain themselves and their families. Such a position as this—and by statute they are entitled to preferred treatment in these cases—such a position, I say, would be a great help to any one of these men. British justice should not be denied these returned soldiers, and I claim that the position should be reopened and these men given an opportunity to compete for it.

Mr. BRADY: In the matter of ordinary repairs such as carpentry work and work around the lighthouse, which very often involves many long hours on the part of the lighthouse keeper, is any extra pay allowed?

Mr. CARDIN: No; in connection with small repairs material is supplied to the lighthouse keeper, but he receives no extra pay.

Mr. BRADY: Is the minister aware that very often the work that devolves upon these men occupies them seven, eight and nine hours a day? In view of this, and the fact that these men must devote a long part of their night to lighthouse work, consideration should be given the matter.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to reimburse certain merchants of Victoria, B.C. for materials furnished and used in the construction of two lighthouse tenders for the service of the government, $8,459.77.

Mr. FRASER: Will the minister explain this item?

[Mr. Macdonald (Richmond).]

Mr. CARDIN: This vote results from the failure of the British Columbia Yacht and Boat Builders' Company Limited, of Victoria, to complete a contract entered into with the department for the construction of two lighthouse tenders in 1920. The original contract provided for a total payment of $62,750 but it was later increased to $75,000 when the work was nearing completion, on the representations which were made that it was more costly than had been anticipated and that the credit and resources of the company were exhausted. Ultimately the government was compelled to take over the vessels uncompleted and to complete them on commission at a cost of $1,450. The above sum represents unpaid claims of various merchants against the original contractors for materials supplied which entered into the construction of the vessels, less 17 per cent which accrued to them from money assigned by the direction of the industrial commissioner for the province of British Columbia. The government acknowledges no legal liability for these things but proposes to pay them as an act of grace. These people supplied materials and goods which were necessary for the building of the ships. We are getting the benefit of this because we are using the materials, and it has been felt that it would be only fair to compensate the dealer.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What was the result of the contract in the first place?

Mr. CARDIN: We got the two boats. They could not carry on; they failed.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Did the boats cost you that much more?

Mr. CARDIN: We paid $75,000 for the boats.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That was the amount of the contract.

Mr. CARDIN: No; the amount of the contract was $62,750. This company, I may say, was an organization of returned soldiers who had gone into the business of building ships; but apparently they were not experienced and could not carry on, with the result that they failed. The government had to supply the necessary money to complete the work. The merchants who supplied the goods were anxious to be paid, having made representations for many years. This year we decided to make this grant as an act of grace.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and disbursements of fishery officers and guardians, fisheries patrol and fisheries protection services, $1,160,000.

Mr. BRADY: On this very important vote, which calls for an increase this year of $180,000, making the total $1,160,000, I have something to say which is of vital interest. It is of such vital importance to our patrol system in the waters of British Columbia that I feel sure that when I put a few facts before the committee they will not be merely surprised at conditions there but will receive a decided shock. To-day on the Pacific coast we find the greatest fishery that Canada possesses. That is the only part of Canada at the present time that presents increased fishing problems; these problems are all on on the Pacific seaboard. For instance, we have entered into a halibut treaty for the preservation of that great industry, and we have made a seal industry from which this government obtains annually $100,000. This money goes into the national revenue and is not paid into the fishing department for its development. This bounty is a gift from one of our sea industries. Then lately we have seen the desirability of entering into a salmon treaty for the preservation of that very high class commercial fish, the Sockeye.

What are the facts to-day regarding our fishing? I went to the trouble to get from the bureau of statistics at Washington the report of the tariff investigation that has taken place in the last few weeks in connection with fishing in the United States and in its relation to Canada and other countries. As a preamble to the facts which I am going to give to the committee. I may observe that the president of the largest fishing establishment in Boston, in giving his evidence before the tariff commission when asking for an increase of 3 cents per pound on processed haddock going in from the Atlantic seaboard into the United States, uttered this sentence, which I am quite convinced will cause every member of this committee to think.

What we want is an equalization basis; having got that, with American brains and American genius, we look after the rest.

To-day in the United States, with a population nearly thirteen times greater than that of Canada, there is a demand thirteen times greater for fish in that market. And here we find this statement in an article:

It has been abundantly proved that the fishing banks to which American fishermen have immediate access are unable to meet the demands of the American market for fish.

From maps compiled by the United States bureau of fisheries indicating the distribution of production, it is made manifest that any further developments in production must be made in waters nearer the Canadian coast than that of the United States.

I will give one more short paragraph which is also illuminating in connection with American inland fisheries; a survey made in American waters proved that they are so depleted that production in these waters is entirely inadequate to meet the demand. Yellow pike, whitefish, yellow perch and jacks, all have suffered depreciation. It is admitted, moreover, by the United States authorities that the production of fresh water fish on the American side of the great lakes is likewise depleted. The blue pike, a highly commercial inland water fish which was obtained in tremendous quantities from American waters up to 1923, has been fished out.

As a preamble to what I am going to say I want to remind hon. members that no phase of this great industry demands the attention of this house and of the people of Canada so much as our Pacific fisheries. What is happening there to-day? Let me go back three years; time and again the Department of Fisheries has been warned that great inroads were being made by American trawlers, and on our fishery grounds only as a last resort on the part of individual Canadian trawlers to undertake to do the police work which the department was unable to do properly because of the lack of an adequate patrol system, with which I will deal in a moment. The smaller boats, except the Malaspina and Givenchy cannot go into these deep waters, swept as they are by terrific storms, and as a result they are unable to give proper service.

The Washington treaty of 1909 undoubtedly has not been lived up to; here is the important section of that treaty, which was signed at Washington on January 27, 1909:

American fishermen shall be permitted to enter such bays or harbours for the purpose of shelter, repairing damages, purchasing wood, obtaining water—

The next is the important provision:

—and for no other purpose whatever.

It has been proved that hundreds and hundreds of American trawlers have violated the provisions of that treaty, and are doing so at present. I have here a sworn copy of the log of a Canadian trawler, covering the period from May 9 to September 6, 1928. I have taken only this one bit of evidence from that offered by all the hundreds of vessels which go in and out of the different harbours, but certainly this should make us feel very much alarmed when we see the dangers with which our fisheries are faced as a result of these American trawlers menacing our fishing grounds. The log is as follows:

May 9th. White Rocks—Banks Isl. 11 U.S.A. trollers from ¼ mile of light-buoy to 14

miles W. ¾ S. A large number of U.S.A. trollers fishing off cape George observed at 17.15 p.m.

May 13th. 43 U.S.A. trollers fishing from 1 mile of Seal rocks (Stephens Isl.) to 20 miles S.S.W. off "Freeman's pass."

May 14th. U.S.A. trollers "Valid" and "Republic" fishing ½ mile off N.W. rocks—Banks island.

May 15th. Several U.S.A. trollers fishing off Reef island.

May 16th. 11 U.S.A. trollers fishing off Scridler point, inside 3 mile.

May 19th. Sat. night at dark anchor lights of U.S.A. trollers resembling street lights of a city at night—off Freeman's pass.

May 20th. U.S.A. troller "Majestic" trolling about 2 miles off White Rocks—Banks island, strong S.E.

May 23rd. 16 U.S.A. trollers fishing from Rose spit buoy to end of dry spit.

May 31st. U.S.A. trollers too many to count fishing from Reef island to Bonilla.

June 3rd. 2 U.S.A. trollers fishing along N.W. Rocks, Banks island.

June 7th. 2 U.S.A. trollers fishing—Butterworth rocks.

June 9th. 3 U.S.A. trollers fishing off Reef island 10—2 a.m.

June 10th. 4 U.S.A. trollers fishing approximately one mile from Meresly Island.

June 11th. Several U.S.A. trollers fishing 2 miles off Reef island.

June 13th. Canadian trollers "Iceland" and "Point May" observe 7 U.S.A. trollers around Rose spit buoy at 11.15 a.m. also 17.55 p.m.

June 14th. One U.S.A. troller (no name on her) trolling inside Butterworth rocks with one line over the stern, her poles up.

June 15th. U.S.A. troller fishing 1½ miles off Gull rocks—no name.

June 16th. 19.30 p.m. Freeman harbour. 14 U.S.A. trollers anchored. Crews cutting poles ashore.

June 17th. U.S.A. troller "Republic" fishing ¼ mile off Indian cove.

June 20th. Sparrowhawk breakers, 8.45 a.m. 2 U.S.A. trollers fishing 1 mile off S.E.

June 22nd. 37 U.S.A. trollers anchored in Freeman's harbour. Crews trolling poles ashore.

June 27th. 7 U.S.A. trollers fishing inside Rose spit buoy.

July 4th. U.S.A. trollers "Jennie" and "W-U" trolling Laparanese rocks 200 ft. off S.W. at 8.30 a.m.

July 14th. 15 U.S.A. trollers fishing around Rose spit buoy.

Aug. 18th. Reported by Canadian halibut boat (Thelma C) large number of U.S.A. trollers fishing off Gosling rocks (Goose island).

Sept. 6th. Reported by D.S.T. (Canadian halibut boat) 3 U.S.A. trollers fishing between Rose spit and Butterworth rocks.

Surely it is my right, Mr. Chairman, to present to this House of Commons and to this committee the gravity of the situation and the danger threatening this great fishing industry. A grave responsibility rests upon us of preserving and conserving that great industry. I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows the complexity and magnitude of this work which he is called upon to perform, but with his double function of Minister of Marine and Fisheries he cannot hope to give the Fisheries department the consideration which it deserves. I would like to quote a few sentences from a very excellent report upon the patrol service and which throws out a hint that this particular service should be improved. The first sentence is:

> In view of the immense increase in the number of fishermen and the quantity of fishing gear operated during the year, particularly in the case of salmon, and the resultant keen competition, the difficulties of the patrol service were greatly increased.

And again, and this is much more important:

> Several of the present overseer's areas must be considerably reduced.

I will explain the significance of that sentence a little later on. The report continues:

> The inspections by guardians and patrolmen are very often unsatisfactory owing to the fact that these officers are usually new men each year.

Those who do not understand the conditions under which these men enter the patrol service cannot get the significance of that sentence. The minister knows that this service is used for patronage purposes. These men see an opportunity of obtaining a job for two or three months and very often some of them have never seen the inside of a boat before. I know of one instance where a man was placed on one of these patrol boats and I looked up his history and found that he did not know anything about a marine engine. I do not blame anyone personally, but I blame the system. The system is wrong and we should have competent men in our patrol system, men who are paid enough to keep them from temptation and bribery. They should be given proper boats and the areas of inspection should be reduced. Moreover, there should be one or two larger boats provided to ply these waters and visit the harbours where hundreds and hundreds of American salmon trawlers are to be found.

It is only since May 11 that any effort has been made to check up this great evil. A recent case was the patrol boat Malaspina which seized five American trawlers and took them to Prince Rupert. They claimed that they came in for shelter, but it was proved by the evidence of the fishery officers in charge of the fisheries that the weather had been fine. They were not in need of water and they had not been forced in through the inclemency of the weather. A few days ago at Zayas island in northern British Columbia another American trawler was seized. The man admitted that he had been fishing, but he was caught redhanded and was forced to make

that admission, and furthermore, he had salmon on board. That boat was a fifteen ton trawler, newly built in Seattle, and had been fishing in Canadian waters. Before I proceed any further, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether or not Hecate straits are "mare clausum" or considered as being Canadian water.

Mr. CARDIN: The department has always claimed that it is.

Mr. BRADY: It is within Canadian waters?

Mr. CARDIN: That is our claim but it is not admitted.

Mr. BRADY: I am very glad to hear the minister say that that is our claim. I believe that that is one thing which will have to be fought for as those waters should be considered as being purely Canadian waters. Last year the American trawlers took nearly 2,000,000 pounds of salmon from that area. At the north end of Hecate strait, at the international line, there are hundreds of American traps to be found, and the same condition applies to the southern end of the international line. Then we find hundreds and hundreds of American trawlers plying along our coasts and coming into our harbours and there is no doubt in the world that they are not keeping to the treaty of Washington. If this committee, or this House of Commons, would realize the importance of this matter it would receive immediate attention. The only place in Canada where we have fishing problems is on the Pacific coast. The Atlantic seaboard has been fished for many years and it presents no great problems at the present time. This government should have a Minister of Fisheries who knows these waters and knows the problems surrounding them; that is the only solution of the whole matter.

I do not wish to keep the committee any longer, but I only desire to say that we are wasting time, energy and money unless a constructive policy is adopted. These people should be made to live up to the treaty, a better patrol service should be provided, better conditions of entering that service and conservation of our fish. These should be the important points.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: How are these fishery guardians paid? Are they paid by the month?

Mr. CARDIN: They are paid by the day.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: When they are paid by the day, are they supposed to do any other work, their own work, or are they paid a sufficient amount to keep them from doing other work?

Mr. CARDIN: They are not supposed to do any other work during the days they are supposed to work as guardians.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: Does that apply to all the fishery guardians?

Mr. CARDIN: There are a few of them who are not obliged to give their whole time to the work.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: I have had several complaints from parts of my constituency that these guardians are doing other work and neglecting the streams. I did not take any notice of this because I was not sure whether they were compelled to devote their full time to the work or not. I suppose this is according to the pay they get.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes. In answer to the observations of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Brady), while I have no intention of going into any of the details that he has discussed, referring to his last observation that the proper move would be the appointment of a separate minister to look after the fisheries, I have already said in the house that personally I am not very anxious to continue the office of Minister of Fisheries. I think my hon. friend should be relieved by the declaration of the Prime Minister not very long ago that he was considering the matter and that he expected he would be in a position to appoint a Minister of Fisheries. What has been stated by my hon. friend relates, if I am not mistaken, to last year.

Mr. BRADY: Yes, 1928.

Mr. CARDIN: The results for this year are very satisfactory. The patrol service has already effected several seizures, and I think the condition has very much improved as compared with what it was last year. At present we have in British Columbia twenty patrol boats. We have two big boats; in district No. 1 we have six smaller ones; in district No. 2, nine, and in district No. 3, five, making a total of twenty. We propose to build for district No. 1, an additional boat, and for district No. 2 five additional boats. We propose also as an experiment to build four sea sleds, very fast motor boats, to operate from a master ship. Of course these sea sleds will not be capable of going on the high seas and in rough weather, but as they are very fast-running boats, we think they will be of great advantage. Outside of that we have the flying service to help us, and after considering the whole matter and discussing it with interested parties, we have reached an agreement to cooperate to the greatest extent

possible with the Northern British Columbia Fishing Association. The department is satisfied that at present the situation has improved, and we hope it will continue to improve.

Mr. SHORT: The minister has given us the number of patrol boats he has on the Pacific coast. How many has he on the Atlantic? The hon. member for Skeena evidently thinks that we have no fishery problems in the maritime provinces. I should like him to understand that we have quite as many problems and difficulties in the maritime provinces as they have on the Pacific. The minister might also give the number of patrol boats on the great lakes.

Mr. CARDIN: We have none on the great lakes, but on the Atlantic coast we have the Arras and the Arleux. We have also the Mildred McColl and the F. P. 1. In New Brunswick we have the Phalarope, the Gannet Rock, in addition to chartered boats. Moreover we are building three boats for the eastern coast of Canada, one to replace the F. P. 1 which has been condemned, a new boat for scallop investigation and a new boat for patrol service.

Mr. SHORT: Last year the amount appropriated was $980,000. This year it is $1,160,000, or an increase of $180,000. How is this made up?

Mr. CARDIN: In the first place there are statutory increases and the employment of four new overseers. This includes the travelling expenses and allowances for these officers.

Mr. McRAE: What do the overseers get?

Mr. CARDIN: We have two grades, one receiving from $1,200 to $1,500, and the other from $1,500 to $1,800. This increase also covers special guardians, employment of additional guardians in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Saskatchewan; miscellaneous expenditure, the small amount of $5,000; the building of new boats for the west coast and the east coast, amounting to $137,000. That is the big item in the increase.

Mr. McRAE: How much of that is for the west coast?

Mr. CARDIN: $98,000. The existing wooden boat sheds at Digby island, British Columbia, which were of cheap and fragile construction, are beyond repair and must be replaced at a great cost or deterioration of the boats will be incurred. Additional sheds are now needed, there being no accommodation for some boats. The amount for that is $6,700. We are now providing $20,000 more than last year for air service.

Mr. McRAE: Principally west coast?

Mr. CARDIN: Altogether west coast.

Mr. McRAE: This patrol service which, I presume, is being operated on the west coast, is rapidly mounting into very large figures. I notice that last year we spent on the patrol service, $228,904, and from the figures given by the minister our expenditure this year will probably be close to $350,000 on the coast. There is a good deal in what the hon. member for Skeena has said. The conditions of which he complains on the west coast of Vancouver island and under which our Canadian fishermen have suffered have prevailed for a long time. We have beyond the west coast of Vancouver island the Swift Shore banks, about twenty-five miles out, and our fishermen should enjoy the advantage of proximity to that bank, but under the old treaty American vessels have the privilege of entering our ports for wood, water, shelter and repairs. I appreciate that it is very difficult for the department to protect our fishermen and prevent what is undoubtedly going on, and that is the use of these numerous harbours on the west coast of Vancouver island as a resting place for the Seattle fleet. I submit to the minister that we should take some steps to protect our fishermen on the west coast, even to the extent of asking for a modification of that old treaty which is no longer applicable to present day conditions. I submit that a great deal of this expenditure of $350,000 which the government will make this year is caused by the fact that we are endeavouring to protect ourselves against the misuse of our numerous harbours on the west coast. I can see the difficulty the department must experience in doing that because to-day it is not unusual to find twenty-five or fifty American boats, which fish off the Swift Shore Banks, resting in our harbours on the west coast. They can run in and out of these harbours with impunity under this clause in the treaty which permits them to come in for wood, water, shelter and repairs, almost as conveniently as our own fishermen who have their homes on the shore. I submit that the Seattle fleet would be at a great disadvantage, operating two hundred miles away from their base, if they could only use our harbours when there was a real storm on, and then they could come in for safety. I do not think this treaty was ever intended

to allow foreign fishermen to come into our harbours and enjoy exactly the same privileges as our own Canadian citizens. The Seattle fleet buy all their supplies in Seattle, and then come up and fish off the Swift Shore banks, enjoy the privileges of our harbours so far as shelter is concerned, and then return to Seattle with their catch, but they are not subject to two cents a pound duty.

I am glad of this opportunity to put these facts before the committee because I think it is a matter that requires the attention of the government, particularly in view of the increased expenditure which is going on from year to year in order to protect ourselves against conditions which it is impossible for us properly to protect ourselves against, regardless of how many boats you put on the patrol service, for there are dozens of harbours, probably forty or fifty, into which these American boats can run, and there is no habitation there at all. It is quite easy for the Seattle fleet in any little blow which would just make the ordinary landsmen seasick to run into our harbours and call it a storm, and then immediately go out and fish again when the sun comes out.

Mr. BALDWIN: How near the shore can they fish, three or twelve miles?

Mr. McRAE: I believe that three miles is the limit, but that is not the real complaint, because I believe that poaching will be done once in a while by all fishermen. It is difficult on a long coast line of 300 miles to prevent poaching altogether, and I do not think there is any serious complaint about that. What we complain about is that common use of our harbours by foreign fishermen and our own people.

Mr. NEILL: I would like to endorse everything that the hon. member for Vancouver North has said. He has outlined the situation as it exists. What the remedy is I do not know unless it be greater vigilance on our part. Some years ago it was the practice never to interfere with these men at all. There seemed to be some doubt about the correct interpretation of the treaty, and I had a good deal to do with pressing the department to take the matter up. Two years ago the department finally decided to take action, and in order not to be too harsh at first they first of all warned these men, and then on the second offence they seized the vessel. I think last year five or six boats were seized. The United States government took the attitude that we were all wrong, that we had not interpreted the treaty correctly. I believe the matter never went to the courts. The boats were confiscated or released on paying a very heavy fine. I saw in the local papers only a few weeks ago that quite a number of them had been taken recently, some in the constituency of my hon. friend from Skeena, and some in the district I represent. I can only suggest that the government should be more vigilant in this matter and make an example of these foreign fishermen and vessels when they catch them.

Mr. McRAE: The difficulty the government experiences is in connection with this clause in the old treaty which gives foreign vessels the right to come in for wood, water, shelter and repairs, and until that treaty is modified all we can expect is that the government do the best they can, but they will not get very far in protecting the interests of our fishermen in these harbours because you can readily see that a man could shut off his gasoline engine or put it out of business and then come into port and say he wants to fix the engine up. Many a man has said that when he has been approached—"I am fixing up my engine"—and he is allowed in under that clause in the treaty which enables him to come in to make repairs. I really think that in the interests of our fishermen the treaty should be revised. It has been in effect for one hundred years, and I think it would be a good thing to bring it up to date.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How much will be spent on the air patrol under this item?

Mr. CARDIN: This year about $40,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What does that include?

Mr. CARDIN: Three planes must be always available and give at least three hundred flying hours.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Are the planes owned by the department?

Mr. CARDIN: No, by Canadian Airways Limited.

Mr. McRAE: I should like to say that there is no fisheries patrol service on the coast as efficient as the air service.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Where do these planes operate?

Mr. CARDIN: All along the coast but mainly in district No. 2.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is the arrangement with Canadian Airways Limited as to the use of these planes?

Mr. CARDIN: They have to have three planes available at places specified by our officers from time to time.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What do you pay for this service?

Mr. CARDIN: We pay $40,000 to that company for the use of a plane, and three of them have to be always available anywhere that is indicated by our officer.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What do they do? I quite agree that the air service is most useful in fisheries patrol, but I am wondering what work these planes actually do. If we were really getting results, it would seem to me that this poaching which the hon. member for Skeena has told us about should not occur.

Mr. CARDIN: Those aeroplanes are operating in the same way as the protective boats that we are using there. The efficiency of the service cannot be gauged by the number of arrests made. The prevention of offences is the most important feature, and judged by these results I think we are justified in saying that the service has proved satisfactory.

Mr. SHORT: Under this heading comes salaries. I presume that is one of the items which accounts for some of the increase. Among the new men appointed since the reorganization of the Fisheries department I notice Mr. Paisley, a former editor of the Sydney Record. Will the minister state what position this gentleman occupies, what are his duties and his qualifications?

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. Paisley has been appointed director of publicity. His salary comes under the civil government vote. As my hon. friend knows, the appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SHORT: What qualifications does Mr. Paisley possess for a position of this kind? Did we not have an intelligence bureau presided over by one of the other officers of the department?

Mr. CARDIN: We had no officer fulfilling the same duties.

Mr. SHORT: Did not Mr. Cowie perform those duties?

Mr. CARDIN: We had an intelligence bureau for the obtaining of information regarding bait along the coast. That was the only object of the bureau presided over by Mr. Cowie.

Mr. SHORT: I would think that the man in charge of the intelligence bureau of the fisheries department would need to have some knowledge of the fishing industry, otherwise he could not give the information to the public that the public are looking for. I would not know Mr. Paisley if I met him on the street, but I am told that he has absolutely no practical qualifications whatever, that his appointment was purely political. Had he not been of the right political stripe, he never would have received this appointment, regardless of whether the Civil Service Commission made it or not. Now, if the minister is going to play politics with the fisheries service he will never improve it; in fact such a course will be very detrimental to the industry. You must get practical men in the department if you are going to make a success of this great natural industry; you must have men who know something about the business.

Mr. CARDIN: I think this appointment cannot be described as a political appointment. It was made by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with the Civil Service Act. Mr. Paisley is a newspaper man and is supposed to know something about advertising, and certainly having lived for a long period of years in the maritime provinces he has a general knowledge of the fishing industry in that section of the country. We do not need at the head of the publicity division an expert in any line or branch of the fishing industry. If he has a knowledge of the general principles of the industry, and capacity for devising a better scheme of reaching the public, I think his qualifications are sufficient. He has to collect information and distribute it for the benefit of the fishermen and the general public as well. He does not require any technical experience.

Mr. SHORT: What advertising is the department doing? I get our maritime papers every day, and so far I have not seen any improvement whatever in the articles that are sent to the press.

Mr. CARDIN: Surely my hon. friend realizes that we are only at the start of this branch of the service, and are not yet in a position to show the benefit resulting from its establishment. I repeat, Mr. Paisley's appointment was made through the Civil Service Commission. Several others applied, and the commission decided that Mr. Paisley was the best qualified.

Mr. SHORT: How long does a man require to get a bureau like this started? How long does it take him to get into his stride? He has been in his position for several months. I do not believe there is any intention on the

part of the department to make any radical change. If he is such a wonderful man I would think, after having been in the position for several months, he would be able to show the public that he can improve the service.

Mr. McRAE: Mr. Chairman, I notice that guardians come under this vote, and I have a suggestion to make to the minister. No people on our coast are more interested in the industry than the fishermen themselves. They have some very representative and serious minded associations, and these associations are giving a great deal of time to the development of the industry. I have no hesitation in saying to the minister that if a little less regard was given to the political complexion of the guardians, and if the fishermen's associations were a little more closely consulted about appointments, the department would get men who not only know the district to which they are assigned, but also possess the knowledge which the associations have at their disposal. I have not the least doubt in the world that more efficient guardians could be obtained in that way. This would result in better protection of the fish, which is the purpose for which these men are hired.

Item agreed to.

Building fishways and clearing rivers, $20,000.

Mr. McRAE: It is not very often that this side of the house criticizes the government for not spending enough money, but this vote for clearing streams is absurd; it is totally inadequate, and in some cases the money has not even been used. It requires no expert in fishing to know that you must remove obstructions from rivers and streams if fish are unable to get up those rivers and streams; and on our coast there are dozens of streams in which improvements of this kind could be made to great advantage. I should like to see the vote sufficiently large so that if applications came in to the department, and investigation warranted it, a proper expenditure could be made to improve any stream where necessary. I know of one steam at least which would require the whole of this vote to put it into proper condition. The expenditure would be worth while, and as a business proposition it would be made. But the department has always been handicapped by the limitation of this particular vote.

Mr. CARDIN: Last year we spent practically the amount voted—$19,000. I agree with my hon. friend that more work should be undertaken.

Mr. McRAE: The vote should be $100,000, and even if you did not use it all you would at least have the money on hand to do work which is of primary importance.

Mr. SHORT: I agree with the hon. member that this vote is a mere pittance compared to what it should be to take care of so important a matter as the clearing of streams. We have the same difficulty in Nova Scotia. In some of our rivers, which were splendid salmon rivers, this fish is now almost extinct; the salmon are unable to get up the rivers on account of obstructions. I wish to read an editorial that appeared in the Halifax Herald two or three days ago, bearing on this subject:

Protect The Salmon

There is urgent need for more adequate protection in relation to the salmon streams of Nova Scotia. If this adequate protection is not afforded, these fine fish will cease to exist in streams now famous as anglers' haunts.

On certain streams facilities are provided for the passage of salmon upstream, but when the small fish come down they get into the flume and are destroyed.

What is needed, The Herald is advised, is a screen on the flume to keep the small fish out.

This matter is giving concern to those interested in conservation of the fish of the province, and it should receive immediate and effective attention.

I believe this matter was brought to the attention of the minister last year by the senior member for Halifax, and it is one that should receive the immediate consideration of the department. Our rivers and streams should be so cleared as to enable salmon to get up and down. This means a great deal to the province of Nova Scotia and to every province in the Dominion. If there is not sufficient money in the vote for the purpose, it would be advisable for the minister to ask for a further appropriation.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Last year I called the minister's attention to this very item. There is not much use clearing rivers if you do not take precautions to see that fishways are maintained. The preservation of spawning beds is a most important thing. As I pointed out to the minister, charters are being granted to power companies for the erection of power sites on rivers which are navigable and which should come under the jurisdiction of the federal department. If this matter does not come within the scope of the federal department, then I submit that there should be a certain amount of cooperation with the provincial governments to see that fishways are made on these rivers. I have been over a great number of them and I cannot find one. Consequently, both by damming and by the

erection of power sites, the old spawning grounds are being destroyed, and the future supply of fish is endangered. It is more important to preserve fishways and spawning grounds than it is to maintain hatcheries in an attempt to restore the fish. I spoke about this matter last year but I do not think one thing has been done by the department since then. The result is that power sites are being built without any attempt to establish fishways.

Mr. CARDIN: We took this matter up last year with the Ontario government, but my hon. friend understands the difficulties that have to be met. We can only make representations; we have not the power to impose our views upon the provincial government and to decide whether or not dams shall be built. However, I can assure the hon. gentleman that we are not failing to make representations in the matter; every case brought to our attention is discussed with the provincial authorities.

Mr. GARDINER: Where were the various amounts spent last year and for what purpose?

Mr. CARDIN: Money was spent in practically every province. In Nova Scotia we spent $4,545; in New Brunswick, $6,308; and a very small amount in Prince Edward Island. We did some work also in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

Mr. GARDINER: No money spent in Ontario or Quebec?

Mr. CARDIN: No, because the administration of fisheries in Ontario and Quebec is provincial.

Mr. MacLAREN: What work is being done on the small salmon streams in the bay of Fundy, on the New Brunswick coast, such as the river near St. George?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that we did a certain amount of work there last year. The engineers are going there this year to continue it.

Item agreed to.

To assist in the conservation and development of the deep sea fisheries and the demand for fish, $130,000.

Mr. McRAE: What is this for?

Mr. CARDIN: This appropriation is to encourage the production, to extend the demand and to improve marketing facilities. With a view to having the growing demands for fresh fish supplied as far as possible by our inshore fishermen, an experiment was started last year in the collection of fish along the coast, where those supplying the fresh fish markets would agree to buy all the fish caught. The portion of the coast covered was from Port Bickerton, Guysborough county, to Canso. The Maritime Fish Corporation, particularly, entered enthusiastically into the experiment. The experiment was successful and resulted in the building of several new boats by the fishermen and in other preparations being made for more intensive fishing. It was continued there last season, when over one million pounds more cod and haddock were transported than in 1927. Another result is that during the present winter at least twenty-two new boats are being built by the fishermen, wharves are being enlarged and additional ice and bait facilities are being provided.

The experiment was extended last summer to the portion of the southeast coast of Cape Breton from Main a Dieu to Canso, where again the Maritime Fish Corporation undertook to buy the fish; to the portion of the cost from Sonora, Guysborough county, to Halifax, along which the National Fish Company of Halifax and Messrs Mitchell and McNeil undertook to buy, and along the portion of the coast from Cape Negro to Lockeport and Shelburne. The idea is to collect the fish from places where it is not easy to market them and take them to where they can be marketed advantageously.

Mr. McRAE: That would seem to apply to the development of the industry; how about the conservation?

Mr. CARDIN: I think the word "conservation" does not apply to the fish but to the fishing industry.

Mr. McRAE: There is one point I would like to mention in this connection; I refer to the question of our deep sea fishing off the west coast of Vancouver island. I would like to ask if any representations have been received from the fishery interest on the Columbia river with regard to the restriction or the regulation of the fishing season off that coast?

Mr. CARDIN: I suppose my hon. friend refers to spring salmon?

Mr. McRAE: Yes.

Mr. CARDIN: Representations have been made but we are not yet in a position to state whether or not those representations are correct.

Mr. McRAE: That being the case I want to warn the minister and the government of a complication which may develop there. It

has been determined by our biological officers that 70 per cent of the fish we catch on the Swift Shore banks off Vancouver island would go to the Columbia river if left alone, and the Columbia river fishermen represent that the fish we catch weighing nine or ten pounds, if caught six or eight months later in the Columbia river would weigh eighteen or twenty pounds. I think probably they are correct; and they claim that from an economic standpoint there should be some regulation to prevent the catching of immature spring salmon on the west coast of Vancouver island. Naturally the position of our fishermen is that this is their source of supply and, while the fish may be small or immature, they belong to our fishermen. They contend that any regulation which would permit these fish to grow to maturity, while it might give the Columbia river fishermen twice the weight of fish, would give all these fish, or practically all, to the Columbia river fishermen instead of to our own men. Bearing in mind the seal treaty and other treaties we have made with respect to these very waters I want to take time by the forelock and point out to the government that we should not interfere in any way with the rights of the fishermen on the west coast of Vancouver island for the benefit of the fishermen of Portland.

Mr. NEILL: I think I might add that it is contended by our fishermen that it is not true that later on the fish are bigger; they claim that they can occasionally catch immature fish off the west coast of Vancouver island and, as the hon. member for North Vancouver has truly said, they violently resent the idea that they should be restricted in any way for the benefit of the Columbia river fishermen. I drew this matter to the attention of the government a couple of years ago in a similar endeavour to take time by the forelock, as my hon. friend has said.

Mr. McRAE: For the benefit of the committee I might say that the biological society, if my memory serves me correctly, by tagging a great many fish on the Swift Shore banks, showed that when the fish were not interfered with 70 per cent found their way to the Columbia river, and all but a small percentage of the remainder went to Puget Sound. Only a very small proportion reached the Fraser river, so that of the entire catch on the Swift Shore banks, if those fish were not caught, probably not over 10 per cent at the most would find their way into Canadian waters. So it will be easy to understand the deep concern which is felt by our neighbours in desiring to conserve these fish for themselves at our expense.

Mr. SHORT: This item has been in the estimates year after year, and has remained at the figure of $130,000; I think last year was the first time the full amount was expended. The item was originally included in the estimates for the purpose of assisting in the conservation and development of the deep sea fisheries and also to create a demand for fish, but within the last year or two I do not think one dollar has been spent in an effort to create that demand. I commend the minister for the action he has taken in having a number of boats collect the fish from the outlying districts of the maritime provinces and take them to the central markets. That has been a splendid thing for the fishermen but it has not created a demand for the fish after they are landed.

I find on looking up the accounts that of the $130,000 voted last year $66,000 was expended in connection with the commission which was appointed to investigate the fisheries. Surely that should not be put under the head of fish conservation. I find also that $17,000 was expended for the extermination of hair seals. Last year we passed an item of $25,000 for that purpose, but we find that a part of this $130,000 has been used to pay bounties in that connection. I just want to show the inefficiency of this department and its inability to cope with the problems of an industry which is of so much importance to this country and which, if properly looked after, would provide for all time sea food in much greater quantities than it is available to-day. I wonder if hon. members are aware of the fact that in the maritime provinces we have not increased our fish production since 1910; the figures for that year and for 1927 are almost the same. In 1928 there was a slight increase in the value but none in the amount of the catch, which goes to show that there must be some great inefficiency in this department. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the committee because this item has appeared in the estimates year after year. It was intended for the purpose of increasing the consumption of fish in this country, but the department has not been able to expend it until last year, and they would not have expended it last year had it not been for the royal commission, which took up a large portion of that $130,000. I think the minister should try to create a further demand for our fish as we could sell double the quantity of fish in this country if we had some assistance by way of advertising and had a good live department which would look after the industry as it should be looked after. We have been drifting along for the last twenty years and I hope the attempted

reorganization will bring about a larger demand for fish, not only in this country but in foreign countries. I do not see any reason why our trade commissioners should not look up markets for our surplus fish. One of the officials of the department was sent to Great Britain last year to look into market conditions there and he reported that there were possibilities of selling a great deal of our Canadian fish. In order to start that it would need some assistance from the department, but the department has never paid any attention to his report. The fishing industry will continue in a stagnant condition unless a little life is put into the officials of the department. Our production of fish should be worth $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 instead of $10,000,000 or $12,000,000. We have one of our greatest natural resources right at our doors in the province of Nova Scotia, and if we had a department which was capable of coping with the problem the industry would not be in the position in which it is now. I hope that the reorganization of the department will put some life into this industry.

Mr. BRADY: What quantity of haddock was caught on the Atlantic seaboard and landed at Canadian ports last year?

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): While the deputy minister is looking up that information, I would like to say a few words with regard to the fish collecting service. This has been of great benefit to the fishermen in Nova Scotia, and I desire to make the suggestion that that service might be extended to Prince Edward Island. The last speaker complained of the inefficiency of the department as far as Nova Scotia is concerned but that province has been receiving much better service than has been given to Prince Edward Island. I think the fisheries on the north coast of the island could be greatly increased. It is quite true that a private corporation has been operating this year, but if this fish collecting service has been so beneficial to the province of Nova Scotia it would be equally beneficial to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): I think the department is to be commended on inaugurating this service, but there is one feature of it which should be called to the attention of the government. As far as I can learn, the department does not exercise any supervision over the prices which the buyers pay for the fish. I am instructed that in many instances the prices offered are very low, and I know of one case where the fishermen opened their traps rather than accept the amount which was offered. A question was asked in the house in relation to this matter and the minister promised to get some information. I would suggest that the government go a step farther and introduce the same cooperative methods which prevail in the western provinces in regard to wheat. If we could get the fishermen to cooperate in that way we would be going very far towards solving many of our difficulties. I think the government will need to take the lead in this matter and possibly furnish some money for the first step.

Mr. CARDIN: I can assure my hon. friend that the department is trying to get the fishermen to cooperate in the same way as the agriculturists are doing in other sections of the country. We have tried to convince them that it would be to their advantage and we are helping them as much as we can. In regard to the prices being paid for the fish, I answered a question in that connection some time ago. It was contended that the companies were buying the fish by the count instead of by the pound, and that the prices offered were not satisfactory. We made representations to the companies that the fish should be bought by the pound instead of by the count, and also that the price offered should be reasonable. Of course we cannot compel them to pay a certain price, but we made the strongest possible recommendation.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): With what results?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that they are now paying a better price than they paid last year. To answer the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Brady) I will give him the figures which appear in the report of 1927. That is the only report which has been published; a more recent one is now in process of publication. The production of haddock by provinces is as follows:

	Cwt.
Prince Edward Island	1,188
Nova Scotia	384,297
New Brunswick	33,834
Quebec	3,500

Mr. BRADY: The reason I asked that particular question is because of the very great importance of this particular vote. It is to increase the demand for fish within as well as outside of Canada. I have a few figures that are very interesting, that are compiled from an authoritative source, the bureau of fisheries of the United States. These facts made an appeal to me for the simple reason that this is just the thing we need, namely, to develop a great demand, a home market for our fish and particularly for that

highly-prized fish, the cod family, which includes the haddock, mackerel and cod. In the decade commencing with 1911, the total catch in pounds of haddock landed at Canadian Atlantic ports, taking the average for the decade 1911 to 1922, was 55,000,000 pounds per annum while at United States ports during the same decade the catch amounted to 73,000,000 pounds. Something happened in 1922. The United States government imposed a tariff of one-half cent per pound on our haddock. The result was that from 1922 to 1927 the catch of Canadian haddock fell to 38,000,000 pounds while the United States catch increased to more than 100,000,000 pounds. In other words, as regards fishing in the very same waters, there was a decrease of 17,000,000 pounds in the Canadian catch and an increase of 27,000,000 pounds in the United States catch. The point I wish to bring out is this. These fish came from the same waters. Nevertheless we find on one side a great decrease and on the other a great increase. By what means were these fish caught? I will give the answer. It was the Canadian fishermen who were induced to cross over to the United States and get a market there. We allowed them to go; they went with their families, and they continued fishing, but they did not bring their fish into our Canadian ports. There is the greatest need to-day for the development of our own home market. The fisherman is at the thin end of the line. He is the producer; he has no control over the markets. He cannot dictate or stipulate the price for his fish and this government, realizing the importance of that food, should do everything it can to enable him to market his fish where there is a demand for it within Canada, a demand that we are not now getting.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Can the hon. member give us any information as to what price the fisherman gets per pound for his catch, say of halibut, and then compare it with the price the consumer has to pay?

Mr. BRADY: I did not go into that involved question.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It is very important.

Mr. BRADY: We will discuss it some other time when it comes up.

Mr. QUINN: This is a very important item:

To assist in the conservation and development of the deep sea fisheries and the demand for fish.

The hon. member for East Calgary has just asked the hon. member for Skeena the cause of the great spread between the price paid to the fishermen and that paid by the consumer. The price the fishermen gets is as low as half a cent a pound.

Mr. ADSHEAD: For halibut?

Mr. QUINN: For what we call the common fish, codfish and haddock, caught on the Atlantic coast. The consumer is charged anywhere from 15 cents a pound up.

Mr. ADSHEAD: To 25 cents.

Mr. QUINN: Yes, and to 30 cents. What I want to ask the minister is this: Is there not some way whereby the Department of Fisheries could fix a minimum price to the fisherman for his fish?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. QUINN: It is done in connection with other commodities, as the hon. member for Skeena has pointed out. There is a minimum price for wheat.

Mr. BROWN: Does the hon. member make the assertion that there is a minimum price for wheat?

Mr. QUINN: There has been in previous years. It was fixed by the government in previous years.

Mr. BROWN: But to the detriment of the producers.

Mr. QUINN: This is very important to the fishermen. There is a tremendous spread between the price the fisherman receives as the result of his toil and the price charged to the consumer. That is a matter which should be taken into consideration by the Department of Marine and Fisheries and thoroughly investigated, because the spread is entirely too great.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The point raised by my hon. friend is very important, not only to the fishermen but to all kinds of producers. It has been raised in the house before. We find, in connection with other primary producers, for instance those producing wheat or, as was pointed out in the house the other day, those who are producing apples, there is a tremendous spread between what the producer gets and what the consumer has to pay. I was taken to task a little for questioning the advisability of bringing in more people to produce, for instance, apples in the Okanagan valley where the producer does not realize enough to cover the cost of production,

whereas in Calgary we have to pay $2 or $3 a box for apples. When the hon. member stated that there is a minimum price set for wheat, that statement was entirely outside the mark. I know of no such thing.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The minister says that as a result of departmental activities, we have an increased price for fish in the Ingonish district. What is the price per pound for fish in the Ingonish district at the present time?

Mr. CARDIN: The price paid last year was 2 to 2½ cents, while this year it is 2¾ cents.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I have asked the minister a direct question. I do not know whether he is seeking to deceive the committee or not. We have never received 2½ cents a pound for cod or haddock caught off the shores of Nova Scotia. Some of these fish may weigh as much as from four to ten pounds, and that price is per piece, per fish. The question that was before the committee was to have the fish bought by the pound, not by the piece. I do not think the government seriously grasps the situation that faces the fishermen at the present time.

Mr. CARDIN: For fear of being accused of trying to deceive the committee I think I had better read this memorandum which has been handed me by the officers:

> The matter was immediately taken up with the general manager of Leonard Fisheries, who explains that for a great many years it has been the practice to buy trap-caught fish by the piece, instead of by the pound, and that this practice has obtained in other places as well as Ingonish. The fish are caught in the traps, sometimes in very large numbers, and only a few men are required to handle the traps, and it is difficult, and hardly possible, to move these fish quickly enough to assure their quality being maintained, and that this was the reason that the method of buying trap fish by the piece had been adopted. The price paid last year was two to two and a half cents, while this year two and three-quarter cents were offered. Apart from this, there is competition for the fish, and anyone is at liberty to go there and buy, and that keeping in view the cost of transporting these fish to the freezer at Mulgrave and their quality, the price being paid is as large as the market conditions will permit.

Mr. QUINN: That just bears out my contention that as low as half a cent a pound has been paid. The hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton mentioned that a fish weighing ten pounds would be sold for two and a half cents, which works out to less than the figure I quoted. Last fall I saw some hundreds of barrels of salted herring and salted mackerel which the fishermen in my constituency had gone out and caught and salted and barrelled, and the information that was given to me was that they could not sell this fish for what it cost to catch and barrel them. That is why I ask if it is not possible for the department to regulate the price of fish and fix a minimum price for all classes of fish.

Mr. CARDIN: It is impossible for the department to fix the price of fish. We are quite ready to help the fishermen get a better price for their fish, and every recommendation or representation of a constructive character will be welcomed by the department. If my hon. friend has any method to suggest, the department is quite ready to look into it, but I must confess that at present we know of no method of fixing the price of fish. It depends on market conditions. As the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis has pointed out, the marketing is the important problem that has to be solved, and we hope that with the new branch that we have established, the publicity that will be given will increase the demand for fish and thus enlarge the market. But I repeat, I see no method at present of fixing the price of fish.

Mr. QUINN: May I suggest to the minister that he inquire into the cause of the great spread between the price paid to the fisherman and the price paid by the consumer? I think that would be a very good matter for investigation by the new deputy minister of fisheries, and I would suggest that the minister instruct the deputy minister of fisheris to go into that question thoroughly and find out if some relief cannot be given to the fisherman.

Mr. CARDIN: I have not the least objection in the world to following that course.

Mr. SHORT: Is it the intention of the department to expend any of this $130,000 for advertising?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that the officers are preparing to do advertising out of this vote.

Mr. SHORT: A portion of this money will be used on advertising?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It is not a question of demand, because there is plenty of demand for fish. The trouble is that the people who are demanding fish have not the money to buy it at present prices. I think the minister would do a good work if he would undertake to find out what causes the great spread between the price paid to the original

producer and the price paid by the consumer. Such an inquiry might lead to very valuable results in other departments of the government.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would just like to support what the hon. member for East Calgary has said. Year after year we hear hon. gentlemen from the maritimes complaining that the price the fishermen get for their fish is not sufficient to pay for catching them, and yet when that very product gets to western Canada it is so high in price that we cannot buy it. Take such a good old fashioned article of diet as boneless codfish. Frequently I have sent down to the martimes and got a pound or two by mail. We cannot buy it in the west for any reasonable price at all. I would draw attention to the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has an item in his estimates for a cooperative marketing agency, and I think that this subject might very well come up under that vote. The question of British Columbia fruit is on a parity with this fish question. The producer in British Columbia hardly gets the cost of growing his fruit, and yet the price of that fruit when it reaches the prairies is so high that we cannot afford to buy it. This question of the spread between the price to the producer and the cost to the consumer offers a great field for investigational work. We spend hours and days and weeks arguing about the tariff, and it is an important matter for those who have to pay the extra cost that the tariff imposes, but the tariff is not nearly so important as this other factor that operates over the tariff wall and in spite of any tariff wall, and that is the cost of distribution. I hope that when the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture are up we will give these questions consideration in connection with the item for a cooperative marketing agency.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Coming back to the question I asked, I said that fish were selling at two and two and one-half cents apiece. I do not believe that in Ingonish they are selling any higher than two cents apiece; that is, to the corporations who own the traps; I am not talking of trap fishermen, net fishermen and line fishermen, and we have 43,000 of them in the maritimes. They are compelled to accept two cents apiece for every cod or haddock that they they sell to the corporations. Some of these fish weigh as high as ten and fifteen pounds, and, when retailed here in Ottawa, bring 25 and 30 cents a pound. I have bought it here in Ottawa at that price, and I did not get fresh Nova Scotia fish, but fish that had been in cold storage for a long time. I did not get the fish that I would get at home for five cents apiece, not per pound. The point I want to make is this: It is not for the corporations that we should seek to legislate, but rather for the individual fisherman. As to organization of fishermen, we had a very distinct recommendation in that respect by the royal fisheries commission which sat in Nova Scotia in 1927. It is some time since that commission made its report, and the present condition of affairs shows how this department is falling down. I may say that, irrespective of governments, the department of fisheries as formerly or as now constituted has not taken into consideration the seriousness of the question. Ten thousand fishermen have left our shores since 1912. Five hundred have left the little island of Scatarie—to go where? To engage in the American fisheries. A good many of those men will become American citizens. The American fishermen are getting a decent price for their fish. Fish landed in Boston or New York fetch 5 or 6 cents a pound. If our Nova Scotians received 3 cents a pound for their catch they would be able to live.

After going over and describing various forms of organization, the royal fisheries commission made this recommendation:

> We recommend, therefore, that the establishment of cooperative organizations of fishermen be assisted by the department as soon as possible, and that an organizer, experienced in cooperative methods, be appointed and paid by the federal government for the required period to initiate and complete this work.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the minister if this had been done. Has his department taken any steps to organize the fishermen of the maritime provinces? The fishermen to-day are seeking to organize themselves by private contributions and by assistance from the provincial government. But has this one important recommendation of the royal fisheries commission been carried out by the Dominion government? No, the minister's department did not organize the fishermen of the maritime provinces. Instead, what did they do? They went to work and supplied a collection system. For whom? For the benefit of the corporations—not for the benefit of the cooperative societies, but for the advantage of the financial corporations. The fish have been carried at government expense practically free of cost to the corporation, but the producer—the fisherman—is not receiving one copper more for his fish than he did in 1927. I notice the Deputy Minister of Fisheries does not agree with me. Well, I wish he were in the minister's place. I think he has had control of the situation for the last fifteen or

sixteen years, and it is through him, through our director of fisheries in the maritimes, that we have fallen down.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the situation. The fish are collected by a government fish-collection service and brought to the private corporations. These corporations pay whatever price they see fit. Is not that the fact? The fishermen of the maritimes to-day are not receiving a cent more. The corporations are not paying the cost that they formerly paid to have the fish collected; the government is collecting the fish for them and helping them out to that extent. This is the new "system" that is assisting our fishermen in the maritimes. The result is that to-day we are receiving two cents apiece for cod and for haddock caught on some of our best fishing grounds—Ingonish, for instance. I submit that it is up to the minister and his department to follow a different system and to implement the finding of the commission that sat in Nova Scotia and cost this country $100,000; I say it is up to the government to do so without further delay.

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend, Mr. Chairman, is hardly fair to the Deputy Minister of Fisheries. He may be subject to certain criticism, but no man in the world can escape criticism in the fulfilment of his duties. The present Deputy Minister of Fisheries during the time he was director of fisheries and since has devoted himself to developing the fishing industry of the maritime provinces. If anybody should be interested in that work it should be the present deputy minister, because he comes from the maritimes, and nobody can accuse him of neglecting his duty towards the fishermen of those provinces. He is not perfect, nobody in this country is perfect, and if my hon. friend were occupying the position of deputy minister of fisheries he would be subject to criticism as severe as that which he is now directing against the deputy.

It is true that the fishermen of the maritime provinces have been experiencing difficulties, but the fishing industry is not the only industry in this unhappy condition. The farming industry has been passing through very difficult days; our labouring men have been experiencing great difficulties; our traders and merchants generally speaking are experiencing great difficulties. But so far as the good will of the fisheries department towards the fishing industry of the maritimes is concerned, I may say that our officials are putting their heart and soul into their attempt to solve the problem. It is not an easy problem. It cannot be solved by a few accusations, it cannot be solved by writing a few letters. It is a problem that will require the best minds of this country for its satisfactory solution. We are experiencing difficulties because we are next to a country which has closed its market, a very profitable market, to us.

Mr. BENNETT: Hush, hush!

Mr. CARDIN: The United States market in the past was very profitable for our fishermen, and when congress increased the duty on our fish it placed our fishermen in a very difficult situation. We are trying to cope with the situation, we are trying to carry out the recommendations made by the fisheries commission. The very thing that my hon. friend is speaking about is already being undertaken. Our officers are being trained with a view to organizing the fishermen and assisting them. We propose to help them as much as we possibly can.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The hon. minister states that my criticism of the deputy minister is hardly fair. Now, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries formerly occupied the position of director of fisheries, and since then he has been promoted. Well, after receiving the report of the royal commission which investigated our fisheries, I cannot see why the government took such a stand. The commission recognized that the Department of Marine and Fisheries had fallen down in the maritime provinces—they must have recognized it. If the deputy minister had paid as much attention to the results which would accrue to the fishermen as to the corporations, he would have taken a different stand in the last fifteen years as regards the problem of the maritime fisheries.

Mr. CARDIN: This is unfair.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I do not blame the present government only. I blame every government that has directed the affairs of this country during the last fifteen years. I blame both parties. Both parties are guilty.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): When the committee rose I was dealing with a few statements made by the minister, who characterized my criticism of the deputy minister as hardly fair. I covered a little of the

ground, pointing out that during the last fifteen or twenty years the department, so far as the maritime provinces were concerned, had been administered by a director of fisheries. Now I want to impress upon the minister the failure of the government to carry out the recommendations contained not only in the report of the Duncan commission but, as well, in the report submitted by the royal commission which was appointed to investigate the fisheries. I contend that this government was distinctly at fault in appointing the director, to whom must be directly attributable the condition which has existed in our fisheries in the maritime provinces during the years I have mentioned. And for this the government should be severely censured. The minister stated that conditions were bad not only with the fishermen but with the farmers and others as well. In reply to that statement I have this to say: Had conditions been looked into as thoroughly, and an effort put forward as vigorously, to bring about an improvement in the fisheries of the maritime provinces under this department as has been the case in connection with the agricultural industry in Canada, the fishing industry in the maritimes would not be in the state in which it is to-day. The minister further stated that so far as his department was concerned, good will had been shown towards the people of the maritimes. Let me assure him that the fishermen and the people generally of the maritime provinces welcome his good will. But we want a little more than good will; we want an organized department of fisheries for the maritime provinces. We want the maritime fishermen to be properly organized; we want them to be given something more than good will; we want conditions so improved that they may obtain the things that are necessary to life, in order that they may secure a living wage, in order that they may be as well paid as their brothers who are engaged in various other industries in the country. That is what we demand. We accept the minister's good will, but we want the fishermen in the maritime provinces to be given the consideration which has been shown the western farmers in regard to rural credits and other benefits. We want organization similar to that which now exists in the west. In short, we want to have the recommendations of the fisheries commission carried out. The minister suggested that we were organizing—through what means? Through the fisheries inspectors in the maritime provinces. We have had these inspectors for a number of years, and what have they accomplished? To-day they are being taken before a biological board in Nova Scotia—to study organization? Is that the way in which the fisheries commission's recommendations are being carried out?

I am going to read a few statements from the report of the fisheries commission in case the government have not read them. The commissioners state that they do not propose to discuss in detail methods of organization; that must be left to responsible authorities —not, as the minister suggests through his deputy, to a group of fishery inspectors who are sent every few weeks to Halifax to a biological board to study the organization of fishermen. The report proceeds:

> But we suggest that after careful study the maritime provinces be divided into zones or districts, the limits of which shall be determined by the number of fishermen and the quantity of production; that each of these zones be organized into a fishermen's cooperative association; and that the zones so organized be again included in a provincial body, and perhaps into one association of the entire maritime provinces. In certain places in each of the zones or districts so formed, small brine-freezing or rapid freezing plants, with a small auxiliary cold storage building, with salt and ice equipment, should be established; and at a central point, within a day's transit of these small local plants, a large cold storage building and possibly a fish-waste plant where warranted by quantity of waste, should be provided, all with initial subsidy assistance from the federal government. The large, central cold-storage building would take care of surplus frozen fish direct from the freezers, or would take the surplus product from the smaller local storage buildings. More extended reference to brine freezing has been made in another paragraph. From such an organization a marketing sales board to control the output of the product. . . . and selling agents to control the distribution in the larger places of demand, would dominate the market, keep it on a stable basis, and, with the organized power of bargaining, could dictate reasonable prices alike for producer and consumer, and gain a reasonable profit. Such a plan would ensure a more direct contact between producer and consumer, and would eliminate some of the costs for services which now intervene.

Then he goes on to say that by such methods, properly established, the consumer would receive a better product and the fishermen would receive more adequate recompense for their labour.

The reason I spoke as I did this afternoon is because I live in a fishing community; my livelihood depends upon the ability of the fishermen in my community to earn a living. If I am to prosper every fisherman in that locality must prosper, and how can they prosper when they sell their cod and haddock for two cents each? That is not two cents per pound; fish weighing eight and nine pounds are sold for two cents each. What is the reason for this condition? The minister said it was due to the large amount of fish taken in traps,

but he neglected to refer to the fact that the large amount of fish taken by our beam trawlers is equally responsible for this condition

We do not want to play politics in connection with this question, but there is a matter to which I must refer. Last summer the deputy minister made a trip to Nova Scotia and arrived right in the midst of our local campaign. I believe he landed somewhere near Canso, and took with him on his trip the manager of our large beam trawler concern, Mr. Robinson. They toured through the fishing sections of Cape Breton in order that they might appease the fishermen in those sections. I do not know what private conferences took place or what happened during those conferences, but I do know that the fishermen of the province of Nova Scotia were led to expect much more than was contained in Bill No. 26 which was brought down in this house some time ago. I can tell the minister and the deputy minister that the fishermen of Nova Scotia resent having their industry used as a football at election time; that is one of the reasons why I spoke as I did this afternoon. This question does not concern the minister so much, but it does concern us in the maritime provinces, and I want to tell the deputy minister that if he comes to our province again during an election he will not be so well received as has been the case in the past.

Mr. CARDIN: I think my hon. friend is not fair when he makes the insinuation that the Deputy Minister of Fisheries went to Nova Scotia during election time in order to influence the electors of that province. That is not correct; he was there on business for the department.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Then I would ask the minister why his deputy took with him the head of the largest beam trawling concern when he visited the various fishermen during his trip to Nova Scotia?

Mr. CARDIN: I understand the reason was that this concern was the only one which was willing to buy the fish which would be brought in as a result of the fish collection service; they were the only people ready to cooperate under the new system.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What price did the fishermen receive?

Mr. CARDIN: That is not the question.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was this visit made just before the election?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that the election was decided upon after the deputy minister had left Ottawa.

[Mr. Macdonald (Richmond).]

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): That was the second trip, when he went to see if Mr. Paisley was a proper man to place at the head of the fisheries intelligence bureau.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that that is not so, and surely my hon. friend will not complain if the deputy minister visits Nova Scotia several times in order to get better acquainted with the situation there.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): To play politics with the fishing industry.

Mr. CARDIN: He has not been playing politics at all; the deputy minister is out of politics and is fulfilling his duties without interfering in politics.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): If he was not playing politics certainly he was not looking after the interest of the fishermen when he took with him the head of the beam trawler group, the man who to-day is responsible for the election of the Liberal member for the constituency of Antigonish-Guysborough. He came to the Liberal headquarters in my constituency and had a conference with my opponent; he also went to see Hon. Mr. Mombourquette, who looks after the interests of the Liberal party in the outlying districts. He did not go to see anyone else; he left the gospel with those gentlemen.

Mr. QUINN: He did not go to you?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): He certainly did not come to me.

Mr. CARDIN: With regard to that section of Nova Scotia I might quote a few words from a letter signed by the president and vice-president of the fishermen's federation of Louisburg. Surely these gentlemen know something about this question. The letter is as follows:

> This year the experiment of having a boat collect the fish and take them to the firm's market, was started too late in the season to prove the full worth of the experiment. But I think you will agree that even though the best fishing season had gone before the experiment was put into effect, yet the outcome fully warranted the cost of the service. It simply turned what had every appearance of a failure in the fisheries to a successful year for our fishermen. It has given the fishermen new hope, and with the promise of a continuance of thus marketing our fish, our fishermen will procure better facilities and go into the fisheries on a larger scale.
>
> Next year, which will be a full year, will prove to you and the fishermen as well, that there is a living in the fisheries, when the fish can be properly marketed.

I am surprised to hear my hon. friend complain about the establishment of this collecting service; I think he is the only man from Nova Scotia opposing or critizing the establishment of that service.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What is the date of that letter?

Mr. CARDIN: It is dated last fall and is signed by the president and vice-president of the fishermen's federation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What time last fall?

Mr. CARDIN: After the season had been closed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The fishermen had great hopes that the establishment of this service would be a panacea for their ills. These collecting services have been in operation all along the line but the fishermen are not receiving a better price than they did before. They used to receive $9 for a little over a hundred pounds of dried fish, but during last season they hardly received two cents apiece. Moreover, they were making $1 per hundred pounds more by selling their fish salted instead of selling them under the method my hon. friend advocates.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is this collecting done free of charge?

Mr. JACOBS: They are fish pools, perhaps.

Mr. CARDIN: This service is provided for the collecting of fish from certain points where there are no transportation facilities. A charge of 10 cents per hundred pounds is made against the shipper.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The service is supplied to places where there is no rail communication?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And a charge of 10 cents per hundred pounds is made for that service?

Mr. BENNETT: They take them to the cold storage depot first.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I suppose the service would be limited to the outside places. To that extent it is good, but it would have no effect on the general level of prices and is not a step in the direction of organization. I think that in time the fishermen down there will be handling that service for themselves, but there is no harm in this government service.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): For the benefit of my hon. friend I would say that in practically every one of these communities the various corporations which have been buying fish in the past have maintained such a service. Now the government has instituted a service but the fishermen are not receiving one cent over and above the old prices. If the company has enough fish it will offer the fishermen half a cent or a quarter of a cent per pound, or 2 cents apiece. The fish have been selling in Ingonish and northern Cape Breton for 2 cents apiece, and until we have the proper method of organization and until the recommendations of the commission have been carried out by this government and proper cooperatives and associations formed, that fish collection service will be of no value to the fishermen in the various communities.

Mr. RALSTON: I should like to read a petition from the constituency of my hon. friend. I think that the fishermen, perhaps, understand the conditions a good deal better than I do, and I am beginning to think they understand them better than my hon. friend does. This petition is as follows:

At a large representative meeting of the fishermen's—

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I would like to tell the hon. member—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The hon. member has made a statement, and I should have the opportunity—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. RALSTON: I will not yield the floor.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I rise to point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member desires to speak to a point of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The hon. Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) has stated that probably there were people who understood the fishing conditions better than I do. I just want to make the statement that if I did not understand them, and if the fishermen did not feel that I understood them—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): — they would not have sent me here.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has stated his point of order.

Mr. RALSTON: I was about to say that I do not claim to have a knowledge of the real benefits of this collection service such as the fishermen have, but I am beginning to think that my hon. friend has not that knowledge either. This petition was addressed to myself and to the hon. Minister of Fisheries, and I should like to know from my hon. friend whether or not it correctly represents the views of the fishermen. I have been under the impression that this collection service is of substantial benefit and I must confess that I have done all in my power to support it and assist in having it started, believing that it would be in the interests of the fishermen. The following petition was passed unanimously by the fishermen's union:

> At a large and representative meeting of the fishermen's union of L'Ardoise district the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:
>
> Whereas the fishermen of the L'Ardoise district have heretofore been greatly handicapped on account of lack of adequate transportation facilities;
>
> And whereas the federal government has subsidized collection boats to collect fish from the various sections along the southern and eastern shores of Nova Scotia;
>
> And whereas a collection boat can be successfully operated from the port of L'Ardoise at least during the spring and summer months, and thus enable the fishermen of that port to dispose of their catch on equal terms with those of other districts already served by collection boats;
>
> And whereas L'Ardoise is one of the largest and most important fishing centres in the province of Nova Scotia;
>
> It is therefore resolved that the Department of Fisheries be respectfully requested to make provision for a fish collection boat to serve the district of L'Ardoise during the coming season.

It was resolved that a copy of the resolution be forwarded to the Hon. Mr. Cardin, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and to myself. The petition was signed by the president, Mr. Wilfred Mombourquette, and by the secretary, Mr. A. P. Sampson, of the fishermen's union, and I took the petition at its face value. I believe that the gentlemen who signed it and the gentlemen whom they represented knew what they were talking about, and until my hon. friend spoke this afternoon I had thought that the collection service was considered to be in the best interests of the fishermen.

The only objections I have received to this service have been from representatives of the companies. One company did not give any particular reason, but stated that they did not favour the proposition. Another company wrote to me:

> We suppose that such a move is intended to raise the prices to the fishermen, but we, as curers cannot stand any increase.

[The Chairman.]

Even though these objections were received the collection service was put into effect. My hon. friend says that he has no desire to play politics in this matter; if that is so, I think he should give credit where the credit is due, and I was surprised to hear him criticize this service this afternoon and again this evening. I should like to know whether he is for or against this collection service. The service was inaugurated in my own constituency and as a result the fishermen were enabled to fish as late as the middle of January whereas previously they had been forced to stop fishing about the end of October. It was regarded as a substantial benefit. In that connection I should like to read an extract from a letter which I received, as follows:

> The boat is a great help to all concerned and everyone is anxious to make a success of it so that the service could be continued another year. It surely makes a great difference to all concerned in the fishing industry in this locality.

That letter was written early this year. The petition which I have read was signed in February 1929. I think we should deal with this matter fairly. These measures were thought to be of great assistance to the fishing industry, particularly in the outlying places and the fishermen are approving them and asking for more. If my hon. friend is against the service I should like him to say so.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): If the minister has been in the house for the last twenty minutes, he knows exactly where I stand in the matter. I do not have to make myself any clearer. I say that without cooperation to handle that fish production, the fish collection service is of no benefit to the fishermen whom it is supposed to serve. As it exists to-day, it is of benefit to the corporations and the department is paying for what the corporations should be paying for to-day.

Mr. RALSTON: That is what neither the fishermen nor the companies say.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): When the fishermen sent the letter and the petition to my hon. friend, they were not in a position to know. They were reading what was in the departmental literature on the subject as to the benefits that would accrue. If the fishermen along the shore where this fish collection is in vogue were to salt that fish instead of selling it fresh, they would last year have been a dollar per 100 pounds better off.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Evidently there is a good deal of dissatisfaction, at least among certain classes of the fishermen in Nova Scotia. Under date of November 15, 1928, I received a letter enclosing certain resolutions from the Fishermen's Federation of Nova Scotia in which, it is stated, there is an actual membership of more than one thousand. There were enclosed with the letter copies of resolutions adopted at the district convention of the Fishermen's Federation of Nova Scotia held at St. Peter's, Nova Scotia, on July 19, 1928. Among other statements made are these:

The fishermen consider the erection of the public fish cold storage in Halifax very unpropitious, unless further steps are taken to enable shore-fishermen to profit by it. If it is only going to help a few investors in the trade and, alas! perhaps serve only as a storage room for steam-trawler fish, then we claim that a huge sum of public money is being spent to hasten the already appalling exodus of our fishermen, and, indeed, a good many small dealers will be put out of business.

Again:

While the government is showing itself so generous towards doubtful projects of this nature, large sections of the coast are unable to sell their fish fresh through lack of small storage plants and, further, are unable to secure public funds to erect wharves, and other harbour facilities sorely needed. We are told that without trawlers, we could not supply the market. The fact is we could flood the market if we could sell fresh, profitably, instead of salting.

The recommendation of the royal commission that a chain of small cold storages should be erected along the coast, with a large plant near shipping facilities, to gather in the product of the smaller plants, is the real solution of the fishermen's troubles. If that were done, we would not have to worry about trawlers, or supply of the market, or exodus of our brave fishermen. But, to concentrate public favours upon a few spots and a few people, and leave the coast and its inhabitants as they are now, is to leave the fishery question unsolved, and, really, to make it worse than it ever was.

In one of their resolutions the fishermen's federation goes on to urge that the government should appoint some officials to help them to organize. Personally I am not at all sure that government officials will do very much to help in the organization of these fishermen, but there is not the slightest doubt that some organization and possibly further facilities than the fishermen now have, are needed. When I was in the east a few months ago, I was told that very frequently the fishermen had to go to cold storage plants operated by the big corporations even to procure their bait, and that they were absolutely in the hands of the big corporations. Bearing out what was said about the low price of fish only a few weeks ago, namely on April 18, I received a letter from a correspondent in Nova Scotia in the Canso district who made this statement:

Brittain from Montreal recently announced fish prices as follows for 1929: market cod, $1.25 per hundred pounds; steak cod, $1.50 per hundred; fish under 23 inches, 75 cents a hundredweight.

It seems to some of us who are outside that area that surely there is something wrong when, with such large supplies of good fish on the Atlantic coast, we have to pay in the inland parts such high prices for fish. Some urge that we ought to increase the market. We have a great market in central eastern Canada and all through the west. Many of us would like to use fish to a much greater extent, but we cannot pay the high, fancy prices which we are charged under present conditions. In other words, we have the fishermen themselves being exploited at one end through lack of organization and facilities, and the consumers throughout the inland areas being exploited because of the lack of proper facilities for bringing the producer and the consumer together. The minister should to-night make it much clearer than he has yet done why a more definite attempt has not been made to carry out the recommendations made by the commission.

Mr. SHORT: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has just read an article from what he calls the Fishermen's Federation of Nova Scotia. That is the fishermen of eastern Nova Scotia. There is no such thing as a general federation of fishermen in the province of Nova Scotia. I know something about the fishermen of that province, representing one of the largest fishing sections there. There is no such federation in the western section of Nova Scotia. The hon. member also read a statement that Britten—I presume that applies to Mr. A. H. Brittain of the Maritime Fish Corporation of Montreal—had set the price for the season. There is not a word of truth in that statement. I am in a position to know.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I said that a Canso correspondent had given me that.

Mr. SHORT: And I say there is not a word of truth in the statement he gave the hon. member. Mr. Brittain never set any price for the season at all. That is a most ridiculous thing for the hon. member's correspondent to state, because there is no such thing as a set price for the season for fish in the province of Nova Scotia. That was the opening price for the spring, and it is a good fair price. The price of 1¼ or 1½ cents

a pound is for round fish. That is the opening price in the season when the fish are in their poorest state. They are very thin in the spring, and consequently are not worth the same price that they are later on. As the season advances and the fish get better, the price advances. Last fall the prices rose to 2½ and we paid as high as 3 cents a pound. I am fully in accord with these fish collecting boats that the government have put on and I believe they have done a great deal for the fishermen of Nova Scotia.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The hon. member says "we paid." Whom does he mean by "'we"?

Mr. SHORT: I am in the fish business myself, if the hon. member wants to know. I have been in that business for more than thirty years, and I claim to know something about it. I have every sympathy for the fishermen of Nova Scotia, and I am doing and have done everything I possibly can for them. As I said this afternoon, I commend the government for putting on these collecting boats. I think they have done a great deal for the outlying stations. There are sections of Nova Scotia which cannot reach the markets without a service such as this, and there are other sections that do not require it, but in the outlying districts undoubtedly it has done a great deal of good, and I want to commend the government accordingly.

There are many other things which the government could do to help; I outlined some of them this afternoon. There is no question that the shore fisheries have been greatly neglected, but the government has now made one more in the right direction and I hope it will proceed further. There has been a great deal of talk about cooperation among the fishermen. I think that would be a move in the right direction. If you can get the fishermen into cooperative societies they will be able to buy their materials cheaper and make better arrangements for disposing of their fish. At the present time, were it not for the firms to which some people object, I do not see how the fishermen could sell their products. It might be of benefit to them to go in for cooperation as has been done in the west in connection with the wheat pool, but it is questionable whether it would or not, because fish and wheat are two different commodities. Wheat you can hold until the market can take care of it, but fresh fish has to be marketed every day, and marketed promptly.

I had not intended to speak to-night until the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre quoted a communication that was supposed to have come from a concern in which I am interested, and I felt I must take exception to it. I know that he did not intend to mislead the house, but evidently the parties who sent the communication to him intended to convey the impression that those spring prices were all the year round prices, and that is absolutely not correct.

Mr. BRADY: It is quite evident that there must have been a reason for the establishment of this fish collecting service. The fishermen must have been under some disabilities or it would never have been brought into being. It was established for the benefit of those fishermen out on the banks who were not able by their own enterprise to get their fish promptly to the nearest market. The minister knows thoroughly the conditions that prevailed prior to the inauguration of that service, and it would be a great help if he would tell the committee just what they were. I should also like to ask if this service is confined to the Atlantic seaboard, or is it extended to the British Columbia coast? I have been away out on the banks with the trawlers and I find that private enterprise enables the British Columbia fishermen who catch their fish far remote from the markets to market their catch. People go out to the fishermen and for a nominal sum they buy the fish from the fishermen and transport it to the market. If this fish collecting service on the Atlantic seaboard is operating so successfully, I should like to know if it is to be extended to the Pacific seaboard.

Mr. CARDIN: This system is not extended to the British Columbia coast. It is contended in the department that conditions in British Columbia are very different because there the fish buyers go out and buy the fish on the fishing grounds. On the Atlantic coast the buyers do not do that, and the fishermen are not in a position to bring their fish in fresh to the market and dispose of it for cash as advantageously as they can with this service. As to the conditions prevailing prior to the establishment of this service, I can only refer my hon. friend (Mr. Brady) to the expressions of opinion that we have received from all parties concerned to the effect that they are satisfied with this service and that it is a benefit to them. We are receiving requests to extend the service to many other communities.

Mr. BRADY: It means that the fishermen are not compelled to leave the locality where they are fishing, but can continue their operations and at the same time have their catch marketed and disposed of?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: I have listened to the observations of the Minister of National Defence as well as those of the minister in charge. As I understood the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton, he was not objecting so much to the collection of fish as to the failure to carry into effect the recommendations of the royal commission on fisheries, one of those recommendations being the establishment of cooperative zones for dealing with the distribution and sale of the product. If the minister has read the farm relief bill in the United States he will observe that it proceeds exactly along the lines of the recommendations of the fisheries commission, and that a $500,000,000 revolving credit is to be established, to be operated not by the nation itself, but through cooperative societies acting through clearing houses. The recommendation of the royal commission as to cooperative effort in marketing fish is finding concrete expression in that bill. As I understood the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton, his complaint was that the government had substituted for the recommendations of the royal commission this service of gathering fish in the manner in which he indicated, and that it has not brought about an increase in the price, which was the object aimed at; for the price, he pointed out, was not adequate having regard to the risk involved and the character of the food secured. It is contended that the spread between the initial price to the producer and the ultimate price to the consumer is too great. Can the minister say why these recommendations have not been carried into effect, and whether it is the intention of the government to endeavour so to do?

Mr. CARDIN: Certainly it is the intention of the department to carry out the recommendations of the royal commission appointed to look into the fisheries. We have already established the fish collection service, and we propose to follow the other recommendations of the commission.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend the leader of the opposition probably has not read the whole report lately. But one of the recommendations of that report was for improved transportation facilities, and it dealt with one of the sections that were under discussion tonight. The petititon I read on the matter of cooperative effort was from a fishermen's union.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no misunderstanding as to that; but as I listened I gathered that the criticism was that we had transportation without linking up the transportation with cooperative sale and distribution.

Mr. RALSTON: They are two different things.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course, but if you are going to gather fish they must be sold, and the question of how they are to be sold is an important matter that arises out of the gathering. One method is through cooperative organizations; the other is by the old method.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A few days ago we received notice that some new process had been evolved in regard to the chilling of fish for transportation to remote markets and we had in the restaurant a very fine sample of haddock. Is that system now in general use, and can fish which has been so chilled be shipped into western Ontario, for instance?

Mr. CARDIN: Three companies have already started operations along that line, and there is a possibility that other companies will go into the business.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can only say that the fish that came last week was a very prime sample; but if the minister had tasted the cod that was served in the restaurant yesterday he would have found he had got the other end of the line.

Mr. JACOBS: Will consumers be able to purchase the fish at 1½ cents a pound?

Mr. CARDIN: I am afraid not.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Has any arrangement been made with the International Fresh Fish Corporation with regard to carrying fish along the shores of Prince Edward Island? If so, what will be the cost to the department?

Mr. CARDIN: We have arranged for a subsidy to that company, and it is preparing to carry on.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): On what basis is the subsidy to be paid? And what will it amount to?

Mr. CARDIN: We are paying $1,800 a month to the company for the operation of the boat.

Mr. McRAE: This new freezing process has been under observation for some time on the Pacific coast, but it has not made a great deal of progress. Will similar treatment be given to any cold storage men who want to adopt the system on the Pacific coast?

Mr. CARDIN: It is wide open to the people on the Pacific coast.

Mr. McRAE: On what basis is the subsidy granted?

Mr. CARDIN: There is no subsidy in connection with that freezing process.

Mr. HEAPS: The statements made this evening by two hon. members from the fishing district of Nova Scotia struck me forcibly. It was news to me to hear that the fishermen who risk their lives on the fishing grounds receive only two or three cents for the fish they bring in. The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) stated the fishermen in his district were paid only 1½ to 2 cents a pound for their catch. We, the consumers, have to pay some 25 to 30 cents a pound for our fish. I have never yet been able to find out how the spread is made up. There is no use talking about improved systems of freezing fish and catching more fish unless at the same time some means is devised of laying down the product to the consumer at a reasonable rate. No matter what the fishermen may do to improve their position, their efforts will be unavailing unless the fish can be sold to the consumer at a reasonably low price. I do not see why fish cannot be sold at half the present price and the various interests concerned in the industry still be allowed a reasonable profit. When the farmers of western Canada were faced with a situation somewhat similar to that which now confronts the fishing industry they organized a wheat pool. It seems to me that if our fishermen would copy some of the methods of our western farmers, for instance, organize themselves into a cooperative marketing pool, they might be a good deal better off.

I observe that the total vote for the fisheries department is $2,403,000. That seems to me to be a rather large sum. I do not know whether the fishing industry is getting full value for this expenditure. I believe we are spending more money in the interests of this industry than in looking after the farming community, and yet the total value of the catch of fish is small compared with the value of our farm products. Will the minister kindly tell me the total value of the catch for the last fiscal year?

Mr. CARDIN: The total value for 1928 was $54,000,000.

Mr. HEAPS: And we spent $2,400,000 to look after that catch, or about 4 per cent of the total.

Mr. QUINN: This discussion, Mr. Chairman, would have been unnecessary had the recommendations of the Duncan commission been implemented by this government. Dealing with fisheries organization, the Duncan commission made this recommendation:

> There should be a separate branch in the joint department with a deputy minister of fisheries at its head. In view of the importance of the industry and the distance at which the department has to function from the principal fishery areas, we feel it would be advisable to have a deputy minister whose duties would be confined to that section of the department and who would therefore be freer to keep in close personal touch with its problems by periodical visits to the fishery areas, and we recommend accordingly. It was urged that the deputy minister should in such an event be a person having practical qualifications.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against the present incumbent of the office of Deputy Minister of Fisheries. I believe he is a gentleman of the highest integrity and is so regarded by all members of this house. But I have no reason to believe that he has any practical qualifications for the position which he holds, and in my opinion if the recommendations of the Duncan commission had been carried out in that respect we would have had a man with practical qualifications at the head of the department. Acting on the recommendation that I have quoted, he would have paid periodical visits to the fishermen of the maritime provinces to study at first hand their difficulties, consequently we would not have the conditions which exist in that industry to-day and of which hon. members are now complaining. During the last few hours we have listened to a recital of the deplorable conditions of the fishing industry of the maritime provinces. We have heard hon. members conversant with those conditions describe how the fishermen are living, and the poor prices which they are being paid for the products of their toil. I ask the government to take into consideration this question with regard to the appointment of a Deputy Minister of Fisheries. We have been told time and again that the Duncan report has been implemented except for one or two items. But here is one recommendation in that report which the government has not carried out. The government has not implemented the recommendation of Sir Andrew Rae Duncan and his colleagues with recpect to the appointment of a practical man to the office of Deputy Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. SHORT: The hon. member for North Winnipeg speaking a few minutes ago, referred to the spread in prices as between the east and the west; he suggested that with a price of a cent and a half a pound down at the coast there should not be such a spread in the west. I agree with him in some respects as to there being a great spread in the price, but he does not make allowance for the fact that the cent and a half per pound is for the round fish. These fish all have to be processed, and in many cases the

loss is from 55 to 67 per cent. In this connection I would refer the hon. member to page 34 of the report of the fisheries commission in which this matter is discussed. The commissioners state:

There is much discussion of the price spread between the fishermen and the consumer in Quebec and Ontario. A fact too frequently lost sight of, when comparing retail prices in these markets with the prices paid to the fisherman, is that there is a loss in weight when the heads are removed, or when the fish is filleted. As already pointed out, when the head of a cod is removed 27 per cent of the weight of the fish in the round is lost; and in haddock the loss is 25 per cent. When a fish is filleted, from 55 to 67 per cent in weight is lost, depending on how closely it is cut, and when fillets are smoked 3 to 5 per cent additional weight is lost. It is evident therefore that the prices of headless or filleted fish must reflect these losses. For example, a shipper who purchases 100 pounds of haddock in the round, at say 2½ cents per pound, pays $2.50. We will assume that the customer requires headless haddock, and thus a loss of 25 pounds in weight is at once incurred. The shipper therefore must receive $2.50 for the remaining 75 pounds, or three and one-third cents per pound. It is estimated that when fish is filleted, three pounds of round fish are required to make one pound of fillets. Therefore when a shipper buys one hundred pounds of fish for filleting, he must receive $2.50 for the resultant 33⅓ pounds of fillets or 17½ cents per pound to realize what he paid for the fish without any allowance for the labour of filleting or handling the fish.

There is therefore a considerable loss in the processing of fish; and when you add to this the express charges from the seacoast in the maritimes to the middle west, another four or five cents per pound, and on top of that two or three profits to wholesaler, middleman and retailer, you will readily appreciate why high prices are paid for fish in the middle west.

Mr. MacLAREN: In reference to the new rapid process of freezing fish for purposes of transportation, will the minister inform us what kinds of fish are so treated?

Mr. CARDIN: Any kind of fish may be treated in that way, but at present cod and haddock are so processed.

Mr. MacLAREN: I can quite understand that any kind could be treated that way, but the question I asked was, what kinds of fish, as a matter of fact, are being so treated.

Mr. CARDIN: Cod and haddock.

Mr. MacLAREN: The haddock we have had an opportunity of testing has been very satisfactory, but I have just heard a reference to salmon being so treated. Is it a fact that salmon are so treated at the present time?

Mr. CARDIN: Not now.

Mr. BRADY: The hon. member for North Winnipeg wondered how it was that there was such a marked difference in price between the fish as caught on the banks and when it reaches the consumer. I have been looking up some data lately and I find the very interesting fact that it takes two and a half pounds of round fish, or ex-vessel as they call it, to make one pound of filleted haddock, that is, a manufactured or processed fish. Consequently there must be one and a half pounds waste in order to produce the finished product. On this point I may say that I have information which leads me to believe that the United States, realizing the importance of processing fish, and appreciating the value of having the fish processed in that country, are very anxious that the Canadian fisherman should be content to sell his round or ex-vessel fish at a low price while they process them, getting the higher values. I think it is a suggestion which the government should seriously consider, to try to develop the processing of our own fish in Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Is there some arrangement in connection with the International Fresh Fish Corporation as to what they should charge the department for transporting fish by the boat which it is proposed to have call at Prince Edward Island? In view of the subsidy, which appears to be a liberal one, of $1,800 a month or $60 a day, I think there should be an arrangement with regard to the charge for transportation.

Mr. CARDIN: It will not be more than 10 cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): If they are allowed to charge that on a product for which a minimum price of one cent per pound is supposed to be paid, the rate would appear to be very high. From my knowledge of what freight rates are and ought to be, taking the short haul in Prince Edward Island from the north side of the island to Georgetown, I think there should be a much lower minimum than 10 cents.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I noticed in one of the maritime papers a few days ago a despatch from Ottawa stating that the boat has been subsidized to carry other things besides fish. Is that so?

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend's information is correct; the boat may carry other things.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What other produce is it supposed to carry? In a newspaper article appearing in the Halifax

Herald a few days ago, and emanating from Ottawa, the statement was made that the boat would carry potatoes during the fall months.

Mr. CARDIN: Any kind of produce; if the producer wants to ship it he will have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Then I understand that this is to be a produce carrier from September on. Is that the understanding?

Mr. CARDIN: It is available if they wish to take advantage of it, but it is a cold storage vessel.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): And it is to be used for carrying produce during September, October, November and December; is that the case?

Mr. CARDIN: It is to be used for carrying fish particularly.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): According to the Halifax report this ship is for the benefit of the agriculturists in the fall, as soon as their crops are ready to be marketed.

Mr. CARDIN: It is mainly for carrying fish.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Did I understand the minister to say that the rate would be ten cents per hundred pounds?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, that would be the maximum.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): If this boat is to be used for the carrying of produce from September to December, why should this subsidy be paid out of the fisheries appropriation? That should come under the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. CARDIN: The vessel can carry other things than fish; our subsidy is for the purpose of having this vessel carry fish but that does not mean that it may not carry other produce so long as that other produce does not take the place of fish.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): When that boat is not carrying fish is this subsidy to be paid by the fisheries department?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Or by the Department of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. CARDIN: The subsidy will not be paid.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The subsidy is not paid when fish are not carried?

[Mr. Macdonald (Richmond).]

Mr. CARDIN: If they do not carry fish they do not get the subsidy.

Mr. KELLNER: In view of the statements which have been made about cooperative marketing I want to ask the minister if there is not at present a cooperative organization for the sale of fish in northern Alberta?

Mr. CARDIN: There is nothing under the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. KELLNER: I know it is not under the Department of Fisheries; the wheat pool is not under any department either, nevertheless there is an organization out there which cooperatively markets fish at present. Their headquarters are at Lac La Biche, and I remember when I was there a couple of years ago they told me they were getting almost twice as much for their fish through that organization as they had received formerly. According to reports which I had something over a year ago the organization was operating with considerable success, and I think if the minister would get in touch with his overseers in that district they would instruct him that the organization is still successful.

Mr. CARDIN: There is no doubt that such an organization is profitable; we know of the existence of the association mentioned by my hon. friend and we are prepared to try to induce the fishermen in the maritime provinces to follow that example.

Mr. KELLNER: The department did not render any assistance in the formation of this association; the fishermen did it themselves.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How many fish collecting services have been established in the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. CARDIN: We have two at present but we expect to have three or four a little later on.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Would the minister give us the location of these services?

Mr. CARDIN: There is one on the southeast coast of Cape Breton island.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What section does this service cover?

Mr. CARDIN: From Port Morien to Fourchu.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Where are the headquarters?

Mr. CARDIN: In Canso.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Then one service is from Port Morien to Canso; where is the other?

Mr. CARDIN: From Westport in Pictou county to Digby.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Where will the others be?

Mr. CARDIN: One is to be established from Port Bickerton to Canso and the other from Cape Negro to Lockeport, and there may be others also.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What is the amount of the subsidy in each case?

Mr. CARDIN: For the Pictou service we are paying $800 a month for one boat, and for the other service we are paying $1,200 for two boats.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What became of the service which was extended along the Guysborough shore last year?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that it will be started again on June 20.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What is the subsidy for that service?

Mr. CARDIN: The amount has not been fixed as yet but we will try to get it as cheaply as possible.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Are these boats owned by the government or hired from private individuals?

Mr. CARDIN: We hire them from private individuals.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Who are the private individuals from whom the government hires these boats?

Mr. CARDIN: Two were hired from Hendry of Halifax; one from Cruikshank of Sydney; and the other one from Crocker of Westport.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Were those boats hired through an agent for the department, or direct from the individuals?

Mr. CARDIN: The transaction was carried on directly with the individuals.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I asked for the number of boats chartered by the various departments of the Dominion government from Hendry's Limited of Halifax for the years 1927-1928 and 1929, and I did not receive any information in connection with these boats in the fish collection service. A good many of us suspected that they had been hired from Mr. Hendry, and I would like to know why the department did not mention that.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that the arrangements were completed only a few days ago.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The return was tabled only a day or two ago, on Tuesday, June 4.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that these boats started just to-day and probably when the return was prepared to be tabled they had not been hired.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How long would it take to enter into an arrangement between Mr. Hendry and the department? This return was handed in on June 4 and the arrangement must have been under consideration at that time. It takes about three days for correspondence to come from Nova Scotia. What class of boats has been hired?

Mr. CARDIN: They must have a mileage of at least ten knots per hour and a capacity of at least 60,000 pounds of boxed fish.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Have they cold storage compartments?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Suppose a boat should get a full load of boxed fish at Main a Dieu and unfavourable weather should arise and the boat be forced to lie up in Louisburg, or if she has a shallow draught she may have to make the port of Fourchu and may have to wait there for a week or ten days; at whose risk would these very perishable goods be carried?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that it would be at the buyer's risk.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Not at the risk of the fishermen?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Are the fishermen paid when the fish are put on board the collection boat, or do they receive their pay after they are landed at the plant of the corporation?

Mr. CARDIN: I cannot give my hon. friend that information because the arrangement is made between the buyer and the seller.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): They are at owner's risk until delivered?

Mr. CARDIN: Buyer's risk.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm)

knows that there is a passenger service between Mulgrave, Arichat and Petit de Grat, for which service Mr. Hendry is receiving about $15,000 by way of a subsidy. According to Lloyd's register the boat on that service is some twenty-two or twenty-three years of age. She was built of Nova Scotia wood and I do not see any reference in the register of repairs having been made since she was built. Mr. Hendry had another boat, the Prince Albert, which went out of service some time ago, and which must have been twenty-eight or twenty-nine years old. A year or so ago her stern fell out at the port of Mulgrave and she had to be docked for repairs. During last winter this boat sunk at Mulgrave in the strait of Canso with 60 tons of freight. She happened to be at a wharf when she sank, so that no lives were lost.

Mr. MALCOLM: The statement made by the hon. member as to there being freight on that boat is not borne out by the evidence we have in the department, which is that there was nothing on the boat at all except a few rubber boots. Our information is that there was not freight aboard.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The information which I have from people who were there and witnessed the sinking is that there were some 50 or 60 tons of freight aboard.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am afraid my hon. friend will have to take the information we have; I do not think the owners of the boat would give incorrect information.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): When they would have a boat of that kind transporting passengers in the strait of Canso, I do not think I could take their word.

Mr. MALCOLM: The hon. member realizes that the boat was insured and the insurance was paid. Therefore she must have been in such condition as to pass the underwriters, otherwise the insurance would not have been paid.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The hon. minister is probably not as well acquainted with Nova Scotia timber and Nova Scotia ships as I am.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am not putting my own opinion against that of my hon. friend; I am giving the opinion of the underwriters who handled the insurance.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): If the boat carried insurance then the underwriters were the losers. All the old boats in the province of Nova Scotia are being picked up by friends of this government and leased to the different departments, or they are put into different services under subsidies. The government is paying for public services and we should get what we are paying for. No matter whether these people are friends of one party or of the other, the government should see that we receive the services we are paying for.

[Mr. Macdonald (Richmond).]

Item agreed to.

Fish culture, $442,000.

Mr. McRAE: This is probably the most important item in the fisheries estimates. There was an increase of about $175,000 in this vote last year, but I observe that the appropriation has not been increased for this year. I should like to ask the minister if there has been any increase in the work, or if it is remaining stationary.

Mr. CARDIN: A program of expansion in the fish culture service is being systematically carried out. A portion of the appropriation is being set aside for the construction of new hatcheries and improvements in the existing hatcheries. In the last year four new hatcheries were completed at a cost of $127,774, as follows:

Alberta	
Lesser Slave Lake	$46,714
Nova Scotia	
Yarmouth	$37,456
Antigonish	32,666
New Brunswick	
Florenceville	$10,938

Owing to the necessity of maintaining and operating these hatcheries, less money is available for construction for 1929-30. It is anticipated, however, that it will be possible to carry out the following building project:

Windsor Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.	
Salmon and trout	$30,000
Northern Saskatchewan	
Pickerel and perch	40,000
Anderson, Lake Seton, B.C.	
Sockeye salmon	15,000
Shuswap Lake, B.C.	
Sockeye salmon	25,000

Mr. McRAE: Where is it contemplated they will get the spawn for the Shuswap hatchery and what system is there in that hatchery? Are they adopting the pond system?

Mr. CARDIN: This is a proposed establishment, and we expect to get the spawn from Cultus lake and Harrison lake.

Mr. McRAE: Is it proposed to continue the hatchery at Babine, which last year I notice cost $7,182?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. McRAE: I presume, as previously done, the spawn will be taken from the head waters of the Skeena?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. McRAE: I want to protest against this expenditure, first on behalf of the fishermen on the Skeena river—

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that is the Skeena watershed.

Mr. McRAE: I want, second, to protest from a national standpoint against the transfer of that spawn. The fact is that the Skeena river is a purely Canadian stream where Canadian fishermen catch 100 per cent of the fish. Any contention there might be that the head waters of that river are overstocked would not be borne out by the catch there for the last twelve years. In looking over the records I find that for the four years, 1917 to 1920 inclusive, the sockeye catch on the Skeena river averaged 116,000 cases annually; from 1921 to 1924 inclusive the average catch was 104,000 cases, and since that time the average has been 81,000 cases, or a continual decrease from 116,000 cases prior to 1920 to 81,000 cases annually at the present time. I might observe that as many as 14,500,000 spawn were transferred in 1926 and the result of transferring that spawn to the Fraser river is that the fish find their way to the sea through the United States outlet and on their return 70 per cent of them, and some times more, are caught by United States fishermen. Therefore we are taking this spawn out of a river where 100 per cent of the fish come back to our fishermen and to the business of this country and we are putting it into the Fraser river where only 30 per cent of the fish come back to our fishermen and 70 per cent remain in the United States with their fishermen. That is not a sound business proposition, and it is not sound business to spend $7,000 or $8,000 a year to bring about that change.

There is another matter that I should like to call to the attention of the minister. He says that a new hatchery is being built this year at Anderson lake. That hatchery in 1928 cost $6,856.28 to operate. What do they propose to do with the new hatchery which is to cost $15,000?

Mr. CARDIN: We have no hatchery at Anderson.

Mr. McRAE: I misunderstood the location. Then I should like to ask the minister what is approximately the pack of sockeye salmon this year at Anderson lake and Uchuceslet inlet, which is the entrance to Anderson lake.

Mr. CARDIN: I have not that statement before me at present.

Mr. McRAE: Perhaps I can make a reasonably close guess at it. That stream originally provided as high as 8,000 cases of sockeyes a year. This is very important because it leads up to a matter which I consider of sufficient moment to call to the attention of the committee in connection with our fish culture. Along in 1910, about the year that the hatchery was established, 8,000 cases was the maximum that was packed. The department will correct me if I am wrong as to the year. After the first cycle this fish largely disappeared, and from a river that had provided as many as 8,000 cases there was packed, after the hatchery returns should be in, less than 1,000 cases. Therefore I say that this hatchery has ruined the business at that point.

Much along the same line is the experience at the Naas, another rather important river in our section of the country. I notice that the report shows that 13,488,000 fry were released there in 1924. If in the cycle year, 1928, one per cent of those fry returned, we would have had 134,000 fish. If you take 12 fish to the case, which would be about right, we should have caught in 1928, 11,200 cases of fish. What was the pack last year in the Naas? It was 5,540 cases, showing that if nature did not do a thing, if the fish which ran into that stream did not spawn at all and the hatchery is given credit for every fish that was packed there, the return is less than one-half of one per cent. The country has thrown away millions of dollars on fish culture when the department should have known for at least the last fifteen years, as everybody in the business knows, that we have not got value for our money. The department has spent on fish culture in our province about $2,100,000, and look at the fish we are getting to-day! The pack on the Fraser river, partly for this and partly for other reasons dropped from 1,000,000 cases to 26,000 last year. The Skeena river has gone off from 116,000 cases to 81,000 annually, and the Naas river is down to the trifle of 5,500 cases this year. At least $2,100,000 has been spent in British Columbia on a system of fish culture which every man in the business in our province has condemned. I have had this matter up with the government before I was a member of this house, and I asked them to investigate

the pond system which has prevailed in the United States with so much success. I do not wish to say anything unkind against the department, but I do believe that the only reason we have not experimented in a real way with the pond system is because to do so would be for the department to admit that we have been following wrong methods. For fifty-five years we have been spending money in British Columbia for fish culture and our fish have been getting less every year.

I have heard many people speak of this great natural resource. We should be getting in British Columbia $50,000,000 a year from our fish. We have no market problem in connection with our fish because the world wants them and the world takes them. Our problem is to get the fish.

I want to offer to the committee, Mr. Chairman, the experience in the United States with regard to the pond system. I may observe that the treaty now under discussion provides for the pond system. The state of Oregon took up the pond system in 1912. It had been carried on by the United States federal government before that date, but in 1912 the state of Oregon took that work over from the federal government and turned it over to a commission of practical men, not a paid commission, not a commission for disappointed politicians like our harbour boards, but a commission of men who had the interests of their country and the interests of the business at heart. The president of the American Can Company in Portland was president of that commission, and these figures were given to me by him at that time. Consequently I give them to this commission, as being absolutely reliable. That work has been carried on under the jurisdiction of the Oregon game and fish commission, and later, for the last sixteen years, under the Oregon fish commission.

Under this system, the fish are carried in ponds and fed until they are about six or seven months old, and then they are turned out as fingerlings four or four and a half inches long, the idea being that the fish is then able to take care of itself. I submit to the committee that to turn out the small little fry as we are doing is but furnishing food to our trout, because they are not big enough to take care of themselves. That great difficulty was recognized in the state of Oregon in 1912, and since that time, under the propagation methods carried on by this commission, the fisheries of the Columbia river have been largely re-established, and re-established on a very sound basis.

[Mr. McRae.]

The cost of those fish is rather surprising. I believe the cost which I have here has been much reduced recently, but the cost at that time of turning out fingerlings was $2.50 to $3 per thousand. It was difficult to get the exact returns, because as you can understand there are always certain fish running in the stream propagating their kind as well. There was however one opportunity to get exact returns and that was in connection with the red sockeye which the commission brought from Alaska and which had never previously been in the Columbia river. They were brought down to the Columbia river and at the end of the four year cycle they jumped back into the hatchery ponds—the identical ponds they had left four years before and 600 cases of them were caught. Some years later 50,000 of them were tagged, and running true to form they came back at the end of their four year cycle. Three thousand of these tagged fish were caught, showing a six per cent return. On that basis the enterprise would be a highly profitable one commercially. No less a man than the president of the American Can Company in Portland has said that he would so regard it.

Now what have been the results? The Columbia river has come back until this year they got some 350,000 cases. The cost of that commission was $118,514.80 in 1928. The industry on the Columbia river is self-supporting and does not cost the country one cent. Yet here we are to-day sitting down in this committee and spending about $800,000 in my province for an industry that you are running into the ground.

On the Columbia river there are nine of these hatcheries and they turned out 47,812,136 fingerlings last year. There are seven of these hatcheries in the state of Washington. Washington has followed the example of Oregon and has taken up this work. They have built on the Green river at Auburn on Puget Sound one of the finest pond systems hatcheries in existence, a pond system capable of turning out 10,000,000 fingerlings per year. Altogether they have seventeen of these hatcheries in that state and their costs are very much less than I have quoted for the Columbia river. They figure that if one fish in a thousand comes back, it will pay the cost.

We spent on our hatcheries in British Columbia in 1928, $112,532.65, a little less than the state of Oregon is paying, the only difference being that while it is a waste of money on our part it does not cost the state of Oregon a dollar. The industry there is entirely self-supporting, and so it is in Washington, I understand. I think this country has

gone on long enough throwing money away on the present methods of fish culture, and it is about time that we took stock. If we are going to get any results we must change our methods. All you have to do to be convinced of that is to look at the decrease there has been in our fish production all along the line. I know that the answer which the Fisheries branch makes to that is that they are keeping up the annual value of our fish packs, but what they are actually doing is raking the bottom of all our streams to get the pinks and the dogs, the cheap salmon, which means no profit for the fisherman or the operator. Sockeye are worth on Puget Sound from 80 to 90 cents, and in our country 60 cents; pinks are worth 5 cents and dogs a little more. It is like bundling up the chaff on the prairie and letting your hard wheat go by.

The great handicap under which the province of British Columbia has operated in the past is political interference; there is no doubt about that. But we have passed that stage now because we have nothing more to interfere with. All we can do is to raise a great row because we fear we will soon not get any fish at all. We are rapidly approaching that stage. Stream after stream has gone, and there is no new propagation. Why is it? It is not because the information I am giving you here is not in the possession of the department; of course it is. It is because they are afraid to tackle this business proposition.

I want to make one suggestion to the government—and it may be a very useful one in connection with the sockeye treaty as well. What we want in British Columbia is a fish commission, say, of five members composed of representatives of the fishermen, the cannery men and the business men, because the business men of British Columbia have a deep interest in the restoration of the industry. We do not want a paid commission; you cannot get the proper class of business men to give their services on such a commission for the few thousand dollars that you pay your politicians on the harbour board. We want good capable experienced men on such a commission, for it will be no child's job to run it. If the people of Oregon can bring back their fishing industry to a flourishing condition, as they have, and if the people of the state of Washington see fit to fall in line, surely the people of British Columbia, if entrusted with their own fisheries, can restore the Fraser river and every other stream to their former flourishing condition. Under this pond system the whole industry is capable of great development and instead of the total export value of our fish being $34,000,000, of which about 50 per cent comes from my province, the value of the British Columbia catch alone would soon be $50,000,000. This would benefit greatly, not only the province but the whole Dominion.

Mr. CARDIN: I do not fail, Mr. Chairman, to appreciate the fairness of the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Vancouver. I quite realize that his observations are of a constructive character. I may tell him that we have already started the pond system, but in order to ensure the best results we have instructed the biological board to make a complete investigation. We shall be prepared to follow their recommendations. The observations and the statistics with which the hon. member has favoured us will be looked into with great attention by the officers of my department.

Mr. McRAE: I have this to say about the efforts made by the present department to test the pond system. I believe the system was established in connection with that ill-fated hatchery at Anderson lake. I am informed—I did not see it myself; it is rather a hard climb to get to it—that the water in the ponds was very inactive and the fish were not properly developed. Anybody who has seen one of the modern Oregon pond systems in operation, where the water is very turbulent and the fish are developed the same as they would be in a natural stream, will realize that anything like a still pond is no good.

I have one word to say of the biological board. I do not see any reason on earth why we cannot take the experience which our neighbours to the south have gained during the last twenty-five years. I cannot see why we should wait for the biological board to report. How long is it going to take them to investigate and decide on a system unless they take advantage of the experience of our neighbours; and if they are going to do that they should have done it years ago. Here we have the biological board starting in at the ground floor. That is the trouble with the board. You cannot talk with a fisherman in our country who has much regard for the work of the board. Our fishermen agree that its members are very fine individually, but they complain that the board do not accept or profit by the information they get from the fishermen who are on the ground. Our fishermen claim that the board are actually endeavouring to propagate fish in streams where, to the man who knows, it is absolutely impracticable to do so, and where the effort is worse than wasted. Let me state one instance with respect to the biological board; it will be sufficient. The board has spent a very considerable sum in an effort to ascer-

tain the damage done to fish by hair seals. Why, bless your heart, every fisherman in our country knows that hair seals literally tear his nets to pieces and destroy the fish in it. What we should do is destroy the hair seals. I am going to deal with that later. Our biological board should start out by taking advantage of all that the fishermen know and build up from that.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): This, Mr. Chairman, is a subject that I have been discussing in this house for the last four or five years, but my voice has been as "one in the wilderness." Now I am going to say a word in defence of the biological board. For several years the board has been demonstrating that our fish hatcheries have been in most cases miserable failures. They have proven to the department that the work of taking the fingerlings and fry and depositing them in our lakes and streams has been for the most part wasted effort. During the last four or five years the biological board has been condemned by those officials in the department who had no interest in and could not keep up with scientific research work. For years the biological board has been struggling along without very much sympathy from the department. The result is that one chairman resigned. I am glad to see that now a little light is dawning on the department, and its officials are recognizing the value of the work that has been done by the biological board. Undoubtedly the board has proven that the stocking of our waters with fingerlings and fry was wasted effort. I know one lake that has been restocked for the last thirty years with fry of one kind and another, and I defy you to find one man who has caught a mature fish in its waters.

For years the biological board has been trying to get the department interested in this work, but no person would listen to its representations. The pond system has been in operation across the border with most successful results. I think the provinces can do more than the federal authorities in this matter. The pond system could be easily established throughout the Dominion if local clubs were organized, as they have been in the States, to look after the fry or fingerlings until they are strong enough to escape the pirate fish. I should not like hon. members to think that the biological board has been behind the times in regard to this work. It has been years in advance with very little encouragement from the department. And I could mention other lines of work in which the board has engaged without any sympathy or backing from the department. I agree that the minister may not have been properly acquainted with the work of the board, but those in charge of the department should have kept him acquainted with it and stimulated his interest, because it is one of the biggest things that we can undertake in the Dominion, whether we regard it from the commercial or the sports point of view. Every man remembers when as a boy he went out with a hook and line and had very little difficulty in catching all the fish he desired. But those days are past. Only a vigorous policy by this department can put our streams and lakes in the condition where they should be as fish preserves. It is a scientific subject, fish culture and fish production, and behind it is the study of aquaculture, with which so few are acquainted. These two, fish culture and aquaculture, will give us results if they are prosecuted. I should like to see more cooperation along this line. It does seem to me that we are wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars on this fish culture and the work of the hatcheries. Some of it is good, In connection with salmon we have obtained some results, some good demonstrations; but in central Canada, where we are interested in sport fish, such as bass, very poor results have been obtained from the work of the hatcheries. The field, however, is one for cooperation; it is a scientific field, and I believe that only men with biological knowledge and information will get us anywhere in this work.

Mr. BRADY: The hon. member for Kingston, speaking in reference to the biological board, has said he has been as "one in the wilderness". I recall, however, that as late as two days or so ago he held the stage, when the estimates for the Department of National Health were before the committee, and he helped considerably a great number of us who are neither doctors nor scientific men. To-night I wish to tell the hon. member that it is not from any personal reason that I am trying to get as much information as possible in regard to this important subject, and when the hon. member for North Vancouver mentions the Naas river I am very anxious to elicit from the minister some information regarding the future of the Sockeye fishery in that great river. I do not agree with the report that appeared in the Vancouver Province about a week ago regarding the hopeless position of that river so far as the sockeye salmon is concerned. I went up there last year, going into the upper stretches, the headwaters of the Naas river, and I have in a little notebook the name of every river that flows into the Naas from Mezziadsen lake right into that mighty river. I find that every one of those streams has an

Indian name which means "Sockeye". In other words, in days gone by, that river was the centre of a great sockeye run. I will not believe any scientific man who tries to prove to me that that river was not originally the home of the great sockeye family of salmon. I wish to ask the minister a question and then I shall discuss this matter further for a few minutes. Has there been an overseer looking over the Naas area in the last twelve months or two years?

Mr. CARDIN: The position has been vacant for some time, but the Civil Service Commission is going to appoint an overseer.

Mr. BRADY: Thank you. Now let us get the facts. Why is it that no overseer will go into the Naas? I know that no overseer will go in because his life is in danger and he is not going to venture among a hostile people at a salary that does not give him a living wage. To whom do I refer? I will tell the minister. On the Naas there are the largest Indian settlements in British Columbia; at Aiyansh, and Gitladamix and right down the whole of the Naas there are large Indan settlements. I went last year to investigate, merely as one desiring to get information, and I was ordered off one of the reserves because the Indians believed I was there for hostile purposes. However, I went up there after the close season, when the sockeye were running up, and I can assure the minister that they were running up; but at the upper stretches the nets of the Indians were stretched across the river and the sockeye were caught before they reached the spawning grounds. Let me give some figures in connection with sockeye salmon tagged in these waters:

Sockeye Salmon Tagging—Haystack Island, Aug. 3 to 21, 1925

Number tagged 659: returns 135: 20 per cent

Naas river	80
Observatory inlet	1
Portland canal	9
Wark canal	3
Dundas island	1
Skeena river	13
Union passage	1
Alaskan waters	27
Total	135

In other words, to the Naas river went the great proportion of the salmon that were tagged at Haystack island. Yet what do we find? As the hon. member for North Vancouver says, only five thousand cases were obtained last year. I contend—and I am assured in the stand I take in this regard—that if we grapple with the problem in the Naas river and put behind it all the weight of our strength and power, in five years we shall resuscitate the run of sockeye into the Naas. But I will admit to the minister that he has the biggest problem ahead of him in the Naas of all the rivers in British Columbia. There we find thousands of Indians who are given many privileges, and they overstep those privileges; they are taking a great toll of the sockeye salmon which are endeavouring to reach the spawning grounds. Why should the Indians at the headwaters of the Naas catch sockeye and transport them down the Naas river and sell them at the canneries? Why?—because there is no overseer. An overseer is the one man who must take a great responsibility when he goes there to perform his duty fearlessly and bravely. And you do not find men to do it with such meagre salaries. That is the position on the Naas river. The very word Naas, Mr. Chairman, is itself indicative of "sockeye" for in the Indian dialect it refers to sockeye salmon, just as Aiyansh means "early summer" and "early bloom". I urge the minister to obtain all the information he can in regard to that river, because if he takes courageous action and places two overseers there, one at the mouth and one higher up at the headwaters, he will obtain surprising results. I guarantee that in less than two cycles he will find there will be not five thousand cases, but many times five thousand.

Mr. SPENCER: I am interested in what the hon. member says in regard to sockeye salmon. Were they able to trace all the sockeye salmon tagged?

Mr. BRADY: No, they were not; out of 639 which were tagged 135 were caught in the various rivers I mentioned, and I believe over 70 per cent of the tagged fish came to British Columbia waters.

Mr. NEILL: Eighty per cent.

Mr. BRADY: No subject which has come before this house during the present session is more important, not merely to British Columbia or to the Atlantic seaboard but also to Ontario and the maritime provinces, than this question we are now discussing. I desire to pay tribute to the minister and deputy minister of fisheries; I am afraid I must have worried them this year but I honestly believe they are trying to do the best they can under very adverse and difficult circumstances. However, as a very clever man has said, ignorance of the law is no excuse; I believe there is too much at stake in this matter to pass it

by lightly. Therefore I do not apologize for having taken up the time of the committee to-day. I have not spoken in the house very often this year, but in this case I did desire to express what I think was constructive and helpful criticism.

Mr. NEILL: Referring to the remark of the hon. member for North Vancouver, the hatchery at Anderson lake is in the district I represent, and I would not like the impression left with the committee that the work is a failure or that the superintendent is in any way to blame. I do not think this gentleman votes for me, so I am not boosting a political friend, but I know the superintendent to be a thoroughly capable and an exceedingly conscientious gentleman who has devoted many years to the prosecution of his duties, and I think he has made a success of his work.

The hon. member for North Vancouver instanced a case where the catch of the cannery immediately below the hatchery suddenly fell off, and he connected up that falling off with the commencement of the hatchery operations. But he missed a cog in his description of the matter. What happened was this: The headquarters of this cannery were in Vancouver; it had been coming along very nicely, getting a moderate catch for a good many years. I forget the size of the catch, but it does not matter whether it was 4,000 or 8,000 cases; the proposition is the same. Then the management passed into the hands of people of the go-getter type and word was sent to the local manager that he must double his pack of sockeye salmon. He replied that it was impossible to do so in justice to the stream, which was small, but he was told that if he did not do so they could get someone who would. So he said he would double the catch and he did so the next year, but that was done by the most barefaced poaching. Perhaps the cannery people would deny that they did any poaching themselves; probably they did not, but they winked at it when it was done by their employees and they bought fish they knew had been poached. The cannery was situated on a bay about three miles long, into which emptied a narrow stream only a few hundred feet wide, and it would be very easy to put a net across that stream. That was done day and night, and every fish going up to the spawning grounds was caught. That was the reason for the sudden drop in the catch. Then within a year or two the management realized that they had adopted a shortsighted policy; wiser councils prevailed and they decided to adhere strictly to the law. A capable fisheries guardian was put in, a man who could not be induced to wink at any violation of the laws, and the bay was closed for at least three or four years or possibly longer. The result was that in the course of a few years the bay was reopened and they are now getting a very satisfactory run of sockeye salmon there.

Mr. McRAE: Does my hon. friend know how many cases they pack?

Mr. NEILL: I do not know.

Mr. McRAE: I asked the department and they could not give me the information. I should be glad if my hon. friend could tell me.

Mr. NEILL: I do not know, but I have been told that the pack has increased very much over the sudden drop which took place. The same thing occurred on the Sumas river, which is twenty-four miles away. The fish ran out entirely; it was over-fished. Then the river was closed for some years; fry were brought from this hatchery and put into the lake at the head of the river, with the result that there is a satisfactory run of salmon now. The river has been opened for fishermen again and last year they took a satisfactory catch of sockeye salmon. So I would suggest that the hatchery was in no way to blame for any falling off in the catch; on the contrary, I believe the hatchery has been very successful.

Mr. McRAE: I do not think anyone accused the hatchery officials; I had the system in mind. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni explained about the pack in one year, but I would remind him that the diminution of the fish required excessive packs for four years, since there is a four-year cycle, and surely during at least three years of this period the hatchery official must have been on the job. My information is that the great falling off in the fish came about during all the cycle years after the hatchery had been established. I am sure my hon. friend is more familiar with his own line of business than with the fish business. He will agree with me when I say that for many years the great trouble with the fish on the Sumas river was due to a dam. This was later taken out, and it is true that there was some improvement after the dam was removed.

Item agreed to.

Oyster culture, $35,000.

Mr. SHORT: I have a few words to say in connection with this item. I notice that last year we spent only $10,000 for this purpose. The maritime provinces, particularly New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, at one time produced large quantities of oysters. In 1882 they produced 64,646 barrels while in 1926, according to the figures given before the royal commission investigating the fisheries, they produced only 19,898 barrels. Everyone knows that something has happened to these very valuable oyster fisheries. We produce to-day the finest oysters in the world. At one time the Malpeque oyster was known all over this country and the United States as having the finest flavour of any oyster produced, but it has become almost extinct now through the inefficiency of this department. Our production of oysters has been decreasing year by year, yet until quite recently, nothing has been done to restore it. I am glad that at last the department is waking up to the fact that something should be done for this very valuable industry, but I do not think it can do very much for $35,000; probably $100,000 or $200,000 will be required. Even if it is necessary to expend that amount of money, it would be thoroughly justified in the end. I understand that oysters are worth about $10 per barrel to-day, so it will be easy to estimate the revenue which would accrue if we could get back to a production of 64,000 barrels annually. I hope the department will give some attention to this valuable industry from now on and try to restore it to its former condition. There is no reason why this result could not be brought about if proper attention is paid to the spawning grounds. I direct this matter to the attention of the minister because it is one in which everyone in the country is interested. I repeat that I hope an effort will be made to restock these beds so as to bring the industry back to where it was years ago.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the payment of a bounty for the destruction of hair seals in tidal waters, $50,000.

Mr. McRAE: I want to compliment the minister upon the increase of this vote from $25,000 to $50,000. In the past this appropriation has not been sufficient, and on one or two occasions it has run out and left the department without money to pay the bounty. A rather amusing incident occurred up at Alert Bay in my constituency, in which one of the fishery guardians, in true, honest fashion, said that the government had no more money, much to the disappointment of the fishermen. This allowance of $2.50 on hair seals is not sufficient; it is entirely too small to make it profitable to the fishermen to engage in the destruction of the seals. As a matter of fact a great many of these seals sink when shot and the fishermen recover only about 50 per cent. I think it would be only fair to the hunters to increase the inducement by raising the bounty to $5 instead of $2.50. Probably the most destructive animal to our fish is the sea lion. I would like to see a substantial bounty paid on these animals. The department has been doing some very efficient work in killing these sea lions with rapid fire guns, but I think the work could be increased by allowing a very substantial sum, say $10 or $15, and thus encourage the fishermen to destroy these animals.

Item agreed to.

To provide for an investigation into the life history of the Pacific halibut by the International Fisheries Commission appointed under the Pacific halibut treaty of 2nd March, 1923, $31,500.

Mr. McRAE: Will the minister give the committee a report on the progress being made in this work?

Mr. CARDIN: The first report of the commission was submitted to the two governments last year, and was approved. Extensive as well as intensive studies are being conducted. It is expected that the work which is being arranged for the coming year will cost $63,000. The United States government has arranged to appropriate one-half of that sum, and under the treaty the other half must be provided by Canada. Concentrated attention will be given to the publication of the results of the investigations made up to date. This will cover the migration of the halibut, which is being studied intensively by means of tagging and racial investigation. The growth, spawning and other pertinent natural history questions will be studied. Statistical data will be prepared which will show what has been going on at the different banks since the beginning of the industry. The investigations will cover the spawning conditions, migration, drift of eggs and so forth, and will be extended further west and possibly into the Bering sea. To enable this work to be carried out a staunch vessel is required, one which is seaworthy and able to stand very rough weather, the spawning time of the halibut being during the winter. The boat should have accommodation for four or five men in addition to the crew. There is no such vessel in the Canadian fleet, and the

United States fishing vessel Dorothy has been hired from time to time. This vessel has accommodation for seventeen men; she is 92 feet in length, 20 feet 6 inches wide, has a tonnage of 130, and is equipped with a 250 horse-power engine as well as an extra engine of 12 horse-power which can be used for sounding and other work. The rental has been at the rate of $50 per day for such days as the boat has been used, conditional upon the vessel being fully equipped for halibut fishing.

Mr. McRAE: Has any improvement been noted in the halibut fisheries on the banks between Graham island and the mainland?

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that there has been over-fishing in those areas. No improvement has been shown up to date.

Mr. RYCKMAN: This seems to be a very bald statement: "To provide for an investigation into the life history of the Pacific halibut by the International Fisheries Commission," and so on. What will be done when this life history is obtained?

Mr. CARDIN: Regulations will be adopted as suggested by the commission.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The vote does not say that directions will be given to the department as to how it should operate after the investigations have been completed. I think it would be better if this amount had been added to vote No. 194 and a real effort made to rehabilitate and make commercially profitable the Malpeque oyster industry which made Canada famous. No suggestion is made that upon this history being completed any benefit will accrue to Canada. I am prepared to hazard the guess that when this report, upon which we are spending $31,500, is completed nothing will be taken from it. The minister has not suggested how the country is to profit by this expenditure. More money should be devoted to those things which will produce coin in the cash box instead of making experiments of which the possible results are unknown. We are voting large sums of money without any prospects of a possible return. The minister is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but since I have been in the house nothing of real value has been done for the fisheries; I think the minister has been marine, and very much at sea. When we have such a splendid opportunity in the cultivation of our own fish, of our own oyster beds, it seems to me that the minister and the government ought to take a lead from what can commercially be done for the Canadian fisheries. How often have we heard it repeated in the house that the four basic industries are agriculture, lumbering, mining, and the fisheries? Since I have sat in the house I have never known of any real contribution to the development of the fishing industry by any one who was planning to turn this great industry to account. I do not wish to delay the committee, but if a considered and well-directed effort were made to turn to account the fisheries of this country, to prevent their depletion, to reestablish our oyster beds and to make the industry desirable so that citizens of Canada would enter it, something might be expected in the way of its development. If it is not developed in an earnest way, frankly I do not want it classed as one of the four great industries of Canada; and I defy the government to show that during the last eight years any distinct effort has been made that has resulted in benefit to the fishing industry in any part of Canada.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How much has Canada spent on this international commission to date?

Mr. CARDIN: Unfortunately I have not the information before me, but the commission has been operating for the last four years and the expenditure is between $25,000 and $30,000 or $35,000 a year.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Last year $31,500 was spent; would that be about the average?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: When did the expenditure start?

Mr. CARDIN: Four years ago.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Have we obtained any results so far from the work that has been done? I presume the commission has been investigating the life history of the Pacific halibut during the four years the commission has been in existence. But is it a fact that notwitstanding the existence of the commission, the halibut fishing has been very greatly depleted and that there is grave fear that the halibut grounds will be barren in a comparatively short time? I assume the minister has read the last report of the commission. If he has, no doubt he has seen there a statement by the commission that this fishery is in a very precarious condition. What benefit is Canada receiving from the expenditure which is being made every year on account of this commission?

Mr. CARDIN: According to the treaty, a commission was to be formed to investigate the conditions of the halibut fishery. Everyone

will realize that it takes some time to make the necessary investigation in a matter of that kind. Under article 3 of the treaty the commission is to conduct investigations, make a report and afterwards suggest regulations to be adopted with a view of building up the industry and ensuring to the two countries the advantages which they should derive from such an important industry.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Has the commission any power of regulation?

Mr. CARDIN: No; it will make recommendations that certain regulations be adopted, and those regulations will afterwards be adopted by the government.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But surely the commission must know that there are at present some real grounds for making recommendations; that there should be no delay in regulating the catching of the small halibut, the baby halibut as they call them. I can remember the time when it was unlawful to catch halibut which weighed less than 25 pounds. I do not know whether that is still the law or not, but my information is that the small halibut are being caught and the banks thus being depleted. The fishermen have been forced to go out further to sea; the fish have been driven away from the fishing grounds by reason of the over-fishing that is taking place, and there is a scarcity of halibut. If this condition continues it is only a question of time when there will be no halibut at all. Some action is required immediately. I do not believe in this policy of waiting, waiting, which has been followed in the case of other species of fish. I was told at one time in the marine and fisheries committee that the biological board was investigating the sockeye salmon on the Fraser river, and that it would some day make a report. I asked when we might expect that report, and the reply was: "In ten years or so." Must we wait ten or twenty years, until the halibut fishing is extinct, before we get a report from the international commission? We are either throwing away our money or should expect some results from the work of the commission. I should like to know from the minister what results we are getting, and what results we may expect.

Mr. CARDIN: The only answer I can give to my hon. friend is that the commission having been appointed we ought to wait for its report and give it the necessary time to investigate before adopting any measures.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How long will the minister wait?

Mr. CARDIN: We will wait until the commission has completed its investigation.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How long will that be? The minister must have some estimate as to the time the commission will occupy in investigating. Surely there must be some limit.

Mr. CARDIN: The commission has already made a report and certain recommendations.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I thought they had not yet made recommendations.

Mr. CARDIN: The recommendations will be found at page 9 of the report, which has been tabled and is available to members of the house. The recommendations are as follows:

1. (a) To establish areas, within each of which, if deemed necessary for the preservation of the fishery there, the total catch of halibut may be reduced by a predetermined percentage annually, commencing not less than one year after the putting into force of this recommendation, until the fishery therein shall reach a state of stability of yield.

(b) To determine upon the amount of this percentage reduction, and to revise the same from time to time as may be found necessary, the intent being to restrain any increase in the amount of fishing within such area.

2. To close permanently to all fishing the two areas herewith defined, and known to be populated by small immature halibut, and to close such other grounds as may be found by the commission to be populated by a similar class of fish.

3. To prevent the use of any fishing gear deemed unduly destructive.

4. To extend the present closed season by two weeks at its beginning, making the closure for all fishing in all areas from November 1 to February 15, both dates inclusive, and to facilitate future alterations in the length of close season.

5. To license all vessels fishing for halibut in treaty waters, under such terms as are necessary for the purpose of the treaty, including statistical returns, and for clearance to regulated waters.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is the date of that report ?

Mr. CARDIN: It was issued last fall.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What has the department done to carry out those recommendations?

Mr. CARDIN: The recommendations have to be approved by the parliament of Canada and by the United States.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does not the minister think that he should have brought down some legislation this year? When does he intend to bring down this legislation?

Mr. CARDIN: We are in a position to pass legislation putting into effect these recommendations, but we are waiting for action by the United States.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I understood, first, that the minister was waiting for recommendations from the commission. Now we find that he has recommendations from the commission, and he says he is waiting for action by the United States. It seems a most extraordinary thing that this session has gone by without some action being taken by the government in this regard.

Mr. BRADY: I think that I have spoken at greater length to-day than I have done during the whole of the present session. It is really the first day that I have been impelled to speak, and because of the importance of this vote, nothing can stop me, not even one of those up-to-date machines that can tear down forests, such as the hon. member for North Vancouver was telling us about the other evening when talking of the Peace River.

We are discussing to-night one of the most important treaties that Canada has entered into for many years. In the articles of that treaty there are three outstanding phrases, which, if given effect to would assure to Canada the perpetuation of the greatest fishing industry in the world. There is no part of the world that has a greater halibut industry than Canada. Let me briefly sum it up for those who are ignorant of the possibilities of the halibut fishing industry. The world's annual production of halibut to-day is 90,000,000 pounds. Halibut is the most highly prized fish food that the world knows. It is found on the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. Of that 90,000,000 pounds produced annually we are producing in British Columbia waters, 50,000,000 pounds. What does that mean? It means that we are contributing to the world supply of this highly prized fish, sixty per cent annually.

The story of the halibut banks and their exploitation is one of the most thrilling that anyone could ever read. No novel has yet been written of it, but one shall be written some day, and it will be the pride of British Columbia to know that she contributes one of the most interesting chapters in this country of romance. What was the origin of the halibut industry? It goes back to the year 1888. It started at Cape Flattery and extended until in the year 1910 it included 600 miles of the British Columbia coast. Between 1888 and 1910 more halibut were caught in those 600 miles than are being taken to-day with the area extended to 1,800 miles. Every member of parliament knows the map of Canada. Cast your eye to-night from Cape Mendocina, the first cape from the Panama, and travel up to Cape St. James at the southern extremity of the Queen Charlotte islands. That stretch from 1888 to 1910 produced the greatest halibut return that the world has ever known. Where are we to-day? Follow from Cape St. James up to Cape St. Spencer in Alaska and then to the Aleutian islands. What is the return to-day in that stretch of 1,800 miles of water, even with the most up-to-date devices for catching halibut? We are catching forty per cent less halibut to-day than we were in 1910.

No man, I think, should get up in this house and speak unless he has something constructive to say. I want to get behind this halibut treaty and to bring home to hon. members a few facts respecting the appalling toll that is being taken of our halibut. Are hon. gentlemen aware that there is no scientific method by which halibut breeding grounds may be developed? We have spawning grounds for salmon; we can propagate salmon under the most unfavourable conditions; but we know of no natural law under which we can propagate halibut.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. BRADY: Because they spawn in the ocean. There are three kinds of halibut sold in the market: the baby, the chicken, and the full developed halibut. The baby halibut is five years old. It is of no commercial value until it reaches that age. The chicken halibut before it begins to reproduce its kind must be ten years old. To-day a mighty toll is taken among the fish of that age. I have stood on the wharves of the greatest halibut port in the whole Dominion, Prince Rupert, which is the centre of the halibut market of the North American continent, and I have wondered why we do not realize that we are destroying the halibut industry, tearing up its very roots, when we sell to the fishing companies on the exchange the very fish that can reproduce their kind. The whole of the Pacific coast knows exactly what I am talking about.

Now, the first and most important article in the halibut treaty is this: we shall make a close season of three months. I ask the minister, did that work?

Mr. CARDIN: I am told it did.

Mr. BRADY: I will tell you why it did work—for a time. It gave a breathing spell, but it did not go far enough. What then did the department do? They said: "We will now study the history of the halibut to ascertain whether it is a migratory fish, whether the various banks are isolated units, or whether certain spawning grounds are peculiar to certain halibut. They succeeded in getting a great deal of information. To my

mind the most important article was the third—to make recommendations as to the regulation of the fishery. Number one failed; number two opened up our eyes to the fact that number three was essential. By number three we recognized that the halibut industry to-day is in a parlous state, and that something must be done to arrest the terrible toll which is taken of the fish from cape Flattery to Kodiak island. The halibut industry to-day is in such danger of depletion that, unless the great American nation, whom we admire because of their genius, their intellect and their energy, come to us—and hitherto they have failed to do so, as I proved this afternoon—unless they come to us and agree to restrict the terrific toll that their fishermen are taking of our halibut, we can do nothing to remedy the present desperate state of affairs.

Now, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) asked: What return are we getting for our money? Well, we are not getting very much. We are not getting the return that we should get from what should be, and really is, the greatest fishing industry the world knows. I know there are some who doubt what I say, and for their benefit the following should be recorded.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, June 7, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

SYDNEY JAMES BLACK

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Totzke:

That the petition of Sydney James Black praying for an act to dissolve the marriage between the petitioner and Minnie Black, together with the report of the clerk of petitions thereon, be referred to the select standing committee on standing orders for the purpose of considering the suspension of standing order 92 in relation thereto.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would like to have some explanation as to what this really means.

Mr. JACOBS: This is the petition of Sydney James Black praying for an act to dissolve his marriage with Minnie Black, and the motion is that the petition and the report of the clerk of petitions be referred to the select standing committee on standing orders for the purpose of considering the suspension of standing order 92 in relation thereto.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What does that mean?

Mr. SPEAKER: I might explain by reading the report of the clerk of petitions:

Ottawa, June 7, 1929.

The clerk of petitions has the honour to report that he has examined the following petition presented on the 6th instant, and finds that the time for receiving petitions for private bills having expired, it should not be received.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SATURDAY SITTING

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have had a word with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) and the leader of the Progressive group (Mr. Gardiner) with respect to the resolution standing in my name, and I gather that if the government will undertake not to sit in the afternoon or evening hon. members will not object to meeting in the forenoon at half past ten instead of eleven o'clock, the understanding being that when we take up estimates if there are any contentious items which it may be desired to hold over until Monday, that will be done.

I think this will meet with the general approval of the house, and with the consent of the house I move the amended motion, as follows:

That on Saturday, the 8th of June instant, and every Saturday thereafter until the end of the session, the house shall meet at 10.30 o'clock a.m. and the order of business and procedure shall be the same as on Fridays.

That means that we will meet at 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning and adjourn at one o'clock.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): That wholly meets with the approval of those with whom I am associated.

Motion as amended agreed to.

CANADA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Canada Grain Act, and to provide for the salaries of the chief commissioner and other commissioners, and for the appointment of four assistant commissioners, and for the payment of transportation expenses and per diem allowance to members of the standards boards attending meetings of the said boards.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Malcolm thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 359, to amend the Canada Grain Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. MALCOLM moved the second reading of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister give us some reasonable explanation?

Mr. MALCOLM: Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee on agriculture have spent the major portion of their time during the last few weeks in the consideration of this matter, and they thoroughly understand all the changes which have been incorporated in this legislation. Other members of the house who have been unable to follow the proceedings of that committee may not realize to the same extent the effect of the changes brought about in this proposed legislation, but I think they can be briefly summarized under two or three headings.

The Brown royal commission sitting in the province of Saskatchewan, brought down certain recommendations making changes in the car order book. The recommendations of that commission in regard to the car order book have been taken as being the result of evidence submitted and of careful consideration given thereto. The majority of the recommendations in that regard have been accepted by the agriculture committee and have been incorporated in this legislation.

Considerable complaint has been made with regard to the lack of uniformity in the outturn standards of grain from our terminal elevators and while the inspection board set higher standards of outturns than the standards of inspection at Winnipeg, on appeal they could not be sustained. It was thought advisable to provide by statute that the outturn standard of all grades of grain from the terminal elevators should be as near the average of the grade as it was possible to obtain. Therefore, in order to give uniformity of grade in the flow of grain to Europe or the orient during any one crop season, the committee decided to adopt the recommendations made by the officers of the western pool, that the outturn standards of the grade from terminal elevators should be 75 per cent of the average of the grade and 25 per cent of the minimum of the grade.

The committee was informed by its witnesses that that outturn standard was acceptable to the handlers of grain in Canada as being an advisable standard to incorporate in legislation.

Evidence was submitted also to the committee as to whether or not the existing machinery for the administration of the Canada Grain Act was sufficiently powerful to deal with the ever-increasing problems which arise in the business of handling our western wheat crop. The committee felt that the recommendation made by the Brown commission to increase the number of commissioners to five instead of three, and to locate the commissioners across the country—one at Vancouver, one at Fort William, and one at each of the three western provinces—was not the best way in which to administer this act. It took the view that the board should be mobile, moving from place to place in order to study problems in the administration of the act; that in place of the commissioners being separated, as they have been in the past, the members of the board should work together. However, in order to carry out the demands and the requirements of western Canada, and to meet the complaints arising in the handling and inspection of grain, it was felt advisable to place permanently an assistant commissioner at Fort William, another assistant commissioner in the province of Manitoba, one in the province of Saskatchewan and another in the province of Alberta. The new board would be assisted by four assistant commissioners who, under the act, would be given powers equal to the powers of the commissioners but who would be responsible to the main board for their findings and their actions. The opinion was expressed by the committee that the business of handling the grain crop of western Canada is large enough to justify the extension of the personnel of the board and that this being a billion dollar business only men of the very highest calibre should be in charge of the administration of the act. When one realizes the volume of business transacted, the importance of the rulings made, both as to their financial consequence and the spread of that financial consequence among 250,000 farmers, he must agree with the committee that it might be difficult to get the class of men required at the salaries being paid. The committee therefore recommends to the house that there be an increase in the salaries of these commissioners. May I say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that the men who understand the grain business are practically all in the employment either of the grain trade or of the western pool. It is not an easy matter to get the type of man required for the administration of this act unless he be

taken from some occupation of a similar nature, and the committee felt that it would be quite in order that the salaries should be raised to the amounts mentioned. Indeed it was said in the committee that it would not be paying too much if the chairman of this board were to receive a salary comparable to that paid to railway presidents, as both the volume of business and the importance of the work were comparable to the duties of such a man. However, the majority ruling of the committee was that the salaries should be increased to the amounts provided in the bill.

I think that covers the views of the committee with regard to the administration of the act. Briefly, they are, that the machinery be increased and that the best men available be secured for the administration of the act.

Another matter on which I might speak briefly is the discussion which took place in the committee with regard to a vexed question for many years in western Canada, that of whether or not our grades of grain should be mixed, one with another. Evidence was submitted by some very competent and well informed witnesses that the mixing of one grade of grain with another is the most logical method of disposing of our crop. Evidence was also submitted that in the mixing of grain, our higher grades are deteriorated by putting therein lower grades which rather lower their milling value and reputation on the markets of the world. After due consideration of all the evidence submitted, and of the problems of handling our crop, the committee felt that the introduction of legislation which would have to take effect within the next sixty or ninety days, and which would disturb the handling methods now practised, would be rather a drastic change. The committee also came to the conclusion that as regards the lower or so-called commercial grades of grain, it was not shown, nor, indeed, could it be shown at the present time, that any damage or ill effects could result from the mixing of those grades. But the committee came to the conclusion that as regards the statutory grades of grain, namely, Nos. 1, 2 and 3 red spring wheat, the grades which are more or less our guiding grades, no good could be done to them by mixing any other type or grade of grain with them. In other words, the committee decided that we could not improve the top grades by mixing; that there might be logic in the argument that the lower grades could be so improved. In regard to this question the committee brought down a recommendation that the 75-25 outturn standard to which I have referred, should come into effect at once, with regard to all grades of grain; that with regard to the commercial grades the general practice of mixing which has been heretofore in use, be continued, but that as regards the statutory grades, the committee advised the prohibition of mixing.

As I mentioned a moment ago, I think it is only fair to those handling grain to explain that probably there will be some change necessary in the system in the terminal elevators in order to bring into effect the recommendation of the committee. It may be that an organization like the pool, which has seven terminal elevators at Fort William, will be able to handle through one of its houses all of Nos. 4, 5 and 6 grades, and mix and treat grain therein. They may devote to the the handling of Nos. 1, 2 and 3 another house where they can bin separately and keep intact the grade as it comes through Winnipeg. All people handling grain, however, are not so fortunately situated. Some line elevator companies have more than one house and can adopt a system of segregation such as I have referred to. Other line companies, however, have only one terminal elevator and arrangements will have to be made in order to segregate within the one house those grades of grain which cannot be mixed and those grades which can be mixed.

Representations were made by our chief inspector that supervision would be necessary in order to enforce the findings of the committee, and that if the recommendation were put into effect immediately, a very much larger staff would be necessary to supervise the binning and see that that the statutory grades were kept intact than would be necessary if we postponed the enforcement of the new mixing regulations for one year, during which time arrangements could be made for handling the statutory grades in separate terminals. In this case all the supervision which would be necessary would be an inspection of the cars going in and to see that each of these three grades was put into its proper bin. Therefore, with regard to mixing the committee recommended that the prohibition of mixing in the statutory grades come into effect on August 1, 1930.

I do not want to delay the committee with a discussion on the minor recommendations which can take place as the sections are taken up; and wish only to refer to major recommendations of the committee. That the 75 per cent of the average and 25 per cent of the minimum of a grade passing Winnipeg, be the standard for our grain going to Europe, is most important. This, it is felt, will give a uniformity of standard in the flow of our grain and is most desirable at the beginning of the season when the price is set. I might observe to the house that the prices set on Canada's grain are largely set

on the samples which are submitted at the beginning of the crop season. Prices may fluctuate if the standard of the cargoes improves, but by this method it is felt that the Liverpool corn exchange and the other corn exchanges of Europe will know more definitely what they may expect to get throughout the whole crop year. They will know that the standard they are going to get is above the minimum standard on which the grain was bought, and it is felt that confidence will be established in the European buyer by providing that the out-turn standard shall be almost the average of the grade.

One other point which was discussed and amended is the question of section 150. Section 150 was recommended by parliament two years ago and the import of it was to give to any producer of grain the right to take his shipment to any country elevator, to put it into storage and, when he had paid his storage charges thereon, to direct that it be transported to any terminal elevator of his selection. In simple language, that was the intention of section 150. Certain difficulties arose in connection with a ticket issued under this section. The grain companies handling grain contended that they had the right to handle grain for those who had a contract to handle the grain for producers and by the use of this ticket they deprived the producer of the right of determining the destination of his grain, claiming the right that they had under a certain contract. The committee has suggested a new wording for this section which, I think the house will agree, clearly and definitely sets out that under no set of circumstances can the rights of the producer be taken away from him.

But the committee has gone further. Under the old Canada Grain Act and under subsequent changes which have been introduced by the agriculture committee and recommended to the house, certain forms of tickets were prescribed by legislation. It was also prescribed by legislation that no other form of ticket should be used. This brings up the question of how the act is to be enforced with regard to providing that in all the thousands of country elevators, no violation of the spirit of this section shall take place. In other words, it was, I think, clearly pointed out to the committee that the auditing of all the country elevators in the Dominion of Canada to make sure that no one of them at any time used a ticket that was not in exact conformity with the act, was a task which was colossal in size and would involve a tremendous expenditure. So, inasmuch as the question had been raised that section 150 had been violated by the insertion of certain words on the ticket which were not prescribed in the act—

Mr. BENNETT: And which had not been approved by the governor in council.

Mr. MALCOLM: Quite so—the committee felt that for all time this question could be best settled and expense and laborious auditing saved if they would recommend to the house that it be enacted in legislation that a standard ticket be printed and supplied by the Board of Grain Commissioners to all country elevators, this standard ticket to take the form and appearance of a standard government certificate. The committee are recommending in this bill that the Board of Grain Commissioners do not actually print but supervise the printing of the tickets, and supply them to the elevators, and that no tickets shall be used until they have been supplied by the board. That the use of any other ticket than the ticket supplied by the board shall be illegal. May I observe that this is not going to disturb the printing of tickets in western Canada. There are a few large printing houses which are printing these tickets for the board. I believe that the board will see fit to use a standard paper for the printing of these tickets. They will use a standard border in the printing of the tickets, and there will be uniformity of type throughout. The only difference will be in the name of the grain company printed on the ticket, to supply the needs of the various buyers of grain. The grain ticket which will be used in future in western Canada will be as uniform in appearance as a Canadian government certificate or as a one-dollar bill. It will lead, through standardization of size, to economies of handling and it will I think forever get away from where an operator of a country elevator goes to his local printer and gets a ticket printed which may not be in conformity with the desire of parliament, because the printer has added words thereto, and before the addition of those words is discovered many disputes may arise.

I think I have covered the four or five principal features to be found in this bill. We have dealt with what has been known as the hybrid ticket, and I believe that we have settled that question in the most satisfactory manner possible, by clearly defining the rights of the producer under section 150, and we are providing by having the tickets supplied by the board that no tampering can take place with tickets in the future.

We have recommended a solution for the problem of mixing by asking for the pro-

hibition of mixing in the statutory grades, leaving mixing legal within the commercial grades. We have tried to settle the question of lack of uniformity in standards by making legal a standard which we think is as near the average of the grade as it is possible to reach. We have tried to settle complaints by providing for more extensive machinery for the administration of the act. I think that that is about all the information that I can give the house in a general way on the changes recommended by the committee on agriculture and colonization.

Mr. LADNER: There are four assistant commissioners appointed, one at the head of the lakes and one each in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Why is there not an assistant commissioner stationed at Vancouver, where 100,000,000 buhsels of wheat go through the port in a year, and where there is a storage capacity of approximately 13,000,000 bushels?

Mr. MALCOLM: These commissioners will have for the major portion of their work the settling of complaints of producers, the supervision of the country elevators, and such work as concerns largely the producer's interests. It was felt that the production of grain in British Columbia was not yet sufficiently large to justify the stationing of a commissioner at Vancouver at present, and that the settlement of complaints with regard to the production of grain in British Columbia could be looked after more conveniently and economically from Calgary. So far as the output of grain from the terminal elevators at Vancouver is concerned, the inspection department can take care of that work admirably.

The decision to place a man at Fort William was largely due to the fact that there is a greater quantity of grain moving through Fort William. The Board of Grain Commissioners have been stationed in the past at Fort William, and a great deal of the work of the commission which deals with European shipments passing through Fort William will have to be continued at that point. Undoubtedly there will be a permanent staff at Fort William for the administration of the act on account of the importance of Fort William as an all-year shipping point, by rail in the winter and by boat in the summer. It was not found necessary to establish at the moment an assistant commissioner at Vancouver. We took evidence on that point from our own officers, and I can assure my hon. friend that the matter was given very careful consideration. It may be that in the future when the grain business of Vancouver has increased it will be necessary to have an agent there.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The real difficulty to which attention was directed, namely, the use by the grain trade of a ticket that had not been approved by the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada, for which undoubtedly the government must accept full responsibility, has I understand been settled to the satisfaction of all parties concerned.

So far as we may be interested, we are only desirous that the great agricultural producing sections of the country should feel that they are deriving the full return for their labours from the sale of their product. As I understand that this committee composed of representatives of all parties, has striven for weeks to arrive at conclusions that would be satisfactory so far as it may be possible to all parties concerned, and that these conclusions are now embodied in the legislation which is submitted to the house, we regard it as our duty to say to you, sir, and to the house that regarding the legislation as being acceptable to all interests after it has been fully considered and canvassed in the committee, we shall do our utmost to expedite its progress through the house.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Salaries of commissioners.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I question the wisdom of raising the salaries of these commissioners as proposed in this section. If we were absolutely certain that we were going to get the very best men there would be no objection, but we have no such guarantee. The minister has stated that the experienced grain men have been secured either by the grain trade or by the pool, and that it is necessary to provide a large salary in order to get proper men. I do not altogether agree with that view. As a matter of fact it is not experienced grain men you need as commissioners; that is the class I would very carefully steer away from. I believe that when you pay a man a very high salary you elevate him so far above the ordinary farmer that he is inclined to lose sympathy with him. I simply register my protest; I do not offer any opposition.

Section agreed to.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6—Head office.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the city of Fort William which I have the honour to represent is vitally interested in this proposed change. The same question came up in 1925 when the grain act was amended. Then it was proposed to move the headquarters of the board to Winnipeg, but I put forward the arguments that I intend to submit to-day, and the committee was fair-minded enough at that time to acknowledge the justice of my case. I was supported not only by my own party but by members from the prairie provinces on both sides of the house and by two or three members of the government. As a consequence the headquarters of the Board of Grain Commissioners remained in Fort William. I trust that to-day my hon. friends in all parts of the house will regard the proposal as the House of Commons did in 1925.

May I point out to hon. members, particularly those from the prairie provinces, that the headquarters of the Board of Grain Commissioners was established at Fort William by act of parliament in 1912. At that time Sir George Foster, as Minister of Trade and Commerce, asked the people of Fort William to provide a building to house a sample market and the grain commission. I have under my hand the correspondence dealing with the whole matter. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee by reading the various letters, but I may state that the file contains a communication from Sir George Foster asking the people of Fort William to provide the necessary accommodation. It will be recalled by hon. members that the people of Fort William were badly hit by the crash in real estate prices which took place in 1912. But notwithstanding this misfortune they responded promptly to the minister's request and put up $500,000 of their good hard-earned money to erect a suitable building. For a period of about ten or eleven years that money earned no dividend. I may be permitted to mention a personal incident as an illustration of how the investment depreciated. My father subscribed about $15,000 or $20,000. In 1914 when his estate was being wound up his shares were sold at fifty cents on the dollar. I put in a little money myself and have the stock yet, but I merely refer to it to show that all the business and professional men in the city of Fort William provided money for the building. The building was laid out for a sample market, but no sample market was ever placed in it. As a result for about ten years there was not sufficient revenue to pay any dividend on the capital investment, and it is only within the last seven years that dividends ranging from two and a half to five per cent have been paid on that $500,000. Five per cent is the highest return the contributors have ever received. Now, it is proposed by this section to allow the Board of Grain Commissioners to locate the head office of the board at such place as the board may desire. The removal of the board's headquarters from Fort William would probably depreciate the value of the $500,000 investment to about fifty cents on the dollar.

I would point out to the committee that there is a moral obligation on the government in this case. True, the present government was not responsible for the location of the headquarters of the grain commission at Fort William, but, as I have pointed out, the necessary accommodation for the commission and for a sample market was provided on the request of Sir George Foster when acting as Minister of Trade and Commerce in a Conservative administration. Therefore I submit the obligation is a continuing one on the government of Canada.

If it could be shown that the farmers of the prairie provinces were suffering because the head office of the board is located at Fort William, the people of Fort William, being broadminded, would say: Well, we will just have to take our loss. But no national interest is involved. Ever since I came into this house in 1917 there have been attempts made at various times to change the location of the headquarters of this board. I have lived all my life at the head of the lakes, where eighty-five per cent of the grain of the west is handled. I know something about the grain trade, and I have never yet heard it urged that any greater efficiency in the handling of the grain crop of the farmers of the west would result by the moving the headquarters of the board to any other point. If there has been any inefficiency on the part of the board, it has not been because of its being located at Fort William. I submit therefore that there is no national need to justify the proposed change, and I doubt very much that any assistance would be given to the farmers in any manner, shape or form in the better handling of their grain by changing the location of the board head office. Since 1925 one of the commissioners has been at Winnipeg, anyway, and now I notice under this bill it is proposed to appoint four assistant commissioners to occupy offices in different sections of the country.

I have no quarrel with any other portion of this bill. I associate myself wholeheartedly with my leader when he says that our only desire is to see that the farmers of the west

get the best return they can from their grain. I am convinced that with the appointment of these four assistant commissioners to act with the three commissioners, the farmers of the west will get that efficient administration of the grain act which they may have failed to get in the past. The board must have some place in which to keep their records, and that is about all their headquarters amount to, because this should be a travelling board. I think the farmers will agree that this board should be, as my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland) once expressed it, an itinerant board. In fact to my mind there is no reason why the board should not have a private car just as the Board of Railway Commissioners has.

May I point out in this connection that the railway commission is located at Ottawa, which is a long distance from the centre of the Dominion. Most of its business is done in Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, Montreal, Toronto, Halifax and in other cities of this country. But there has been no complaint of inefficiency on the part of the Board of Railway Commissioners because its headquarters is at Ottawa, a point much further east than Fort William. I submit that the Board of Grain Commissioners in being located at Fort William is much closer to the centre of Canada than the Board of Railway Commissioners located in Ottawa.

I notice that in his statement Mr. Boyd did not give any reason why the headquarters of the board should be moved to Winnipeg, but he did say it is an eight hundred mile trip. It is if you count the distance both ways. He said the trip meant a day lost; it is only a night lost. A train leaves Fort William at night and gets into Winnipeg about nine o'clock in the morning; a train leaves Winnipeg at night and gets into Fort William about the same time next morning.

Most of the cases that come before the grain commissioners are not decided in an hour or a day; they have to be discussed just as have cases that come before any other court. Therefore I think the headquarters of the board might very well remain at Fort William. The board has to travel east and west to hold sittings at various points. Mr. Boyd suggests Winnipeg, but Winnipeg is merely an inspection and trading point for the wheat. I do not need to mention that fact to hon. members who are farmers, but there are other members who are not so familiar with it. Fort William, on the other hand—and I include Port Arthur, of course—is the point at which the wheat is weighed, cleaned, stored, transhipped and inspected on to the boats. There are disputes every now and then arising at that point, and very important disputes in connection with shortages of cargoes going on the boats—much more important than many of the minor differences that occur in the west.

The point has been made in the past that the board, being situated at Winnipeg, might be under the influence of the larger percentage of the trade. I do not care to give credence to that statement, because if the board is properly constituted it should not be subject to such influence. I allude to the fact, however, for the reason that it has been mentioned to me by some people, including some members from the prairie provinces.

The head of the lakes as has been pointed out by the minister, is the largest grain centre in the world; there they have 85,000,000 bushels elevator capacity, and there are thirty-three elevators. To give some idea of the work that is being carried on at the head of the lakes, I may mention two or three figures with regard to the weighing staff and the weighing of grain, an important function which has to be supervised by the Board of Grain Commissioners. The weighing staff in Canada comprises in all 247 members, of whom 139, or more than half, are at Fort William. There are in Canada ten terminal elevators, of which five are at the head of the lakes, four being scattered through the interior and one at Vancouver; and the five at the head of the lakes have twice the capacity of the other five. Then in regard to the income of the board. The income of the Board of Grain Commissioners, according to their last report, was $1,956,000, and of that sum over $1,000,000 was taken in at Fort William and Port Arthur.

I am not going to to detain the committee much longer because I have no wish to rehash all the arguments I have advanced in the past, but I wish to say that I can see no reason for the change. And I make that statement as sincerely as I have said anything in this house. I hope hon. members will bear in mind that there is a fair deal coming to the people of Fort William, just as there is to the farmers of this country; and it certainly is not a fair deal to have the government of Canada ask the people of that city to put up a $500,000 building—and it has been put up—and then tear up the agreement as a mere scrap of paper; because that is pretty much what it would amount to now if this board were to move its headquarters. I appeal to the committee to look at the matter in a fairminded way; I appeal to them to consider the importance of equitable treatment to all sections of the country. Moreover, I would point this out: I have

been a member of this house for about thirteen sessions, and in all that time, so far as I can recollect, I have never taken a narrow sectional point of view in regard to any question. Take, for example, the Hudson Bay railway; speeches have been made in this house against that railway, but I have never made any of them—and this notwithstanding the fact that no city will be harder hit than Fort William and Port Arthur if that railway becomes a success, because whatever wheat is shipped by that railway will be so much less passing through the head of the lakes.

I do not intend to discuss the matter further except to urge upon the members of this committee the desirability of leaving the act as it stands in this regard. And with this object in view I wish to move this amendment:

That section 6 of the bill be amended by striking out in line 26 the words, "such place as the board may decide", and inserting the words, "the city of Fort William or Port Arthur".

The section would then read:

The head office of the board shall be located at the city of Fort William or Port Arthur, and the board may from time to time establish offices of the board at other places.

This would be practically the same as the present provision in the grain act, except as changed by the committee this year. In the previous act it was left to the governor in council, on recommendation of the board, to establish offices in other places, and my amendment leaves that provision untouched but for the stipulation that the head office shall be at Fort William or Port Arthur.

Mr. DONNELLY: The hon. member says that either Fort William or Port Arthur is the logical centre for the board. What reason has he to think that the new board when it comes in will transfer operations from Fort William to some other centre?

Mr. MANION: If, as implied in the hon. member's question, there is no intention to remove the head office of the board, why change the act? While there is a stipulation in the act as to the location of the head office, that location cannot be changed; it is statutory. And that was the understanding when the agreement was arrived at between the people of Fort William and the government. More than that, Mr. Boyd has made a statement to the effect that the head office had better be at Winnipeg, and Mr. Snow lives in that city. So that two of the three members are there, and there is likelihood that they might find it more convenient to live at Winnipeg. I am not sure that this has not something to do with the suggestion as to the desirability of having the head office at Winnipeg; and of course most of us want to live in a large and central city. I do not want to be offensive to the hon. member or even to members of the board, but that is my impression.

Mr. MALCOLM: Many of the remarks of my hon. friend are quite correct. Fort William has proved in the past a very good centre for the location of the board and the committee felt that probably there was not so much of a desire to move the board from that point to Winnipeg. The opinion prevailed, however, that Parliament should not dictate to the board in deciding where its headquarters should be. Let me assure my hon. friend that his arguments with reference to the loss of personnel in the city of Fort William are not well founded. The recommendations which the committee have made to parliament in this connection will undoubtedly result in an increased personnel of grain handlers at Fort William and will add to the population of that city.

There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman has said as to the necessity of having the board travel. That is precisely what the committee thought; the board should be a mobile body. No better suggestion could be made than that this Board of Grain Commissioners should have a private car on which to keep necessary records when they are expected to travel, even to Halifax and to Vancouver. The board should visit every port in Canada; the board should inspect terminal elevators; the board should inspect all handling facilities in the country; and, recommended by as many members of the committee, should also make a yearly trip to Europe to see what reception our grain is receiving on the European market. I appreciate the force of what my hon. friend has said: A large portion of the records will always be kept at Fort William. It would not be convenient to move them to any other place, and I believe that even if the board did decide to set up its office in Winnipeg or Calgary, Fort William would lose very little by reason of the powers we are conferring upon the board under this legislation. May I read the section to my hon. friend:

The head office of the board shall be located at such place as the board may decide, and the board may from time to time establish offices of the board at other places.

I think the committee will agree that, after giving the matter careful consideration, the special committee have introduced legislation

which will not impair the interests of the city which my hon. friend represents. After all, this legislation has been introduced on the recommendation of the committee on agriculture of this parliament. The administration of the act is under a board, and while it is true that the personnel of that board is appointed by the government which happens to be in power, it must also be remembered that the committee on agriculture, who consider this act from time to time and make recommendations to the house in relation thereto, are a non-partisan committee. The members on the government side can take no more credit for the changes proposed in the act than can the members on the other side. These are parliamentary recommendations and in my opinion it is well that this is so; because after all this is not a party question. This is one of the largest questions in the Dominion, and if the committee of the whole consider that the Board of Grain Commissioners should be free to set up offices where they choose, I do not think the remarks of my hon. friend from Fort William should be taken too seriously but that the larger issue should be considered as recommended by the committee.

Mr. MANION: I just wish to say a further word, and I shall not delay the house very long; apparently the remarks I made are not going to have very much effect. The minister mentioned that due to the enlarged functions which are given to the board there will be an increased personnel at Fort William anyway, but whether the board remains at Fort William or whether it is moved to Winnipeg that personnel will be increased if necessary; in other words, that is not to be taken as compensation to Fort William for the loss of this board.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Just what loss will there be? The board never resided there; Mr. Boyd lived at Montreal, Mr. Snow lived at Winnipeg and Mr. Robinson was kept busy attending farmers' meetings. Now there will be a commission at Fort William permanently.

Mr. MANION: The loss will be in connection with this building which the people of Fort William built at the request of the government of Canada.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The building will be there just the same.

Mr. MANION: Yes, perhaps empty.

Mr. MALCOLM: The inspection staff offices will be there.

Mr. MANION: I will admit that my friend the minister cannot move them all away from Fort William, but he is going to move quite a few of them. The minister said the records would remain largely at Fort William anyway.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, I said I agreed with my hon. friend that it might be advisable to keep many of the records at Fort William, and I think that will be the case, but all the committee is doing is leaving it to the decision of the board as to whether they desire to retain their offices at Fort William. They may desire to set up offices in Calgary and be there part of the time, or they may desire to set up offices in Vancouver and spend part of their time there.

Mr. MANION: Yes, it is quite true that the farmers say the board should be a good deal more of a travelling board than it has been in the past, but in view of the fact that the minister said in his previous remarks that these records would be left at Fort William because it would not be convenient to change them, and since a large personnel also will remain there, why change the headquarters of the board?

Mr. MALCOLM: That is not being done.

Mr. MANION: No, but it is being left to the discretion of the Board of Grain Commissioners; one commissioner lives in Winnipeg and another has put himself on record as thinking the board should be located in Winnipeg. Fort William would not have a Chinaman's chance against that sort of thing. I do not intend to fight this matter much further, because while I think I will get a good deal of support from my own party I cannot fight two-thirds of the house.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think you could.

Mr. MANION: Not very successfully. I remember that the last time I took up this matter the hon. member for Bow River was with me.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, and look at the results; much of the dissatisfaction now prevailing is due to the location of the board.

Mr. MANION: With all due respect to my hon. friend I submit that the complaints in regard to the board were not with respect to their headquarters but because they had not been travelling enough and had not seen enough of the farmers, and I am rather afraid some of the complaints were due to the quality of the wheat.

Mr. MILLAR: Is it not a fact that in 1912, when the board was established at Fort William, scarcely any grain was going through the port of Vancouver, whereas now it is a very important port? Is that not a strong reason for a change?

Mr. MANION: I do not think it is a reason for a change; I quite agree that a large amount of grain is going through Vancouver, but a very much larger amount is going through the ports of Fort William and Port Arthur. My hon. friend knows that even with the port of Vancouver in operation, Port Arthur and Fort William handle 85 per cent of all the grain.

Mr. MILLAR: Fort William is at the extreme end of the western inspection division, whereas a great deal of the grain is now moving in a westerly direction.

Mr. MANION: That is quite true. Perhaps if we were merely establishing the board now it might be decided to have their headquarters at Regina; that would be about the centre of the three prairie provinces, but that is not the question. I am pointing out that there should be something like fair dealing with a city after an agreement has been made; there should be fair dealing by a succeeding government under an agreement arrived at by a preceding government. Governments are continuous although the personnel changes, as we learned last evening in another province.

I am not going to take up any more of the time of the committee; apparently hon. members have made up their minds, but in closing again I wish to point out that while the headquarters of the board is not being absolutely changed it is being left to the discretion of the commissioners. According to the agreement between the city of Fort William and the government in power at that time, provision was made in the act that the board should be at Fort William, and under that agreement the people of Fort William put up this building.

Mr. KAY: I just want to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Bow River with reference to the residence of Commissioner Boyd. My hon. friend said Commissioner Boyd lived in Montreal, but that is not correct; his residence is in Fort William. I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to be unfair.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I intended to say that he spent most of his time in Montreal.

Mr. MANION: Why?

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Because it was his business to watch the situation there with regard to grain.

Mr. MANION: Then if one commissioner must be situated in Montreal and others must be located as far west as Regina and Calgary, I submit again that Fort William is the most central point between the two and is the most logical place for the headquarters of the board.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I agree very largely with what has been said by the hon. member for Fort William, and I have noticed some remarks which were made about Vancouver. In my opinion I do not think any of the grain which goes over the Canadian National railway westerly should go as far as Vancouver at all; I think it should stop at New Westminster, and I would like to see this matter looked into by the board. There would be a saving of one cent per bushel on all grain shipped from the Fraser river instead of from Vancouver.

My reason for making that statement is that Fort Mann, on the south side of the Fraser river across from New Westminster, is the freight terminus of the Canadian National railway, which does not enter Vancouver on its own tracks at all; for the last fifteen miles all shipments must go over the tracks of the Great Northern railway which, by the way, is an American concern. That means that grain coming over the Canadian National railway to Vancouver from Port Mann must pay first a toll on the bridge; then the cars must be switched to the Great Northern tracks, which involves a switching charge; then there is a toll to the Great Northern railway and in addition, when these cars get to Vancouver they must be switched to the Canadian Pacific tracks in order to reach the elevators. All these operations cost money, which works out to about one cent per bushel on all grain, so there is that amount of money to be saved by shipping from New Westminster instead of Vancouver. The big ships can come right to the docks at New Westminster, and there are miles and miles of desirable sites for the location of elevators along the Fraser river. As a matter of fact, with the assistance of the government one elevator has been built near New Westminster, and I hope this new grain board, when it starts to function, will look into this situation and see that something is done to recognize the advantages of the port of New Westminster.

Mr. BENNETT: We lawyers have a saying, which indeed is an old maxim, as to "the infallible justice of the crown," and in this instance it is quite clear that the crown selected Fort William as the location for the head office of the board; when I say the crown I mean the government of the day acting through parliament. It is equally true that a number of gentlemen invested their money in a building which was to be used for the head office of these grain commissioners. Should not we leave the matter as it is until the adjustments are made which will insure against any financial loss resulting from any action taken by parliament? In other words, would any harm come to anyone if we left it as it is, having regard to the fact that conditions were altered at the instance of the government of the day and when their wishes were met they were embodied in that legislation? I cannot but think that it would be a fair thing to leave the matter as it is until such time as there has been an opportunity afforded to discuss it with those interested. I was not aware of the circumstances to which the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) referred until he mentioned them to me, but they made an impression on my mind as they must upon the mind of any hon. member of this house. The head office of the organization was established at that point, and upon the strength of that establishment by this parliament certain gentlemen put their money into a building to provide facilities for a sample market and other purposes. Should we not leave this in abeyance until we deal with the whole statute and thus afford an opportunity to the persons interested to present their views? I put that to the minister, and I think he will agree that it is not sufficient to say that there will be an office at Fort William; there is a difference between a head office and an office. At the present moment the official correspondence in connection with grain matters, and the files and records are at Fort William, and to leave the decision to move the head office to the commissioners themselves would be a departure from the principle established by parliament when we asked the Fort William citizens to invest in a nonproductive building for the purposes of meeting the wishes of the country. In other words, if the country should take the head office away it certainly should not do so unless it has considered the effect of that action upon the fortunes of those who saw fit to act in this public spirited matter. That public spirit should not be dampened by any action taken at this moment. What would be the harm if we left it as it is until the act is revised and consolidated? As I understand, it is proposed to revise and consolidate the act as a whole next year?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, that is right.

Mr. BENNETT: That being so, would not it be the proper thing to leave it as it is, without change—I submit that to the minister and to the house—and then the gentlemen and interests affected will have an opportunity to study the situation and be able to deal with it when this house is in committee on the act which will be introduced next year. I think this is a matter which transcends any political view, and when we approach it we should keep in mind that old maxim of the infallible justice of the crown. In view of these circumstances, I think the minister might leave that section just as it stands, having given to the house and to those interested a clear intimation of what may happen when the matter is further considered.

Mr. MANION: I did not know that my leader was going to make the suggestions he has, in fact, I did not know that he was going to take part in the discussion at all. I appreciate what he has said, and I appreciate particularly his final suggestions. I think it is an eminently fair suggestion to allow the matter to remain in abeyance for this year, try out the new system of commissioners and the operation of the act as amended, and then if it be found to be absolutely necessary for the good of the grain trade of Canada to do this thing the city of Fort William will have been given notice that it will have an opportunity to appear and state its case.

The people of Fort William did not know, nor did I know until very recently that there was any likelihood of a change being made; it was understood that there was no likelihood of a suggestion being made in that regard at all. I think the leader of the opposition has made a fair suggestion. This is not a political matter; if it were a political matter it might be better for my purposes to have the office moved and then I could blame the government for doing that. I am not anxious for any political advantage, I only desire that the city of Fort William shall be properly treated. The people of that city have lost considerable money through this deal and they feel that they should not be mulcted of any more.

Mr. MALCOLM: I appreciate the remarks of the leader of the opposition as to there being at least a moral obligation upon the government towards certain capital interests

which are involved, but I would say that the rent paid by the Board of Grain Commissioners to the owners of this office building in Fort William is not a large rental, being only $7,480 per year.

Mr. MANION: That does not include the rental for the other grain offices.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, that is the office of the Board of Grain Commissioners. I submit that this is a question which the department or the government might recognize when it is faced with it. I realize that what the hon. leader of the opposition has said is true, that the government should not enter into a contract with private interests to erect a building for a certain purpose and then when the building has been completed and the capital invested to vacate the premises. It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Board of Grain Commissioners would be the best body to determine where their head office should be. I doubt very much if the Board of Grain Commissioners will see fit to move out of their existing offices for some time. It is not an easy matter to arrive at a decision as to what the best place will be and it is quite within the realm of possibility that the Board of Grain Commissioners will think that their records could be more conveniently kept at Fort William, although they might be spending a good portion of their time in the Calgary office, the Vancouver office or the Montreal office. The question of whether or not the records should be kept at Fort William will have to be decided by the board under this legislation.

I would submit to the hon. member for Fort William that until such time as the Board of Grain Commissioners recommend to the government that they do not require any of the space which Sir George Foster contracted for, we should not be expected to give consideration to hypothetical hardships. When it does come to that point I can assure my hon. friend that I do not believe it will be possible to give up any of the space. The work is increasing all the time and I hardly think it is fair to assume that less space is going to be required for the work of the inspection staffs and supervision staffs in Fort William. While I recognize the argument of the hon. leader of the opposition I do not think it can be used until the time actually comes when the Board of Grain Commissioners state that they do not require the space, and I hardly think that that will ever be the case.

Mr. MILLAR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member for Fort William a question in connection with this building at Fort William. The investment to which he referred was made in a building for the purpose of carrying on a sample market and although the headquarters of the board has been at Fort William for some time I understand that the stock has decreased in value to fifty cents on the dollar.

Mr. MANION: It is paying five per cent at the present time, and has been for the last three or four years.

Mr. MILLAR: I submit that poor business foresight has been shown on the part of the government as well as the citizens of Fort William. When this legislation was put into effect it was quite evident that the sample market would never amount to anything and without being offensive I would say that very poor business foresight was shown in making this investment. The result has been that money was lost in that way although the head office has been located in Fort William. The money has been lost while the board's head office has been right there. How is the removal of the head office of the board going to bring this back or affect the matter in any way?

Mr. MALCOLM: My secretary has just sent me a memorandum covering the complete payments by the department for office rental in Fort William. The rentals are as follows:

Office Rentals at Fort William

	Per month
Commissioners and secretaries' rooms	$ 275 75
The statisticians' rooms	161 59
The licensing and bonding rooms	83 00
The weighing branch	249 34
The inspection and registration branches	823 55
General manager of elevators	141 67
Total	$1,735 90

A total of $20,830.80 for the year.

Therefore I submit that with a supervision branch going into Fort William, it is very likely that the full amount of space will still be required and probably more.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for Qu'Appelle has asked: Since the money was unwisely invested anyway, what harm is there if you wipe it out altogether; in other words, if money is paying 5 per cent, why not wipe out the 5 per cent; it does not make much difference to the people. Perhaps it does not, but it makes the difference of 5 per cent. When I spoke of fifty cents on the dollar, the building had been paying nothing. Later it paid 2½ per cent and recently it has been

paying 5 per cent. It is not being used entirely for the Board of Grain Commissioners. It is a very large building and there are stores downstairs.

As regards the wisdom of doing this, the legislation was passed. As pointed out in this letter of Sir George Foster, it was intended to put it into shape as a sample market, and many people in the west still think there should have been sample markets. The farmers at that time asked for this. Is there any small city in the west that, if approached by even this Dominion government and asked to erect a building which they say they will use for offices, would refuse the same opportunity if they could raise the money? I doubt if any would, so that there was no lack of wisdom on the part of the people, except perhaps in believing that this government would carry out an agreement made by previous ones.

Mr. MILLAR: Was the mistake not in believing that a real sample market could be established by legislation?

Mr. MANION: If there was any mistake it was not that of the people of Fort William.

Mr. LADNER: I feel it my duty to protest on behalf of the people of Vancouver against the provision in the act depriving that city of the benefit of an assistant commissioner. The act specifically locates the commissioners so far as the head of the lakes, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba are concerned. It is interesting to observe the argument of the minister with respect to not fixing the location of the commissioners themselves. Vancouver is becoming year after year a greater shipping point for grain. Last year about 100,000,000 bushels passed through the port and we have or will have shortly, a storage capacity for approximately 14,000,000 bushels. With the development of the Peace River district and the increasing flow of grain from Alberta, it seems most extraordinary that by statutory provision it should be made impossible to have an assistant commissioner at Vancouver, if circumstances warrant it later on. I rise vigorously to oppose that restriction on our great seaport being definitely fixed in the statute and to urge upon the committee as well as upon the minister the advisability of applying the same principle with respect to assistant commissioners as exists with respect to commissioners or definitely establish an assistant commissioner in Vancouver.

Mr. COWAN: With regard to this subject I find myself in complete accord with the stand taken by the hon. member for Fort William. I do not intend to go over the arguments which he advanced this morning, except to say that the statement he has made in regard to the construction of the building and the representations made to the people of Fort William by the government of the day, is quite correct. The people of Fort William subscribed generously towards the construction of this building upon the distinct understanding that for all time the offices of the Board of Grain Commissioners would be established at that point. My suggestion is in line with that of the leader of the opposition, namely, that the matter should be allowed to stand until the board has had an opportunity of functioning for another year; then when the Canada Grain Act is fully and completely revised, the question can be considered whether it is advantageous to move the head office or not. There have been no complaints of a serious nature against the location of the board at Fort William. There have been complaints against the administration of the Canada Grain Act, but those complaints would have occurred whether the head office were at Fort William, Port Arthur, Regina or any other city in the west.

New commissioners are about to be appointed and I suggest that that part of the act be administered as proposed for another year and that this section be allowed to stand. Personally I would prefer that the location of the offices be left, as the present legislation provides, in the discretion of the governor in council, rather than in the discretion of the board. That is the last vestige of control which parliament has over the location of the offices. If you leave it to the discretion of the board, they may place the offices anywhere they please. It would be far better to leave the question of location to parliament rather than to the board and for another year at least the act should be administered with the amendments now proposed and the question of location held pending the final revision.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 21; Nays, 57.

Section agreed to.

Sections 7 and 8 agreed to.

On section 9—Powers and duties of assistant commissioners, and appeals.

Mr. WARD: Subsection 3 provides that there shall be an appeal to the board within fifteen days by any person dissatisfied with the decision of an assistant commissioner. Suppose there is a ruling by one of the commissioners against which I as a farmer wish to

appeal. Is there any provision made in this bill for an appeal against the ruling or decision of one of the commissioners?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, an appeal to the board is provided for.

Mr. WARD: In another section?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Sections 10 to 26 inclusive agreed to.

On section 27—Warehouse receipt.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I feel that the change in subsection 1 is not really necessary. The complaints with respect to section 150 were that the old act was not enforced, and I can hardly agree that failure to enforce the act will be overcome by an amendment to the act. Suppose that this amended act is not enforced any better than the old one; surely we are not going to relieve the situation by a still further amendment. My submission is that the whole trouble was the failure to enforce the old section 150. I realize that some of the difficulties and some of the anomalies have been cleared up, but the fact still remains that no effort was made to enforce the old section, and that was the cause of the trouble we had last year.

Section agreed to.

Sections 28 to 30 inclusive agreed to.

On section 31—Moose Jaw and Saskatoon made order points.

Mr. EVANS: I wish that we had had an opportunity to read this bill beforehand. I notice that Moose Jaw and Saskatoon are to be made inspection and car order points. I opposed this two years ago in the house, and I have seen no reason for changing my mind. There has been no demand to include Saskatoon and Moose Jaw as order points. It will certainly mean extra expense and greater delay in the handling of the crop, and it will serve no useful purpose as far as the grower of the grain is concerned. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Kindersley:

That the words "Moose Jaw and Saskatoon" in lines 7 and 8, and the words "Moose Jaw or Saskatoon" in lines 11 and 12 of section 31 be deleted.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: This section was dealt with in the committee and a vote was taken of the members of the committee then present, and there was an almost equally divided opinion in regard to this particular amendment. In the first place, it was not dealt with by the sub-committee but was referred to the main committee for consideration. In the first vote taken, the figures were 12-12. Our chairman had the right I presume to give a casting vote, but being a very modest man he did not feel like doing so, and he called for a recorded vote, which resulted 11-13. That will show to the members of the house that there was an almost equally divided opinion in the committee in regard to this particular amendment.

At the present time the inspection of cars of grain at Saskatoon or Moose Jaw is optional. Any farmer may have his grain inspected at either of these points if he so desires. I would also point out to the committee that our Saskatchewan wheat pool, who handle more than 50 per cent of the wheat of our farmers, inspect all their grain going through these two points, so that making these two points compulsory inspection points will not affect the members of the Saskatchewan wheat pool to any extent whatever. On the other hand, making these two points compulsory inspection points is going to add to the expense of handling the grain. The effect it will have will be to compel the grain companies to inspect all their grain that goes through these two points, and of course the farmers who grow the grain bear that expense. It will also add to the expense of our government inspection staff. I am not sure what that extra expenditure will be, but I got the impression in the committee that it will require an increase of approximately one-third of the present staff to handle the business if these two points are made compulsory inspection points. For these reasons I feel like supporting the amendment as proposed. Under this section the chief advantage will accrue to Saskatoon and Moose Jaw. Now, if by amending the act in this way advantage is to be gained by individual cities we are establishing a precedent, and if next session Regina, Brandon, Dauphin, or any other city sees fit to ask for a similar concession we will not be able to withstand the request. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel the amendment should commend itself to the committee and that the section should be rejected.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I wish to associate myself with the hon. members for Rosetown and Kindersley in opposition to this section. I believe it is unnecessary in the interests of the farmers. The principle on which it is based is in my opinion a vicious principle. It makes no difference to the farmers whether this section goes through or not, because at the present time any farmer can have his

grain inspected at Moose Jaw or Saskatoon if he so desires. This section would result in the railway companies being forced to provide additional trackage and engage extra employees, and the department would have to enlarge its staff. This would increase the overhead expenses of both the department and the railway companies, without giving any corresponding benefit to the farmers so far as I can see. It is simply a concession to Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, and certainly, as the hon. member for Kindersley has said, if you establish a precedent in this case then undoubtedly many other cities will ask for a similar concession—a concession that means nothing to the handling of the grain trade as a whole, but will impose a penalty on the railway companies and on the department. It may perhaps be said that we are not concerned about the extra expense entailed on the railway companies, but I submit that that is not so. At some future time we may be applying for reduced rates, or fighting a demand by the railway companies for higher rates, and on such an occasion you will find the railway companies advancing this extra expense as a reason why they should be allowed to increase their rates. For these reasons I intend to support the amendment.

Mr. VALLANCE: I notice, Mr. Chairman, that hon. members sitting in the extreme southeast corner of the house, particularly my hon. friends from Kindersley, Rosetown and Mackenzie, point out that under the existing conditions at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon the farmer has the privilege of having his grain inspected. They say the effect of this section will be to increase the cost of handling the grain. Well, we will concede that the inspection is voluntary. What would happen if all the farmers whose grain goes through those two points were to exercise that right and decide that it shall be inspected there? There is only one thing that this department could do—put in a staff to take care of the work. As long as that condition remains we must keep a staff there sufficient to look after inspection. As to increasing the cost, you are only relieving the situation at Winnipeg. As one of the representatives of the farmers west and north of Moose Jaw, while I recognize that they have the right of inspection, I feel that it should be made compulsory. As has been pointed out, every carload of grain belonging to the pool that goes through Moose Jaw is inspected there. I feel that in any case while the inspection remains voluntary the government, in order to enable the farmers to exercise that right, must retain a staff sufficient to take care of the possibility of all the farmers exercising it.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Mr. Chairman, there is one point that has not yet been covered in my opinion, and it is one of the chief reasons why we should make haste slowly in making Moose Jaw and Saskatoon compulsory inspection points. The Hudson Bay railway is nearing completion, and as soon as it is open for traffic a great deal of our grain will go out that way. That of necessity will create a rerouting of the freight that is now making its way towards Fort William. When that occurs it will be time enough to consider where we are going to make inspection points other than those we have already set up. For that reason I shall support the amendment.

Mr. DONNELLY: I have listened to the arguments of those who favour this amendment. The principal argument seems to be that no advantage would be gained by making Moose Jaw and Saskatoon compulsory inspection points. I take exception to this argument. Practically all the grain coming from that part of the country in which I live passes through Moose Jaw. If Moose Jaw were made a compulsory inspection point the grain would be inspected there and this would give the farmer time to complain if he finds he is not getting the proper grade for his grain. At present many carloads of grain pass through Moose Jaw to Winnipeg, are inspected there, and then are unloaded at Fort William. When the farmer gets word of the grade of his car of grain he has no time to make a complaint. I had that experience last year. A carload of grain was graded at Winnipeg and unloaded at Fort William, and when I got the return and asked for reinspection, I was told the car had been unloaded and that nothing could be done. Another objection taken is that the proposal would cause delay. As a matter of fact all train loads coming into Moose Jaw are broken up. Inspection would not cause any delay, for the cars remain there for some time. As has already been stated, the pool companies at present keep inspectors at Moose Jaw and do all the inspection of their grain there. I for one am in favour of inspection at Moose Jaw and am not at all concerned as to the expense the line elevators may be put to. I am not concerned about the line elevators, I am concerned in giving every advantage to the farmer. We are told about

the expense that this would put on the line elevators. Well, if they have to keep inspectors on the job that is their lookout; but it is vital that the farmer should get the advantage that I believe he will get by having compulsory inspection points at both Moose Jaw and Saskatoon.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I fail to see the logic of the argument advanced by the hon. member for Willow Bunch. He states that if grain is inspected at Moose Jaw it will give the farmer time to call for reinspection in case the grade is not satisfactory. The farmer has that right to-day. If the farmer wants the grain inspected there he can have it inspected there. That is the reason we opposed the change. Every argument the hon. member brings forward applies at the present time. There is inspection at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon but by this section we propose to make it compulsory. Now the farmer can exercise that right to-day if he wants to. But compulsory inspection of grain there would mean additional expense to both railway companies and additional expense to the department as well, without any added advantage to any of the parties, and it is simply a concession to the cities of Moose Jaw and Saskatoon.

Mr. VALLANCE: If every farmer whose grain goes through Moose Jaw exercises his right and says that his grain shall be inspected at Moose Jaw, will the department have to maintain a force large enough to carry out that inspection? We are now asking only that the staff be larger and that it be used 100 per cent to take care of all the grain going through Moose Jaw.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member is raising a hypothetical question when he asks what would happen if every farmer exercised that right. He might as well ask the civic authorities at Ottawa what they would do if all the citizens of Ottawa broke the law at once—whether they would have a police force strong enough to cope with such a situation.

Mr. DONNELLY: How many farmers in the country know that Moose Jaw is not a compulsory inspection point at the present time, and how many of them are aware that they may exercise the right of inspection there?

Mr. CAMPBELL: That is an immaterial point. The farmer soon finds out, if he wants to have his grain inspected there.

Mr. EVANS: Hon. members need not be alarmed at the supposition that all farmers will ask for this. I have tried in the last

two years to arouse some interest among the farmers west of Saskatoon in regard to this question but they have not even brought it up at any of the local meetings nor even at the convention. The only body who represented them were, I think, at one time the executive of the farmers' union in Saskatoon, but they did not have the sanction of all those whom they were representing, the rank and file back in the country; and the farmers themselves have never asked for it. The hon. member for Willow Bunch made the statement that it would be of great advantage as it would give the farmer time to complain if he were not satisfied with the grain. I have been shipping grain from Saskatchewan since the year 1896 when I shipped my first carload, and I have never had cause to complain of not having time to enter protest if I saw fit. In several cases I have done so, and I can remember at least in three cases having had the grade changed. There is no need for this extra expense, and so far as the grower is concerned it will not benefit him in any shape or form. It will only entail more expense to the grain trade, and I believe we are creating too much machinery now—rather more than is needed in several cases for the handling of grain.

Mr. DONNELLY: How many carloads do you ship a year?

Mr. EVANS: What has that to do with it?

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at one o'clock we were considering section 31, to which the hon. member for Rosetown had moved an amendment. However, we will revert to section 30, to which an amendment has been moved by Mr. Stewart (Edmonton), as follows:

The car order book and the order for a car shall be in the form D-1, in the first schedule to this act.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 31—Moose Jaw and Saskatoon made order points.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Rosetown has moved in amendment that the words "Moose Jaw and Saskatoon" in the seventh and eighth lines and the words "Moose Jaw or Saskatoon" in the eleventh and twelfth lines, be deleted.

Mr. EVANS: When the committee rose at one o'clock I was speaking with regard to the rights of the grower to have his car of wheat go forward to his own terminal. It was brought out before the Grain Inquiry Commission in Saskatoon last year that certain millers had bargains with the line companies throughout that province by which they were permitted to open cars at the divisional points and divert them to their own mills after having selected those with the highest milling value. When the manager of the Quaker Oats Company was asked if that practice was followed by his company he answered, "No, we do not consider it right."

If there is one thing that should be done in the interests of the grower it is that his car of wheat should be permitted to go forward to the markets of the world without being mixed, and the crop should not be skimmed of wheat with high milling value. World prices should be based on our best wheat instead of on the skimmed grades, and I think perhaps this is the chief reason why the farmer's wheat should go forward to his own terminal. It is very important that we should receive the highest price possible for our wheat, because under present conditions we are hardly able to carry on farming as it is. I would ask the house to consider this amendment from that point of view, having regard also to the expense and delay already mentioned.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The hon. member for Rosetown has just mentioned the diversion of cars of wheat, but this amendment really has nothing whatever to do with that matter. At present Moose Jaw is what is known as a voluntary inspection point; it was made an inspection point by order in council under section 22 of the grain act. Prior to that, in 1925-26 an amendment was moved to the grain act and unanimously adopted by this house, providing that Moose Jaw should be made a full grain inspection point, and when the government passed the order in council making Moose Jaw an inspection point under section 22 of the Canada Grain Act they thought they were making it a full grain inspection point as was intended by the amendment of 1925-26.

For about a month or so after the point was opened all grain passing throughout Moose Jaw was inspected. No farmer ever objected to that inspection; no farmers' organization ever objected, but the grain trade did take objection. A ruling was requested from the Department of Justice, and they held that to make Moose Jaw a full inspection point an amendment to the act was necessary. Therefore last year in the agricultural committee an amendment was moved to Bill No. 188, and that amendment was adopted in the committee by a vote of about two to one. My hon. friend from Kindersley said that this amendment was adopted the other day by a vote of thirteen to eleven, but I would remind him that it was passed by a vote of something like sixteen to eight in the committee last year when Bill No. 188 was being considered, but it will be remembered that this bill was withdrawn.

The present inspection service at Moose Jaw is now fully staffed and is capable of carrying on full inspection except during the very heaviest run of the grain, which is for about three months of the year. That situation could be met by putting on a few extra men. With regard to the railway companies, since this is a voluntary inspection point they have to set out certain cars from their trains and take on other cars, while with full inspection the whole train would be handled there. At all events, no complete train passes through Moose Jaw to-day; it is known as the grand divisional point of western Canada, and all freight trains are broken up in the yard and other trains are made up to continue east. The Canadian National Railways have every facility there for the inspection of all wheat coming to that point, and they have informed me that it is more of a hardship to have voluntary inspection than it would be to have full inspection. A great many farmers' organizations all over that part of the country have continually petitioned the government to make this change. The pool uses this inspection service at present to the extent of 100 per cent, and together with other members from Saskatchewan, a year ago I was told at the pool offices in Regina that due to the fact that Moose Jaw was an inspection point and they were having their grain inspected and their inspections checked there, over $200,000 had been saved to the farmers.

In this case, so far as Moose Jaw is concerned we are not asking for anything more than they have to-day in Calgary, Edmonton or Winnipeg. At Calgary and Edmonton all grain passing through is inspected, whether it is going to Vancouver or Prince Rupert or to the head of the lakes; they are compulsory inspection points. We are only asking that Moose Jaw be put in the same position as Calgary and Edmonton. Surely the province which grows the greatest amount of grain should have the same right as its sister provinces?

One hon. member in the other corner of the house mentioned the fact that this was wanted only by the people of Moose Jaw; that is not the case. It is wanted by all the farmers in that district, as all their grain goes through that point. There is no doubt that a certain amount of work will be done in Moose Jaw because all cars will be looked over when in the inspection yards and a great many leaky cars and cars needing repairs will be found, thus saving money for the farmer as well as preventing damage actions against the railway companies. Surely that would not be a detriment to the grain trade, the farmers or the railway companies.

An inspection at Moose Jaw would not mean a further inspection at Winnipeg. When the grain is inspected at Moose Jaw it passes on under a different coloured car seal and the cars are not again inspected. The only grain inspected again would be those cars of which a reinspection has been ordered. Grain going east is inspected upon arrival at Winnipeg, and it is a matter of only a few hours from Winnipeg to Fort William while it requires considerable time for the certificate to get back to the farmer in western Saskatchewan. To-day the grain is inspected in Moose Jaw, the certificate is sent right out, the shipper has it before the grain arrives at Fort William and thus he has an opportunity to call for reinspection if he so desires.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been passed upon unanimously by the house, it has been agreed to twice by the committee on agriculture, and, therefore, I think this committee should reject the amendment and adopt the section as it appears in the bill.

Amendment agreed to; yeas, 41; nays, 37.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would direct the attention of those who are responsible for the acceptance of this amendment to the fact that it will now be necessary to reconsider section 18. The section which has been amended deals with voluntary orders, but section 18 deals with the actual establishment of the inspection point.

Mr. DONNELLY: We have not been voting on the question of the inspection point at all; we voted on section 31 (a) which refers to the order point.

Mr. EVANS: I move that we reconsider section 18, dealing with the inspection point.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I object to the committee going back to section 18; it has already been passed.

[Mr. J. G. Ross.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): A motion to reconsider is always in order.

The CHAIRMAN: It would have to be by unanimous consent. Standing order 41, paragraph 318, reads:

> There is no such proceeding as a motion to reconsider a decision, in British parliamentary procedure.

It could only be by unanimous consent that we could reconsider section 18.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would point out that copies of this bill were not in the hands of the members until we started to consider it. The sections of the bill have been read off rather hurriedly, and in some cases the marginal references were not read. It has been practically impossible for the members of this committee to follow the reading of the bill and know just what each section means. I think it is only fair that reference should be made to section 18 and reconsideration given to that section in view of the fact that the sections have been passed so hurriedly.

Mr. MALCOLM: Mr. Chairman, I submit that apparently the mover of the amendment did not quite understand the meaning of the section which he moved to amend. I do not think it was the intention of the mover to strike out the order point section at all; I think he had the impression that he was striking out the compulsory inspection point. Therefore, I would suggest that we proceed with the bill and an amendment could be introduced on the third reading. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that an amendment can be introduced on the third reading without going into committee. I do not think that my hon. friend has accomplished what he intended to do by this amendment. The privileges of voluntary inspection could be restored under section 31, and then the house could amend section 18 in the regular way.

Mr. IRVINE: Would not it simplify matters if we went back to section 18 and dealt with it now, instead of taking it up on the third reading?

Mr. MALCOLM: The Chairman has ruled that we cannot revert to that section without unanimous consent, and as one member of the committee is opposed to our reverting, I think the proper way would be to proceed as has been suggested.

Mr. IRVINE: I think unanimous consent should be obtained in view of the mistake which has been made by the mover of the amendment which has been carried, and also because I do not think any hon. member

of the house would like to see a section carried which had not received the proper consideration. I suggest that those who opposed the amendment of the hon. member for Rosetown might very well give their unanimous consent to the committee in order that we might revert to this section.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think we are overlooking the fact that there is such a thing as a consequential amendment. When the committee undertakes to amend a bill in a manner different from the original trend of the measure, consequential amendments to other sections are permitted. The committee has amended section 31 and as a necessary consequence section 18 should be amended. Therefore, I submit that we do not need the unanimous consent of the committee, but that we can return to section 18 for the purpose of considering a consequential amendment.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): With regard to this matter, this has been carried through the house on one occasion and twice through the committee on agriculture unanimously. A vote was taken in the committee here a few moments ago with a small attendance and an amendment was carried. This morning, when there was a large attendance in the chamber, section 18 was carried unanimously by the committee. Now with a small attendance, certain hon. members wish to have us revert to section 18. Seeing that they have obtained a majority on the one amendment they want to try to take the other out. I do not think this is fair. If the minister wishes to bring in two amendments on the third reading, both the amendment that has been carried and the one on section 18, I will agree to that and the house can vote on the question.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): I think we are losing sight of the point under consideration and dealing wth the principle. We voted on the principle in the form of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown. That principle has been decided, and the principle should be settled now in regard to section 18 where the words appear in the same way as the principle has been settled in regard to section 31. I do not think we should carry this discussion on any further because we have already decided on the principle, and this is only a technicality in regard to changing the wording in another section of the act to conform with the principle that we have already decided.

Mr. VALLANCE: The discussion would indicate that those who were opposed to the principle contained in section 18 are agreed, because of the discussion that has just taken place on section 31, that we should revert to section 18. It is quite obvious, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Moose Jaw, why they wish to do this. I do not think it is fair to this committee, the house or the country. This matter was decided this morning and the hon. member for Moose Jaw should receive some consideration.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I have not found myself in very much discord with my hon. friend from South Battleford, certainly not in the work in connection with the agriculture committee. We found him a very amiable, interested and useful member of it, but on this occasion I must disagree with him. Neither he nor the hon. member for Moose Jaw is justified in assuming that the reason why we want to revert to section 18 is because we happen to have secured a majority on the amendment to section 31. The fact is just as the Minister of Trade and Commerce has set forth. It was not the intention of the mover of the amendment to amend section 31. He thought it referred to a compulsory inspection point. It refers, however, to an order point. His intention was to amend section 18, dealing with compulsory inspection points, and all the discussion on the amendment indicated that very clearly. I do not think either of my hon. friends is justified in suggesting that we are motivated simply because we happen to have a temporary majority in the committee or for any other reason than that we want the question cleared up as best it can be. I do not think the amendment moved in this corner of the house is a wise one, and I am willing to have it deleted from section 31. I think those points ought to be voluntary order points, but to make them compulsory inspection points is a different matter altogether.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The amendment deleting those words brings about the situation that Saskatoon and Moose Jaw cannot be order points.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is exactly what I am trying to tell my hon. friend.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I realize that, but my hon. friend says that they are dealing with a different principle, and seeing that they are a majority in the committee they want to revert to another section.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): My hon. friend is wholly incorrect. The point is merely that the will of the committee may be properly carried out. It was clearly the intention of the committee, when the amend-

ment carried, not to disestablish the order points, but to prevent the establishment of the compulsory inspection points, and that therefore we should revert to section 18 and clear that up.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we can revert, it is necessary to have unanimous consent. Unanimous consent was not given. As regards the point raised by the hon. member for South Wellington, standing order 48, subsection 399 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, states:

> After a decision has been given on an amendment to any part of a question, an earlier part cannot be amended. In like manner where an amendment of any part of a question has been proposed from the chair an earlier part cannot be amended unless the amendment so proposed be withdrawn.

I submit that on both those counts we are precluded from considering at this time an amendment to section 18.

Mr. MALCOLM: I would suggest that the mover of the amendment to section 31 withdraw his amendment, and in that case I shall be very glad to ask the committee to revert to section 18 and draft the proper section.

Mr. BENNETT: Just a moment. On the question of order, Mr. Chairman, the section that you read from the rules has no application to this at all. It refers to a question. We are dealing with various sections. When the question is put and amended, obviously the rule applies. That is not dealing with the question at all. The question which was put was: Shall we agree to the section. Then an amendment was made. When that was carried, an amendment was made to the section. But each section is a separate question and not the same question.

The CHAIRMAN: Each section is a question.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly.

Mr. MALCOLM: Can the hon. member withdraw his amendment?

Mr. EVANS: Under the circumstances I wish to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in a position to withdraw it except by unanimous consent.

Mr. IRVINE: Is it in order to move that it be rescinded?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is in order.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is pointed out to me by the clerk that the hon. member does not require unanimous consent to rescind his motion. That can be done by a majority vote. I would suggest that the hon. member move to rescind his amendment.

Mr. THORSON: How can it be in order to rescind without the unanimous consent and not be in order to revert to another section without unanimous consent?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We are still dealing with section 31. We have voted only upon the amendment, and if an hon. member, before we pass on to the next section, moves to rescind the amendment, he is quite in order in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN: We are still dealing with section 31.

Mr. IRVINE: In the event of the hon. member moving that his amendment be rescinded and that motion being carried, will the committee then be in order to return to consideration of section 18?

The CHAIRMAN: No, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. MALCOLM: Or on third reading. I might point out to my hon. friend that the clerk has just informed me that we cannot return to section 18 now except by unanimous consent, but we could have an amendment to section 18 made on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. IRVINE: If you wish to amend section 18 on the third reading, you would have to give notice of motion?

Mr. MALCOLM: No.

Mr. IRVINE: It would have to be referred back to the committee for reconsideration.

Mr. MALCOLM: Not necessarily.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 31, as amended, carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MALCOLM: I move that the amendment to section 31 be rescinded and that the section stand as drafted in the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we should not be asked to rescind the amendment unless we are assured that we are going to be permitted to refer back to section 18.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I contend that the minister's motion is quite in order. We have not yet passed from section 31. We

have merely voted on the amendment, and we are still on section 31 as the next section has not yet been called. I submit that the motion is therefore in order.

Mr. GUTHRIE: After we have just passed the amendment, you cannot under the rules move to rescind it at the same sitting of the house. We have deliberately voted on the amendment and passed it.

Mr. VALLANCE: If the contention of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is correct, the same principle applies to section 18. My hon. friend says that we cannot rescind something that we have passed. Therefore we cannot do it with respect to section 18.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As a consequential amendment, I said.

The CHAIRMAN: A motion to rescind is in order, but it cannot be put at the same sitting at which the amendment is adopted, as pointed out by my hon. friend from South Wellington.

Section as amended agreed to: Yeas, 41; Nays, 37.

Mr. CAHAN: What happened to section 31, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: It was carried as amended.

Mr. CAMPBELL: May I point out the awkward situation we have here in connection with sections 31 and 18? This has happened just because of the way the bill is being rushed through. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you read each section and give us a few moments to consider them.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the charge that the bill is being rushed through is fair to the chair. When we started to consider the bill this morning I called each section, and as no one rose to debate the sections as we proceeded I declared them carried. I think it is unfair now that we have reached almost the end of the bill that the hon. gentleman should suggest that the bill is being rushed through.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I did not intend for one moment, Mr. Chairman, to reflect on you but rather on myself and the other members of the committee because we have sat here and permitted the bill to go through in this way in the interests of the despatch of business. In view of what has happened, however, I think it would be good business to have each section read so that we may consider them for a few moments.

Sections 32 and 33 agreed to.

On section 34—Mixing grades in private elevators.

Mr. EVANS: I would ask the minister if any statutory grades will be permitted to be unloaded into private elevators?

Mr. MALCOLM: The act does not prohibit the unloading of statutory grades of grain into private elevators. It simply provides that after August 1, 1930, the mixing of statutory grades of grain either with anything else or with each other shall be prohibited, but it does not provide for the exclusion of the statutory grades from private elevators.

Mr. EVANS: I must say that I am rather disappointed at the decision of the committee to allow mixing of the commercial grades. I cannot see yet how the minister is going to prevent mixing without an undue amount of police work in all the elevators. As the statutory grades will be unloaded into private elevators, the commercial grades will be unloaded in the public terminals, and I should like to have some idea from the minister as to how he is going to prevent mixing even with a law like this on the statute books.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is admitted that when the prohibition of mixing in the statutory grades becomes effective, probably a great many of the houses will turn public. Arrangements will have to be made, as suggested by the pool officers, to use certain houses for the straight grades where no mixing is allowed, and to use other houses where grain has to be treated or cleaned and where it can be mixed in the commercial grades. The reason the committee thought it wise to defer for a year the putting this regulation into effect was just so the board could make arrangements to cover the points that my hon. friend regards as dangerous. It is proposed that these points dealing with the prohibition of mixing will be dealt with in the new draft legislation which will be submitted next session. The committee on agriculture and colonization felt there was danger from the very point my hon. friend has called attention to. Therefore a year's time was given to enable the board to work out the methods by which no mixing of the statutory grades could be brought into effect.

Section agreed to.

On section 35—Offences in connection with this part—penalties—disposal of penalties.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): I have not my draft book before me, Mr. Chairman,

but if my memory serves me correctly subsection 2 was struck out by the committee. Apparently by some mistake it has been incorporated in the bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS: That is right.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Apparently it is only a mistake on the part of those who compiled the bill.

Mr. MILLAR: That is quite clear, Mr. Chairman; subsection 2 was struck out.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I move to amend section 35 by striking out subsection 2.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 36.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by Mr. Stewart (Edmonton):

The first schedule of the said act is amended by striking out form D thereof and substituting therefor form D 1.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. MALCOLM: With the consent of the committee, I should like to revert to section 26. The wording is hardly clear. In the last two lines of subsection (1a) it says:

Provided however that this section shall come into operation on the first day of August, 1930.

I do not think that carries out the intention of the committee. It will be noted that the section deals not only with the prohibition of mixing becoming statutory on August 1, 1930, but also with the licensing of elevators. To clarify the section I propose the following amendment:

That section 26 be amended by adding at the commencement thereof the words:
"From and after the first day of August, 1930;" and by striking out the words: "providing however that this subsection shall come into operation on the first day of August, 1930."

I think this will make it clear that the whole section does not come into effect until August 1, 1930. It allows the rest of section 140 dealing with licensing of houses to stand until that date.

Mr. IRVINE: Would not the minister's amendment come better on the third reading?

Mr. MALCOLM: It is such a simple change that if the house would give unanimous consent we might clear up the point.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: How will the section read now?

[Mr. W. R. Fansher.]

Mr. MALCOLM: As amended it will read:

From and after the first day of August, 1930, subsection (1) section 140 of the said act from and including the first words thereof down to and including the word "aforesaid," in the tenth line thereof is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

I would point out to my hon. friends there is no necessity for repealing section 140 until such time as we enforce the statutory prohibition of mixing.

Mr. THORSON: I do not think that the amended form of the section makes clear the intention of the committee. It would appear that the permission to mix is withdrawn during the interval between now and August 1, 1930. I think the section would be much clearer if it were put in this form:

Private elevators when so licensed may carry on the business of mixing grain and grades of grain, provided that on and after the first day of August, 1930, there shall be no mixing of the grain of the grades mentioned and defined in section 96. . . . .

That will continue the permission to mix in the meantime and will prohibit the mixing of the classified grains from and after the first of August, 1930. I think if the section were recast as I have suggested it would make the intention of the committee clearer than does the proposed amendment.

Mr. MALCOLM: Mr. Chairman, I submit this can be made perfectly clear to the committee if I may be permitted to read the section in its amended form:

From and after the first day of August, 1930, subsection (1) of section 140 of the said act from and including the first word thereof down to and including the word "aforesaid," in the tenth line thereof is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

There would be no repeal of that part of section 140 which permits mixing until that date. Then section 140 would read:

(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this act the board shall, subject to the approval of the governor in council, make provision for licensing and regulating private elevators and to determine the conditions under which the grain handled by such elevators may be weighed and inspected. Such elevators shall in the course of their operations be bound only to observe such regulations as may be made by the board as aforesaid;

(1a) Private elevators when so licensed may carry on the business of mixing grain and grades of grain except grain of the grades mentioned and defined in section ninety-six of the act under the heading "Spring wheat" and more particularly described therein as No. 1 Manitoba hard, No. 1 Manitoba northern, No. 2 Manitoba northern and No. 3 Manitoba northern.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the section as drafted by the law officers is perfectly clear with the addition of the date at the beginning of the section. It is quite obvious that the intention of the committee is being carried out. I think my hon. friend realizes that is is simply a deferred statutory repeal. That is what it really is.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On the title.

Mr. BROWN: I should like to call the attention of the committee to what has already been under discussion with regard to sections 31 and 18. The only authority given in the report was to change subsection 2 of section 193, which reads as section 31 reads in the bill now before the house. The committee gave no authority for the change indicated in section 18, that subsection 7 of section 83 of the act should be amended by striking out the words "or Edmonton." There was no authority for that change.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): When the matter was before the committee the principle of compulsory inspection in Moose Jaw was voted on, and not the order point as suggested in the amendment. And it was carried in the committee on agriculture. The same amendment was carried once in the committee and once in the house.

Mr. MALCOLM: In reply to my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Brown) I may say that I take full responsibility for the insertion of section 18 in the bill. The committee apparently made exactly the same mistake as the hon. member for Rosetown. Members discussed the principle covered in section 18 and made a recommendation in accordance with section 31. After considering the discussion in committee the law officer of the crown suggested that we amend the section which the committee discussed. Therefore the amendment was included in the bill under section 18.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Mr. MALCOLM: Now.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to delete section 18.

Mr. MALCOLM: And to restore section 31?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. MALCOLM: I submit to the hon. member that the deletion of section 18 as well as section 31 would indeed create a hardship for the farmers of Saskatchewan who want to have grain inspected at Moose Jaw. I would point out that voluntary inspection has been practised at Moose Jaw for some years; that the railways have made certain provisions to carry out voluntary inspection; that the wheat pools have established their offices so that inspection may take place there; and that there are advantages in connection with inspection at Moose Jaw. When any shipper feels that he will not have an opportunity for re-inspection if his grain is inspected at Winnipeg. One of the advantages of inspection at Moose Jaw, as pointed out by a former member for that constituency, Mr. Hopkins, when the question was first discussed, was that a farmer who wished to appeal from a Winnipeg inspection had very little time in which to get his appeal before the board, whereas if the inspection was made at Moose Jaw and he wished to appeal, he had ample time to have the appeal made before the grain reached Fort William. I do not think my hon. friend wishes to withdraw from the farmers of the west the privileges of inspection at Moose Jaw.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I had no intention whatever of doing that.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): But you voted twice to do it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It was to change the amendment.

Mr. MALCOLM: If the hon. member would change his amendment to provide for the deletion of section 18 and the restoration of section 31, he would be doing exactly what is desired.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am quite willing to do that. I would change the amendment accordingly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROWN: May I ask, on this point, what difference there is in the situation as between Moose Jaw and Saskatoon? A good deal has been said about Moose Jaw but little about Saskatoon. The same situation

does not prevail at Saskatoon to-day as at Moose Jaw, and this is simply a move to introduce into Saskatoon the custom that has prevailed at Moose Jaw. I am opposed to the principle of introducing anything into the grain act simply for the sake of giving consideration to a certain town. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the principle of doing anything whatever that will help the producers, but I do not believe in establishing inspection points or order points for the sake of helping some particular town. I may be wrong, but I believe that for some time there has been voluntary inspection at Moose Jaw. It might possibly be well that this practice should continue, and it might also be well, now that it has become established, that it be made compulsory. On that point I do not feel strongly. But I understand that the situation in Saskatoon is somewhat different; the only inspection that takes place there is made for the sake of milling institutions established at that point. While, therefore, confirming the practice that already obtains at Moose Jaw, we are proposing to extend it to Saskatoon, and I fancy there is a little rivalry between Saskatoon and Moose Jaw: one does not want to see the other get something which it does not enjoy itself.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Surely my hon. friend will admit that the grain going into the elevator at Saskatoon is inspected at the government elevator.

Mr. BROWN: I was not perfectly clear on the situation at Saskatoon and I am willing to hear further evidence on that point. One important point in this matter is this: these inspection points seem to have been established at the demand of local interests. What, therefore, is to hinder representatives from other communities—from Weyburn, say, or Brandon, or any other of a number of points —coming along and demanding that inspection points or order points be established at these places? It is altogether too soon to establish a point at Saskatoon. The time is coming when we shall have grain shipped through Hudson bay, and in that event Saskatoon is much too far west for the inspection of grain going through that port. In my opinion the whole question has been inadequately considered from the beginning; we have rushed into the matter of establishing order points and inspection points without taking a proper view of the whole situation, and the demand of local communities have been considered rather than the situation as a whole as affecting the producers.

[Mr. Brown.]

Mr. CAHAN: Suppose section 31 stands as it is now: cannot voluntary inspection of grain take place at Saskatoon in the future as it has done in the past?

Mr. MALCOLM: I might tell my hon. friend that if section 31 stands as amended, then a farmer can order his grain inspected at either Moose Jaw or Saskatoon. There is a small inspection staff at Saskatoon and it has been represented to the inspection department that in view of the fact that grain will move via Saskatoon for the Hudson Bay line, a man should have the privilege of ordering his grain inspected at that point as well as at Moose Jaw. It has been held also, as I pointed out to my hon. friend from Rosetown, that there is often difficulty in securing enough time for appeal, when the grain is inspected at Winnipeg. It moves very rapidly to the head of the lakes and after the farmer is informed as to the grade which has been given his grain, before his request for a reinspection can be complied with the grain may be unloaded at Fort William. Therefore the privilege of primary inspection at either Saskatoon or Moose Jaw is a distinct advantage, and I would suggest to the house that making both Saskatoon and Moose Jaw order points and permitting voluntary inspection at these points can be nothing but a privilege to the producer.

The question involved in section 18, which was discussed in committee and discussed in this house, is as to whether or not it should be compulsory for all grain to be inspected there, and inasmuch as the mover of the amendment has agreed that the bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to the committee with instructions to delete section 18 and restore section 31 to its original form, I am entirely in favour of the amendment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The committee has already refused compulsory inspection at these two points, and if voluntary inspection is also denied them we will practically prohibit the use of Fort Churchill at all, after an elevator is built there, except by taking the grade with no chance of reinspection or survey. There must be some place, somewhere, to have an inspection service where a grade may be given before the grain is taken to Fort Churchill, otherwise it will go straight through without an opportunity being given for reinspection or anything else. I think that is most unfair, particularly to a province which grows about 60 per cent of the grain grown throughout all Canada.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I am under the impression that two members of the government

are not giving us a true interpretation of the actual circumstances. I am under the impression that Moose Jaw and Saskatoon have been and still are voluntary inspection points.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, that is true.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Then the amendment to section 31, deleting the words "Moose Jaw and Saskatoon" and "Moose Jaw or Saskatoon" restores section 193 of the act to exactly the same form in which it now appears, so we will continue to have Moose Jaw and Saskatoon as voluntary inspection points.

Mr. VALLANCE: Dealing with this Moose Jaw inspection point, by the very act of making it a voluntary point we imply that something can be gained by the producer by making use of this voluntary privilege; there must be something in it or we would not be using it. Representing as I do that portion of Saskatchewan to the west and north of Moose Jaw, through which comes all the wheat grown in that part of Saskatchewan, it is my opinion that this inspection should be compulsory, because those of us who have used the voluntary system have found it to our advantage to do so, and if it is good for those of us who have taken advantage of the voluntary system I do not see why it would not be good for all that portion of the country if it were made compulsory. It is the producer for whom I am concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the debate proceeds further I might say that I have received from the hon. member for Mackenzie an amended amendment. His first amendment reads:

That the bill be not now read a third time but referred back to the committee with instructions to delete section 18 therein.

The second amendment, which the hon. member desires to substitute for the first, adds the following words:

—and to restore section 31 to its original form.

The hon. member should withdraw his first amendment before submitting the second, if the house gives him permission to do so.

Is it the pleasure of the house that the hon. member shall have leave to withdraw his first amendment?

Mr. IRVINE: I want to know exactly what we are doing before this action is taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will explain to the hon. gentleman. The hon. member who moved the original amendment, moved it in the following words:

That the bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to the committee with instructions to delete section 18 therein.

Now the hon. gentleman desires to add the following words:

—and to restore section 31 to its original form.

He must first obtain permission to withdraw the original amendment.

Mr. IRVINE: I think I understand the procedure but I want to know from the minister what will happen—

Mr. SPEAKER: First of all we should settle this question.

Mr. IRVINE: If this question is settled I will not have anything to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to know from the house if the hon. member shall have leave to withdraw his first amendment.

Mr. IRVINE: I understand that but I want to know whether or not I should give him leave to do so, and that depends upon the minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the hon. gentleman can put his question.

Mr. IRVINE: I want to know from the minister whether, if the section is allowed to stand as it was amended in committee a few moments ago, that implies that compulsory inspection of wheat will be not permitted, and whether that will leave the section as it was in the original act. If that is the case, why should the first amendment be altered?

Mr. MALCOLM: For my hon. friend's information and to make it clear to the committee I think perhaps we had better take our copies of the Canada Grain Act and refer to section 193, which section 31 of Bill No. 359 proposes to amend. Section 31 is as follows:

Subsection two of section one hundred and ninety-three of the said act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

"(2) To the exetent to which any provisions of subsection one of this section are stated therein to apply to Winnipeg or St. Boniface, such provisions shall also, to the like extent, apply to Calgary, Edmonton, Fort William, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, and in every such case—

And so forth. If hon. members will turn to section 193 of the Canada Grain Act and read the privileges which are now given to Winnipeg, St. Boniface, Calgary and Edmonton, and which it is proposed to extend to Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, I think they will realize what an order point means. Section 193 is as follows:

Grain in carloads offered for shipment to points in Canada may be consigned "to be held at Winnipeg for orders" en route to its destination on the direct line of transit on the following conditions:—

(a) The shipper shall pay to the agent of the transportation company at the point of shipment the sum of three dollars per car;

(b) The shipper shall endorse upon the consignment note and shipping receipt "this car to be held at Winnipeg for orders" with the name and address of some company, firm or person resident in Winnipeg, who will accept advice from the carrier of its arrival in Winnipeg and who will give to the carrier instructions on behalf of the owner for its disposal;

(c) Twenty-four hours free time after such advice of arrival shall be allowed the advisee in which to dispose of the property;

(d) If the carrier, within the twenty-four hours free time referred to in pararaph (c), receives written directions for delivery within its Winnipeg-St. Boniface terminals, such delivery shall be made to team tracks or industrial spurs or sidings within its own terminals upon payment of the current grain rate in effect to Winnipeg or St. Boniface at the time of shipment, and surrender of the bill of lading;

(e) The carrier may, in the absence of written instructions from the advisee for the disposal of the grain within the free time mentioned in paragraph (c), forward the grain to its destination as consigned;

(f) Grain shipped "to be held at Winnipeg for orders" delivered in Winnipeg or St. Boniface, as provided in paragraph (d), may be sent forward to any point in Canada within six months of its receipt at Winnipeg or St. Boniface—

We have a government elevator at Moose Jaw and one at Saskatoon, but at present they are not order points. A farmer cannot order his grain held at either of those points, but under this amendment subsection 2 provides that they will be given the same privileges as are now extended to Winnipeg, St. Boniface, Calgary and Edmonton. The creation of an order point has nothing to do with the compulsory inspection of grain; it provides that the farmer may have the privilege of ordering a car held for diversion at a later date.

Mr. IRVINE: I thank the minister for his explanation and I withdraw my objection to the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment moved by Mr. Campbell will read:

That the bill be not now read a third time but be referred to the committee with instructions that they have power to delete section 18 and to restore section 31 to its original form.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The amendment is that they have power to do that; that does not mean that they must do that?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is an order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is parliamentary parlance; if they have the power they may or may not do it.

[Mr. Malcolm.]

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Does it compel the committee to act?

Mr. MALCOLM: With instructions.

Amendment agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 359 has been referred back to the committee with power to delete section 18 and to restore section 31 to its original form.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Mr. Chairman, I did not think that it was going to be necessary to debate this matter at any length, but this is a matter which could be discussed for hours as it is one which has been before this parliament for the past seventeen years. This matter first came before parliament during the days of the Union government. Prior to that time inspection at Moose Jaw was recommended by the then chairman of the Board of Grain Commissioners, Doctor Megill. This matter had been considered by the board on many occasions and it was brought into the house and the section was amended in 1925-26. It was passed by the house but in the break-up of parliament which occurred that year it was dropped in the Senate. On May 25, 1926, the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce stated to the press that pursuant to an order of the board, approved by the governor in council, Moose Jaw was to be made a grain inspection point. At that time the government thought that they were providing full inspection at the city of Moose Jaw for the surrounding country. On August 1, 1927, at the start of the crop year, an inspection point was established there. All grain was compulsorily inspected for thirty days, but the grain trade, through the Northwest Grain Dealers Association, objected to this inspection. No farmer, or no farmers' organization objected to this compulsory inspection, but the grain dealers were able to get a ruling from the Justice department that in order to make Moose Jaw a compulsory inspection point it would be necessary to amend section 18. In 1928 the committee on agriculture passed these amendments to Bill No. 188 by a vote of 16 to 8. The bill was then brought before the house but because the committee had not agreed to certain other sections of the act the bill was dropped in the house and did not become law. This matter was brought up again this year in the committee on agriculture and an amendment to section 18 was voted upon and carried, and it was then brought to the house.

We are asking that the farmers of Saskatchewan be given the same advantages at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon as the farmers of Al-

berta have at Calgary and Edmonton, and the same advantages as the farmers of Manitoba have at Winnipeg, and nothing more. We are asking the privilege of having our grain inspected as close as possible to the point of production.

Mr. SPENCER: There is nothing to stop you having your grain inspected at those points if you so desire.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I beg my hon. friend's pardon, but there is. When the railway companies find that it is inconvenient to set out a car to be inspected they pull the grain right on through. That has been done repeatedly and although orders have been given to have the grain inspected at those points, the railroad companies have not carried them out.

Mr. RALSTON: I think the committee should proceed regularly; is there a motion before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: No, there is no motion before the committee.

Mr. RALSTON: Should not there be a motion so that we may proceed regularly? This bill has been referred to the committee advising the committee that it has power to delete section 18 and restore section 31, but no motion has been made to that effect.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I beg to move:

That section 18 be deleted from the bill and that section 31 be restored.

Mr. MALCOLM: May I suggest to my hon. friend that it might be advisable to make two motions rather than one. If he wishes to move the deletion of section 18 first, that would be quite in order, or if he wishes to move the restoration of section 31, that would be quite in order. But I suggest that he should permit members who are in favour of the deletion of section 18 to vote on that point and those who are in favour of the restoration of section 31 to vote on that. Under a double motion it is difficult to get a proper vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I ask unanimous consent to the withdrawal of my motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I beg to move:

That section 18 be deleted.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Before the interruption I was discussing the question of inspection in Saskatchewan. The hon. member for Mackenzie appears to be a great deal more exercised over the rights of certain grain men such as the Northwest Grain Dealers' Association than he is over the rights of the farmers of Saskatchewan. Compulsory inspection at Moose Jaw is for the benefit of the farmer, has been asked for by the farmer and has been objected to by nobody but the organized grain trade, not including the pools. The pools have asked for inspection there; in fact, they have used inspection there to the extent of 100 per cent. Every car of theirs that goes through Moose Jaw is inspected there at the present time.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If the pools are using it to the extent of 100 per cent, what is my hon. friend objecting to?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): There are in Saskatchewan, besides the pool, other farmers whom I represent and whom probably my hon. friend does also.

Mr. CAMPBELL: All those farmers have the privilege of having their grain inspected.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): They have the privilege, but they are not taking advantage of it at the present time.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The only thing is that they are not compelled to do so at the present time.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): All I am asking for is compulsion.

Mr. COOTE: One hundred per cent.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The pools have this 100 per cent inspection in Moose Jaw. I may say to the hon. member for Macleod that that includes his Alberta grain as well. In Moose Jaw grain from the Saskatchewan pool as well as grain from the Alberta pool is inspected. A great deal of money has been saved in this way to the farmers of Saskatchewan, according to the statement given to us by the executive of the pool at Regina. No doubt a great deal of money has also been saved to the farmers of Alberta for the same reason. Still my hon. friends object to this proposition although the pools are in favour of it and the organized trade or the Northwest Grain Dealers' Association are against it. No farmer has ever made any objection unless it be my hon. friends in the house.

The question in section 18 is compulsory inspection. The question in section 31 is car order. They are two different propositions. The car order point gives the man an opportunity of having his grain routed from the order point to any terminal that he wants

it ordered to. Once that grain arrives in Moose Jaw, if it is an order point, he will be able to order it to Vancouver, Fort William, Minneapolis or Fort Churchill. That certainly should be an advantage to the farmer in the province of Saskatchewan. The farmers from all over southern, central and north central Saskatchewan, as well as the farmers of eastern Alberta, have asked for this for many years. Some of the members in that corner of the house, before I had the privilege of representing my constituency in parliament, went to the then Minister of Trade and Commerce and asked that this be done. Among them were the hon. member for Red Deer, the hon. member for Swift Current and several others at that time in the Progressive group. This matter has been agreed to by the Conservative, Liberal and Progressive parties.

Mr. GARDINER: No.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): It has been passed by the House of Commons. My hon. friend must know that fifteen members of his party formed a committee in 1924 and went to the then Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to this matter.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend forgets that the whole house and the government had agreed to my amendment before it was voted on this morning, yet my hon. friend voted against it this morning.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): My hon. friend will probably vote against me this afternoon.

Mr. MANION: I intend to do so.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Seeing that all parties in the house and the government have agreed to this, I think it should pass and the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry that section 18 be deleted?

Amendment agreed to; Yeas, 49; Nays, 45.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I rise to a point of order. Seven hon. members came in during the progress of the vote. They were not in the chamber when the question was put. Have they a right to vote?

The CHAIRMAN: They have a right to vote in committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that in committee we have the right to do that. I was here when the motion was put.

[Mr. J. G. Ross.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not refer to my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was here when the motion was put.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. gentlemen have the right to enter the chamber and vote when we are in committee.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I beg to move that section 31 of the bill be restored to its original form.

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DOMINION GRESHAM GUARANTEE AND CASUALTY COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston City): I would draw the attention of the government to the second report to the policyholders and creditors of the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company, now in liquidation, and ask if any steps are being taken to reimburse those agents who according to the suggestion reinsured all policyholders under this company?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not here at the moment, but I shall bring the question of my hon. friend to his attention so that he may give him an answer.

ELIGIBILITY OF WOMEN TO SIT IN THE SENATE

On the orders of the day:

Miss AGNES MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): I would ask the government what explanation they have to offer of an editorial which appears in this morning's Ottawa Journal which states that the Hon. Lucien Cannon is going over to England to represent the government and appear in opposition to the appeal to the privy council from the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of Canada last year that women are not eligible for appointment to the Canadian Senate.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Shame!

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): As my hon. friend from Southeast Grey knows, this is an appeal from the judgment given by the supreme court on a reference that was made to the court in order to

clear up that point. The Department of Justice has given a ruling which dates back to many years before I had anything to do with the department, and this question is now before the court for a decision on a reference by the Attorney General of Canada. Of course, the Attorney General of Canada must be represented before the court. The women of Canada who are interested in the matter will have their representatives there, and the Solicitor General will have to be present in order to see that justice is done. I do not think he will be so aggressive as the Journal seems to suggest. I may tell my hon. friend that so far as I am concerned I am in sympathy with her views in the matter, and if the judgment of the court is antagonistic to those views I am willing to do my part to change the constitution.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why don't you go over there in his place?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend must see that I am quite busy here answering questions.

Mr. POULIOT: I would suggest that the first appointee of the government, in case the judgment of the supreme court is reversed, should be our charming colleague the member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail).

LUNCHEON HOUR IN DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. E. KAISER (Ontario): May I draw the attention of the Secretary of State to regulation 89 of the Civil Service Commission which provides that one and one-half hours shall be allowed daily to the civil servants for luncheon, from 12.30 p.m. to 2 p.m. During those hours nobody is left in any of the departmental offices. This is not the case in other countries. At Washington, for instance, the regulations distinctly provide that no departmental office shall be left during the luncheon hour without someone in it to attend to telephone messages and other inquiries. That is also the practice in every large business office in this country. Those are now the only hours at which the members can do business with the departments, and I think someone should be on duty in these offices during the luncheon hour.

CALGARY FLOOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that a short time ago I presented to the department a telegram from the city of Calgary urging the pressing necessity of assistance being given in connection with the washing away of the government's boulevard and other city property by the recent flood. May I ask what the government is going to do about it?

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): My hon. friend was kind enough to bring to my attention the telegram which he had received. The matter is not without its difficulties, but it is receiving very serious consideration by officials of the department.

PROPOSED CHIGNECTO CANAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT K. SMITH (Cumberland): I should like to ask the acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Robb) or the government, or some member of the government, when the Department of Railways and Canals intend to commence their surveys and investigations into the proposed canal across the isthmus of Chignecto. By a resolution, adopted many months ago, the house unanimously concurred in this matter. The season for engineering work is rapidly passing, and the citizens of eastern Canada are uneasy over the prolonged delay, as indicated by a resolution of the associated boards of trade of Cumberland county, passed at a meeting held at Amherst on June 4 last, urging immediate action and asking that the promise made in this house be implemented without further delay, copies of said resolution having been forwarded to three ministers of the crown, myself and others.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I will call my hon. friend's question to the attention of the acting minister.

WAR REPARATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. K. LADNER (Vancouver South): May I ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret) when it is the intention of the government to pay the reparations claims?

Hon. FERNAND RINFRET (Secretary of State): As soon as the supplementary estimates are voted the department will undertake to pay the claims.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William): I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan) in the house. Could he tell me when the estimates for his department will come down?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I am afraid they cannot come down before Monday.

Mr. MANION: Thanks. I saw the Minister of Labour in the house and I wanted to know when we might expect his estimates.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

National revenue—salaries, $745,840; contingencies, $60,000.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, I notice this vote represents an increase of $46,970 as compared with the vote for last year. I am at a loss to know why the expenses of the department should be increasing in view of the fact that the royal commission on customs and excise recommended a decrease in the number of ports, outports and preventive stations. I find the following on page 18 of the report:

> The evidence discloses that at the close of the fiscal year March 31, 1926, there were in Canada 148 ports, 358 out-ports, 219 preventive stations, and 48 post offices where revenue was collected, making a grand total of 773, or excluding the post offices, 725.

In the next clause the commission state:

> In our view, this number is unnecessarily large and might be very materially reduced without detriment to the public service or any inconvenience to business interests.

Further on will be found the following:

> The reduction in the number of ports would to a considerable extent centralize the appraisal work and place it in the hands of competent appraisers, to the great advantage of the revenue.

The royal commission, after a thorough investigation, tell us that if the number of ports were reduced there would be no detriment to the public service, no inconvenience to the business interests, and there would be a great advantage to the revenue. I do not know whether the department has carried out this recommendation or not. If it has been carried out, and the number of ports has been reduced, then I fail to see any justification for the increase of $46,970. I presume the minister will have some explanation in reference to this point.

I desire also for a few minutes to deal with the matter of the clearance of liquor-laden vessels destined for the United States. In the debate on this subject which took place several days ago five members from this corner of the house were unanimous in their opposition to the granting of clearance to such vessels. Some of the facts adduced by the minister tended to give a rather misleading impression because some other facts in relation thereto were not stated. In general, his address might be summed up as more or less tolerating the clearance of liquor-laden vessels to the United States. One member from the subgroup on the government side also took part in that debate, and while he did not condone the clearance of such vessels he did not come out very strongly in opposition to the practice. He seemed to censure the United States for not doing all they might do. I was rather struck by the very mild tone of the speech made by the one member of the official opposition who participated in that debate. It was very much in contrast with the speech he made some three years ago on the administration of the customs department. He did not exhibit nearly the same force and vim in declaring his disapprobation of the practice of the government at this time as he did on the former occasion.

Now, the Minister of National Revenue has stated, and I think he was quite fair, that the United States government asked the Canadian government to discontinue sending reports of vessels when they were ready to clear from this side for the American side. I think that was the statement made, or something to that effect.

Mr. EULER: Only at one point, Windsor.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Well, it is quite clear from the treaty passed in 1924 that such information could be given to the American government by our government; but we must also bear in mind that that information was given at the expense of the receiving government. The information was given by tele-

phone or telegram at the expense of the receiving government, the United States paying for the cost. It would look as though their asking to discontinue the submission of such information was very damaging evidence against them. But this is the point that the minister failed to make clear to the committee: It was brought out in the conference held in Ottawa last January that in five thousand cases information had been given to the American authorities, and an investigation having been made into the said cases it was found that the names of vessels given were fictitious, the names of the owners of the vessels were fictitious, and the addresses of such owners did not exist. In five thousand cases of information sent across it was absolutely false, not because our Canadian authorities purposely sent false information but because the rum runners gave such false information to the Canadian authorities, who had no alternative except to send the information to the American authorities at the latter's expense. Can we find any fault with the American authorities for asking that such information be henceforth dispensed with? It meant an expense to them and was absolutely valueless from the standpoint of doing anything to curtail the rum running business.

Another point was mentioned by the minister, and I think perhaps he was fair in his statement. That was to the effect that not more than from 2 to 5 per cent of the liquor used in the United States was of Canadian origin. That assertion, I believe, was based on a statement made by General Andrews, who was in charge of prohibition in the United States during the year 1926. His statement was, I believe, that not more than from 5 to 10 per cent of the total liquor was of Canadian origin. Then Major Mills, who was formerly in charge of prohibition enforcement in New York, stated that 98 per cent of the supply in the United States was produced within the borders of that country. So that I do not question the minister's statement in view of these statements made by these two gentlemen.

There is a further statement which I should like to give to the house, and this also was brought out at the conference held in Ottawa last January. The statement was made by Mr. Doran, who is now Commissioner of Prohibition in the United States, that in eighteen laboratories in the United States, 100,000 samples of seized liquor were examined in an effort to determine the origin of the liquor in such samples. I am neither chemist nor scientist enough to know how they arrived at their conclusions as to the origin of the liquor in these samples, but I have their conclusions as given at that conference, and they stated that in the great lakes and Detroit section not over 2 per cent of the liquor in these samples related back to the industrial alcohol and other forms of control liquor in the United States. And in the New England states, in New York, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and in such places the figure was not more than from 10 to 15 per cent. The statement was further made that in the southwest section of the country the percentage was quite negligible. That is almost a direct contradiction of the statements made by these two other American gentlemen some years ago, General Andrews and Major Mills. I am putting this statement on record because it is just as valuable, made by a prohibition officer of the present day, as the statements made by prohibition officers of a previous year.

There was another statement made by the minister to the effect that the American efforts to curtail rum running were not very pronounced; that is to say, they seemed more or less to tolerate the situation as it exists. Judging from the evidence given at the conference in Ottawa, it would appear that they have been putting forth a strenuous effort. For instance, I have before me the figures in regard to the seizures that were made in the six months beginning July 1 and ending December 31, 1928. The seizures made by the American customs officers in connection with illegal shipments into the United States were these: During that six month period there were 117 boats seized; 375 automobiles; 46,076 cases of beer; 4,576 cases of whiskey. The total number of seizures in that period was 2,283. I have also the figures for the two fiscal years ended June 30, 1928. During that two year period there were 634 boats seized; 964 automobiles carrying liquor from boats on the American side; 46,594 cases of beer; 6,644 barrels of beer and 16,360 cases of whiskey.

In view of these figures it would seem that our American friends have been making a considerable effort to curtail the rum running business from Canada over to the United States.

The minister rightly stated that a good deal had been done by the Canadian officials to curtail at least the rum running business. He told us that the export docks along the

Windsor frontier had been reduced from forty to ten. That, perhaps, will curtail the business; at least, it will keep it within a narrower channel so that it may be more easily checked. I am not so sure that it will curtail actual shipments to any great extent. The minister also outlined the restrictions with regard to bonded warehouses, which warehouses are to disappear entirely on June 11, 1930. No doubt that will have a salutory effect on the shipment of such cargoes. He pointed out also—or someone in debate pointed out—that the treaty negotiated to permit seizure within the twelve mile limit had a very beneficial effect. And by the way, I believe it came out in the conference in Ottawa that the effect of that treaty was almost entirely to eliminate rum running along the great lakes and along the seaboard. The conference held in Ottawa, to which I have made reference, was a means of airing the differences between the two countries, and while an agreement was not reached, yet perhaps we are safe in saying that some ground has been gained. But in spite of all the efforts that have been made, in spite of the conference that has been held, the business seems to be flourishing. For the year ended March 31, 1926 the value of liquor exported to the United States, upon which duty was paid, was $12,572,011. For the year ending March 31, 1928, the value was $18,380,070, showing an increase of over 46 per cent, and that represents only the liquor on which duty has been paid; it is quite possible that a considerable quantity got across without paying duty. We also know from the debate which took place a few days ago that the government has collected through the excise tax of $9 per gallon a total of $7,800,000, and perhaps that has a considerable bearing on the attitude of the government towards this business. I am not going to make the statement that it has or has not any bearing, but it is quite possible.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I understood my hon. friend to say a moment ago that some liquor might have gone across the border without duty being paid. Would he suggest how that could happen?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I said it was quite possible that some might have gotten over without the duty being paid. No doubt we have stills manufacturing liquor, in addition to the licensed distilleries.

[Mr. Carmichael.]

Mr. EULER: They would not pay duty anyway.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: But liquor would get across without duty being paid. Perhaps our friends in eastern Canada are so much against such an evil that they may not have stills, but I know we have had stills in western Canada which made liquor illegally.

To give my own personal point of view in regard to this matter I may state that I do not hold that Carrie Nation view which was exemplified several years ago in the United States; I am not one of those ardent prohibitionists who think if you look at liquor, smell liquor, handle liquor or even taste liquor you are going to eternal perdition. I do not hold any such views at all, but I do hold that the whole business is an evil tree which does not bear good fruit, I care not where it is carried on or by whom; its influence is not good. Therefore I take this opportunity of registering my protest against the practice of our Canadian government in more or less tolerating the business; I would not say we encourage it but certainly the government does tolerate it and I want to protest very definitely against that state of affairs.

The viewpoint of the United States, of course, is that they can be helped very considerably if our government will refuse clearance to these vessels, and I do not look upon that as being an unreasonable request. I am of the opinion that perhaps the Americans themselves could go a step further than they have gone as yet. I hold no brief for them; I do not say they have done all they can do; I am of the opinion that they could do very much more, and rather agree with the opinion advanced by our Canadian delegates to the conference here in Ottawa some time ago, which was to the effect that if the Americans would require registry of all vessels of every size and tonnage, that would help a great deal in curtailing the rum running business. Then they would be able to check up all their own vessels. I believe it came out at that conference that practically 100 per cent of the vessels in the business were owned by Americans.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to ask if it has not been stated within the last few days that all these vessels are registered, just as automobiles are registered. If I might make an interjection, I would venture to

say that if this is the case the argument to which my hon. friend is alluding has been very much over-emphasized.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I am not sure whether the hon. member expects the minister to answer now; I presume he will deal with that point later. The evidence brought out last January, however, was to the effect that at present vessels of five tons or under are not registered, and the reason advanced by the American delegates to that conference as to why this was not done was that such registry would interfere to a large extent with small pleasure boats which were running back and forth. I do not attach much weight to that argument; in view of the fact that our government requires the registry of all Canadian vessels of all sizes, I see no reason why the American government could not adopt the same practice. Then we had a number of petitions presented to this house this session in connection with this question; I have not taken time to count them but I am sure there were scores and perhaps hundreds sent in. As a matter of fact the minister himself presented petitions from different organizations calling upon the government to refuse clearance to vessels laden with liquor for the United States, but I noticed that every time he presented such a petition he had a smile on his face.

It was stated during the course of the last debate on this subject that the report of the customs committee recommended the refusal of clearances to these vessels. The royal commission, in its report, concurred in the report of the customs committee and stated that smuggling could be considerably curtailed if these clearances were refused. I think it was also stated that the Prime Minister of this country, during his election campaign of 1926, stated that he was prepared to carry out the recommendations of the royal commission to the limit. I think perhaps he obtained a great many votes in Ontario because of that declaration and I have wondered just how many of these votes he will retain in view of the fact that he has failed to carry out what evidently was a very definite pledge to the electors of Ontario.

I am of the opinion that Canada would not lower herself nationally or internationally if she were to take the attitude that this business should be curtailed so far as officialdom can do it. By so doing Canada certainly would be discouraging a business which is not beneficial to the country beyond the small revenue derived from it. If we were to place on the other side of the scale the evils which come from the class of people engaged in this business who frequent our borders and get over into Canada, such people as smugglers, gangsters, rum runners, hi-jackers and racketeers—

Mr. SPENCER: What is a hi-jacker?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I will have to consult a dictionary; one hon. member has suggested that he is a bad actor anyway, and I will take it for granted that he is a bad actor who is in the business for the money he may get out of it. We have such people, as well as murderers, flourishing along our borders like the proverbial green bay tree. Surely this is not a business of which our country is proud; surely after all that old Biblical statement, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches," stands good to-day just as it did when it was made. That holds good for the individual as well; the individual who goes out after great riches may get them, but if he loses his good name what has he left? He has a few paltry dollars, but what good are they? The same applies to a nation, and we should take some pride in our good name. I used to take pride in the good name of Canada but I feel ashamed when I am approached and written to by individuals living in the United States who throw it up to me that we, the legislators of Canada, allow such a business to be carried on. I feel ashamed when I think of myself as being one of the legislators of this Dominion of Canada.

I take this opportunity, therefore, to register my very decided protest against this whole business. The whole business is bad and no good will come from it. The few million dollars of revenue which we obtain from it may look rather enticing, and perhaps it is enticing to the government, but I am rather of the opinion that if we did away with the business and curtailed the rough element of mankind which is flourishing along our borders, we would be moving a step forward in the retention of our good name; we would be washing our national hands clean of the whole business. The government asked for a full discussion on this matter, and I would like to urge upon them that they reconsider it. I would like to see the Americans required to register every vessel and I would like to see our Canadian government refuse a clearance to any vessel laden with liquor for the United States.

Mr. COOTE: The practice of granting clearance papers to ships engaged in smuggling liquor to the United States was discussed in this house a couple of weeks ago, but I did

not have an opportunity at that time of taking part in the debate, and I desire to take advantage of this vote to say a few words in regard to this matter. I do not want to approach the subject from the point of view of the United States, but desire simply to keep in mind the effect which this practice has upon the people of Canada. In my opinion, the smuggling of liquor is a dirty, low-down, nefarious business. The practice is made easy because we grant clearance papers to the boats engaged in the smuggling of liquor. We encourage the location in Canada of a lawless element which is a distinct liability to this country, a class of people who would kill for money, a class of people very well described in those excellent articles which appeared last winter in MacLean's Magazine. It seems to me that the practice of granting clearance papers to these ships is carried on largely for the benefit of the brewers and distillers of Canada, many of whom in past years evaded every tax which they possibly could and, in some cases, when their books were required by a royal commission, they were destroyed.

I was disappointed at the position which the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) took some days ago. He suggested that we should not stop granting these clearances to these rum runners because the United States preventive officers were not doing all they should to apprehend the law breakers. He told of how the Canadian officers notified the United States officers whenever clearence papers were granted and the boat was about to sail, and I could not help but think that it must be very interesting indeed to those Canadian customs authorities to watch the liquor smugglers dodge the American officers as well as the officers of the Ontario government. The very fact that we do notify those authorities would lead one to believe that it is an improper thing for the government to grant clearances to the boats.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is in the treaty; that was in the agreement.

Mr. COOTE: The minister said that he had limited the number of docks at which clearances would be granted, and he seemed to think that that was an improvement. I could not help thinking how much better it would be for us to prohibit clearances at all docks. The minister suggested that if we should stop granting these clearances liquor would be smuggled out of the country anyway, but that seems to be taking it for granted that the distillers, brewers and bootleggers would defy the government of the country, and that seems to me to be the wrong attitude for us to take. I do not think the minister would suggest that we should repeal the law governing the importation and sale of narcotic drugs because a lot of men engaged in that business would not obey the law. The minister read a report made by one of his officers to the effect that no effort was being made by the United States preventive officers to apprehend these smugglers at one of their ports, but it is hard to harmonize that statement with the action of American officers in firing on Canadian boats and at times wounding not only the men engaged in the traffic but innocent parties as well.

Mr. EULER: I did not say that they made no effort whatever.

Mr. COOTE: Possibly I should correct that and say that the minister had said that they made very little effort. However, I gathered the impression from his remarks that they were making no effort. Only a few days ago the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) made rather a long speech in which he complained about the actions of one of the United States patrol boats; that they were too zealous in performing their duty—the notorious I'm Alone case. The minister also said that he was more interested in stopping smuggling into Canada than in preventing the smuggling of liquor into the United States. It would seem to me that this granting of clearances encourages smuggling into Canada; it encourages the location in Canada of a class of men who will not hesitate to smuggle goods into Canada if they can make a dollar out of it; it encourages the location in Canada of people of the very worst type; it brings into Canada a class of people who would not hesitate to commit murder if there was sufficient money in it. This whole business is bound to have a demoralizing effect upon the people living in the areas from which the exportation of liquor is being carried on, and we are encouraging the formation in certain parts of Canada of a gangster element such as they have in Chicago. I think it is time we stopped giving official cognizance to this whole nefarious business.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the minister give us some information about the correspondence which passed between his department and the American officials with reference to the discontinuance of notice to the collector of customs at Detroit?

Mr. EULER: I have not the correspondence here, but it came from one of the officials of the Department of the Secretary of State, asking that we discontinue telephoning in-

formation that clearances had been granted at Windsor. We fell in line with that request, but I can assure my hon. friend that it was perfectly formal. It was not made by the collector at Detroit, it was made by a representative of the American government.

Mr. CAMPBELL: When the minister was speaking a few days ago he gave the impression to the house and to the country that the American authorities were not very much concerned as to whether or not the information was received. Is it not a fact that before that time there was considerable correspondence between the two governments with regard to the proper indentification of these boats, and it was only when the department refused to grant the American requests and properly identify the boats, that they asked for the discontinuance of the giving of this information? Without the identification the information was useless.

Mr. EULER: I am very glad that the hon. member mentioned that matter. I have read of the same thing elsewhere, that the Department of National Revenue refused to give certain information which was asked for by the American authorities, and I desire to deny that absolutely. I will give my hon. friend information as to what we did. Under the treaty we were obligated to give certain information, and I will read the circular which was sent out by the Deputy Minister of Customs and Excise. It is dated October 30, 1926, and I may say that was very shortly before I took office. It reads:

> Memorandum No. 63.
> Additional instructions. When furnishing information with regard to vessels as provided in the above named treaty and regulations thereon, you are instructed to have such information include as far as possible the following:
> (1) Name of vessel.
> (2) Nationality of vessel.
> (3) Name and residence of master.
> (4) Registry or license number of vessel.
> (5) Kind of vessel.
> (6) Description of the vessel sufficiently correct to enable its identification.
> (7) Time of clearing.

Those were the instructions that were sent out, and as far as I know they were faithfully carried out until at Windsor we were requested to discontinue giving that information. We sent out a further circular under date of June 20, 1927, to all the collectors as follows:

> You are requested, when supplying information to United States officers under the above treaty, either by way of advance or immediate information or periodical reports to wherever possible include the particulars set out in supplement F to memorandum No. 63. This should be carefully observed.

That was very faithfully carried out. It is on record and I suppose my hon. friend has read the evidence of what took place at the conference between the officials of the two countries where our United States friends made the following statement. Admiral Billard, who led the United States delegation said:

> This treaty, as we all know, has not accomplished the purpose for which it was designed. In this regard, however, may I be permitted to add that Canada has fully and faithfully discharged the obligations which she assumed under the present treaty. The fact that the treaty has not tended to curb smuggling activities can in no wise be attributed to any failure on the part of your officials to perform their duties under the treaty.

If the United States authorities felt that our officers were not giving all the information that it was possible to give, why did they not accept the offer of the Canadian government to permit United States officials to come on the Canadian docks and send the reports themselves? They declined that offer.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am more tired than I can very well express at having to listen in the house to pussyfooting talk of this kind in regard to the subject under discussion. Surely the people of the United States are able to look after their own affairs without any assistance from us. They admit that practically ninety-seven per cent of the liquor consumed in the United States is brought in by their own people or produced in their own country; the small amount which they claim is brought in from Canada is but 2 per cent.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask where that admission is made?

Mr. CANTLEY: I am sorry that I cannot hear my hon. friend and it does not make any great difference, as I propose to go on with my speech. Within the last three years a delegation from this parliament went over to one of the principal cities of the state of New York, and I see here some of the gentlemen who accompanied me on that occasion. We were entertained there by the mayor of the city, also by the chief of the fire department. Some of my friends whom I see before be now were regaled there with imported liquor, Johnny Walker whiskey, and other potent stimulants, dispensed by the mayor and other officials of that city.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The hon. member is looking at me and I deny the charge.

Mr. CANTLEY: It does not make any particular difference to my argument whether my hon. friend denies it or not. Further, I was not looking at him. I see an hon. gentle-

man in front of me who was there. That, however, is not the point. The point is that ninety per cent of the people of the United States have no intention of enforcing and do not want to enforce their own legislation. That is the real fact of the matter and I am rather tired of hearing in the house statements which in my opinion should not be made. Let the United States people skin their own skunk and enforce their own legislation. If they want restrictive laws of that character, let them enforce them. We have no obligation. We have gone far out of our way to demean ourselves in connection with enforcement of their legislation, which if they really want they cannot expect Canada to enforce. The statement made by the Minister of National Revenue the other day should have convinced any reasonable member that the government had taken every step they could in fairness or by way of international courtesy be called upon to take. Indeed I think they went perhaps too far in their efforts to aid people to enforce laws, many of whom say themselves they do not want enforced. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the minister to a matter to which I referred a year or perhaps two years ago, namely, the publication containing the customs tariff. I have under my hand a book of 300 odd pages. The index, instead of being printed at the beginning or at the end as in almost any other book, extends from page 129 to page 154. This publication is intitled "Office Consolidation". It is anything but a consolidation. It has been in use for twenty-one or perhaps twenty-three years. It contains appendices to the number of something like forty or fifty. There are in it schedules "A", "B", "C", "D", and I do not know how many more. There are in it items which come under two different tariff classifications and it is impossible for the ordinary man to tell under which classification some of the items come. It is a publication of which the government should be absolutely ashamed. Two years ago I appealed to the minister and also to the Minister of Finance to have some improvement made, and I remember very distinctly that they agreed with me and it was understood that some improvement would be made. There have been some slight changes made, but it is not a publication with which the government should be in any way satisfied. I appeal to the minister to have prepared a book setting forth the tariff schedules in such a way that the ordinary man can read and understand them and can see in a few minutes what the duty is on any item and the regulations in regard to it. Such a tariff is published by other countries and conditions in this country differ in no particular way from theirs. I would appeal to the minister to prepare a tariff publication properly arranged and indexed and as will be a credit to the government and the minister at the head of the department at the moment.

[Mr. Cantley.]

Mr. EVANS: I do not think I would have spoken on this question had it not been for the impression the minister gave to the country the other day. Although it might be said that a good deal is being done, and we are doing what we can to aid the United States in the enforcement of their own laws, I do not agree with the hon. member for Pictou when he calls this kind of talk "pussyfooting." In fact, I am very glad to see, judging from the petitions that have been presented to the house from all parts of the country, that the conscience of the people is being aroused in regard to this matter. The United States have taken steps by means of a prohibition law to stamp out the liquor evil and I believe it is time Canada did the same thing. The liquor traffic is considered to be harmful even to health. During the war time we took steps to curb that evil. Since then, we have provincially tried to control the traffic, but we must admit that the result has been practically that the traffic has controlled the different governments. I think it is also true that our provincial administration of liquor laws has made prohibition in the United States very difficult to enforce. To-day we are up against a situation that calls for drastic measures. We are allowing the manufacture of the stuff, and its distribution is carried on by provincial governments. This government gives clearance to craft engaged in defying the laws of the United States. This is a difficult position to be in. The question has a moral as well as a financial side. When we give clearance to these rum-runners smuggling liquor into a country with a prohibition law we give practically a legal standing to the illicit traffic, and Canada as a nation is put in a most humiliating position as a law-breaker. At the same time we are one of the most vigorous members of the League of Nations. That is not a consistent position to occupy. I say again that it is an immoral act, and makes us all partners in what I term and what the hon. member for Southeast Grey has called a dirty business. The Minister of National Revenue says that the stuff will be imported into the United States anyway, and so far as I could gather from his argument the profits override any moral issue in which as a nation we become involved.

Mr. EULER: Will the hon. gentleman quote anything I said that will bear out that statement? What he says is absolutely wrong.

Mr. EVANS: I have not the minister's speech in front of me.

Mr. EULER: You will find nothing of the kind in it.

Mr. EVANS: There was the money question and what we were making out of it.

Mr. EULER: I never even mentioned the revenue that we had from it.

Mr. EVANS: I can remember figures being given.

Mr. EULER: I did not quote any such figures.

Mr. EVANS: There is one thing certain, that this house was given to understand that as the traffic will be carried on illegally, we might as well give clearance to these vessels and make it legal for them, and then nobody will be breaking the law. I am sorry to say that the Prime Minister himself was silent when this question was under debate in the house before, but perhaps we shall hear something from him yet. It is easy to understand from the attitude taken in this house and by the government why newspapers all over the country lauded the crew of the I'm Alone as heroes.

I want to ask, where do we stand on this question? Is it right to make this rum-running business a national undertaking, or is it not? Is Canada to follow the ideal that a Christian nation should have, or are we going to continue to break the law of a friendly country because of a profit of $9 a gallon on stuff that we ourselves have banned as a curse?

The minister, if I understood him aright, justified the granting of clearances because the United States themselves have not done all they could to stamp out the evil. Again let me ask, are we to take advantage of a situation that gives us an excuse to comply with the wishes of a number of men who are determined to make a profit out of the depraved tastes of their fellow men and are violating the laws of a friendly country? Are we to dishonour the laws of a friendly country simply because there is money in it? When Canada dishonours the laws of another nation can we expect our own people to obey our own laws? It is as true to-day as it was when Habakkuk uttered the words, that a city built and established on blood cannot last.

The liquor laws, the minister said, are in a class by themselves. No doubt they are. Too much they are viewed as if they did not have to be obeyed. The report of the royal commission on customs I think gives us the key to this line of thought. Governments through their election managers have put themselves under the power of the traffic and under the power of some of these law-breakers. It is the saddest thing on record in our history that a supposedly valid reason for this traffic can be found by members speaking in this house to-day.

It is most inconsistent for Canada to be a member of the League of Nations and enter into a convention with other nations for the suppression of the drug traffic, and then condone law-breaking in carrying one of the worst drugs there is to a foreign country, and give clearance to craft that engage in that triffic. I have no two standards for laws at all. I would class rum-running and bootleggging along with murder, robbery, rape or anything else. Again let me ask, has the report of the royal commission on customs become a dead letter at this early date? The I'm Alone incident ought to have shown us the danger into which an incident of that kind might land us. Indeed, had it not been for the quiet and steady temper of our people and the way in which they regarded this incident, I have no doubt that it might have landed us into an international difficulty of some moment. Doctor D. L. Ritchie, of Montreal, writing on the I'm Alone incident, has this to say:

> The great war itself broke out when Europe's dynamite dump had an assassin's bullet fired into if from Sarajevo. How great a matter a small fire kindles, especially when primitive impulses are stirred and the baser forces of the nations set themselves to make gain out of men's follies and woes.

Again he says:

> I repeat, Canada's attitude has been an example of the new patriotism, the common sense and true patriotism, a patriotism with moral standards that endeavours to keep everything in subjection to the imperial reason and confers with a nation before it begins to quarrel.

Further:

> It must be made clear that the day has one past when desperadoes can wrap themselves in any honourable flag and expect the might of which it is the symbol to hasten to their defence when caught in evil ways. Certainly to fly the British flag on anything but clean business and honourable adventure is now to soil and to degrade it; so to do must be made a crime. More and more it must wave on every breeze for justice, ordered government, and at least a measure of the golden rule.

Now, the I'm Alone incident raises questions that to my mind go to the very root of

ordered government and everything that makes for peace and good will between nations. All civilization is built on law and its observance, and the question comes down to this: are neighbouring states to assist each other's lawful governments or to connive at their destruction? I do not think we should talk of national honour if any untoward incidents occur while we are granting clearance to vessels manned by law-breakers who defy the laws of a neighbouring country.

Again I wish to read one short paragraph from Doctor Ritchie's statement:

> We may flatter ourselves in Canada that we are not as these Americans, that our courts are clean, our police uncorrupted, our laws firmly administered and our people law-abiding. Once there was truth in all that; but are we not in danger to-day of making it an idle dream? Was not the brazen attempt of the liquor ring assisted, alas! by some of our public men, to make a hero of a rum-running scofflaw, an ugly sign of warning? And what of those in our midst, confederates of evil, who boast that they live by breaking a neighbour's laws, and are still regarded as good citizens? It was frankly asserted in one of our journals that the cargo of the I'm Alone belonged to big interests in Montreal that parade as patriotic. Why cannot they be dragged into the light? Has it not been proved that some of our brewers are behind the bootleggers? And who more swaggeringly patriotic than they?

It is a healthy kind of thing that there are at least some journals that cannot be used to further the interests of a class of men such as those engaged in this traffic. Mr. Ritchie's article that I have been quoting will be found in the Montreal Witness. There is a real danger to-day in taking a wrong viewpoint of the public opinion created by our newspapers.

I read the other day that the Rev. Lorne McTavish had declared that the four leading papers in Saskatchewan aided and abetted this work. When we see such journals upholding the crew of the I'm Alone, is it any wonder to-day that men like Harry Bronfman are untouched? In spite of the crimes named against him in the customs investigation report, that man is still unpunished. Here and now I protest against letting such men go scot free. Although the royal commission said there was a prima facie case against Bronfman, neither the Saskatchewan government nor the justice department at Ottawa hae seen fit to prosecute. As long as the illness of inspector Knowles could serve as an excuse, the Attorney-General of Saskatchewan took the responsibility for not proceeding against Bronfman. Now that gentleman says the duty is on the Minister of Justice at Ottawa, and the Minister of Justice in turn says that somebody must lay a charge against Bronfman. The charge is contained in the customs investigation report, and yet this man still goes free and unmolested. Sometimes I tremble to think what a liquor-controlled press could have involved this country in had it not been for the steady character of our people at the time.

Now, unless this nation takes drastic means —and I say this in all seriousness—to curb this evil, it will as completely control all governments in Canada as it has controlled the government in Saskatchewan during the past year. Our first duty is to refuse assistance to these rum-running craft. At the conference held in Ottawa last January between our officials and officials of the United States we talked in a very friendly tone, but since then we have learned that in such a business smooth words avail very little. Admiral Billard said that as far as he could learn the aim of Canada was to further the temperance problem, but that the whole difficulty was we were handling it in a way different from that adopted by the United States, and he got the impression that the Canadian authorities seemed to think that that situation caused certain difficulties. He clarified the situation at the conference in these words:

> We are asking you to consent to recommend to your government the refusal, or rather the discontinuance, of official sanction to export certain commodities into a friendly neighbouring state whose laws forbid the importation of such articles.

I take his words to be a warning. He also pointed out that our treaty with the United States was entitled a "convention to suppress smuggling," and that he was now asking Canada to follow the policy they had already officially sanctioned. If I understood the Minister of National Revenue in this house the other day, the answer he gave to this was that we are making revenue out of this business.

Mr. EULER: Absolutely, I never made any such statement.

Mr. EVANS: I apologize if it is not so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EULER: As a matter of fact, I was not present at the conference. I do not know Admiral Billard; I never met him in my life.

Mr. EVANS: I did get that impression, but I will accept the minister's denial. When he spoke of the fact that the United States was not looking after the enforcement of its own laws, I certainly got the impression that he was inclined to let the United States look after their own laws.

An hon. MEMBER: Why shouldn't they?

Mr. EVANS: That is all very well, but it will not excuse Canada for breaking the laws of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON: How is Canada breaking the laws of the United States?

Mr. EVANS: Perhaps that is putting it pretty strongly; but at least we do assist the gangs that go out purposely to defy those laws.

Mr. ROBINSON: They are not Canadians.

Mr. VENIOT: They are Americans, every one.

Mr. EVANS: Admiral Billard at the conference said the only way Canada could aid the United States now would be to refuse clearance to vessels that knowingly defy the United States laws. I take that, Mr. Chairman, as a polite way of informing Canada that we are playing a two-faced game.

Now, to me it is a very serious matter. I look on it from our own national standpoint as having a most deadly effect on our young people. As for the money that is in it, I do not care how much it may be; I want law and order upheld before our young people. This is a moral question and we cannot escape it. I think it is indeed a sad reflection on our administration that since 1924 the importation of liquor into the United States from Canada has steadily increased, and Doctor Doran at the conference plainly stated that any regulatory measures would be obviously impracticable. This border outlawry, he states, will be bound to increase. If I mistake not his meaning, he has given warning to us, and we shall have nothing to say if any untoward action occurs in the enforcement of that law. It may involve us yet in a nasty quarrel. I look on the I'm Alone incident as simply an incident in the prosecution of a policy which the United States authorities themselves have now adopted. I know it will be asked—have we no national pride that we allow the United States to dictate to us? They are not dictating to us. That question was put forward in this house, but I do not look at the matter in that light; and in answer to that I want to appeal to those in authority in Canada to-day not to put this nation, by any means whatsoever, in the position where its people will have to defend a dishonourable and disgraceful business.

Mr. KAISER: I want to make a few observations without entering into any details in regard to the question which has been thrust upon the attention of the house by hon. members to the left. That question appears to be whether Canada should or should not lend its forces at the present time to the prevention of liquor exports into the United States. On that question I have my own opinion and conviction.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech made the other evening by the Minister of National Revenue and I must say that it was not convincing to me. In the efforts to grapple with what is civilization's great problem, there would be nothing wrong about the Dominion of Canada endeavouring to do something to assist in the solution of the difficulty which is being met by the United States of America. For the moment, however, I consider it far more important for us as Canadians to take an interest, a universal interest, in what we consider at present to be the solution of the problem so far as this country is concerned. Rightly or wrongly, seven provinces in this Dominion have decided that the best way to handle the liquor question in Canada is under a system of government control. I am not going to say whether I consider that the best or the worst system. All I say is that at the present time the great bulk of Canadians are of the opinion that it is the best method they know of by which to control or to cope with this great difficulty in our country. Whether in the end it will succeed or fail I do not know; but as a good Canadian, and as a citizen who desires to see a better condition of society obtain in Canada, I claim it is the business and the duty of all Canadians to give this great experiment in the Dominion the best possible chance. That we are making some headway is evident, I think, in the fact that about three days ago the leader of the Liberal party in Ontario, who spent three or four years trying to convince that province that government control was all wrong and that some other system should be inaugurated, came to the conclusion and announced himself in favour of the government control of liquor in the provinces. Of course, he was a Liberal, and Liberals do not generally find it very difficult to turn a handspring if it suits them. And this gentleman took a big handspring and landed at this point.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Probably he was only bringing his policy into line with the policy of this government.

Mr. KAISER: No, I wish it were the other way about; I wish this government would bring its policy into line with him. One of the difficulties which the people of Canada have had in the past to deal with this question, from a local point of view, was the fact that the government of Canada would not try to do anything to give the provinces a proper chance. With seven

of the provinces undertaking to meet the situation by means of government control—whether that system be right or wrong—what do we see taking place in Canada? The records show that we export 2,355,431 gallons of whiskey, of which 1,126,399 gallons go to the United States. This is according to the figures given by the department; and 1,229,034 gallons are exported from Canada to other countries. The other countries are classified according to exports within the British Empire and exports to foreign countries. To countries within the Empire we export 657,771 gallons, and this considerable export is largely to the small islands along the Atlantic coast. The minister knows that we export 170,000 gallons per annum to Miquelon. I see it is six o'clock and I will remain at Miquelon until we shall have had something to eat.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 281, respecting The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada.—Mr. Smith (Stormont).

Bill No. 302, for the relief of Hurley Alexander Fummerton.—Mr. Thorson.

Bill No. 314, for the relief of Barbara Elise Sewell de la Penotière.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 315, for the relief of Oliver Milton Martin.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 317, for the relief of Mary Jane Teeson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 318, for the relief of Sam Gladstone.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 319, for the relief of Charles Smolkin.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 320, for the relief of James Franklin McDonagh.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 321, for the relief of Joseph Louis Philippe Corbeau.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 323, for the relief of Frances Thirza Edlund.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

Bill No. 324, for the relief of Vivian Elizabeth Pearce.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill No. 330, for the relief of Robert Henry Dunlop Ellis.—Mr. Lawson.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 350, for the relief of Lillian Ainsworth.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 351, for the relief of Sarah Berkovitz.—Mr. Sanderson.

[Mr. Kaiser.]

Bill No. 352, for the relief of George Frederick Wilson.—Mr. McGregor.

Bill No. 353, for the relief of Roy Franklin Beattie.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 354, for the relief of John George Laney.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 355, for the relief of Albert Nott.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 356, for the relief of John Thomas Legge.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 357, for the relief of Isabella Henderson.—Mr. Heaps.

Bill No. 358, for the relief of Emil Henry Hornburg.—Mr. Edwards (Waterloo).

Bill No. 360, for the relief of Ruth Oretta Taaffe.—Mr. Donnelly.

Bill No. 361, for the relief of Frank William Benson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 362, for the relief of Hilda Rebecca Allison.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 363, for the relief of Sydney James Black.—Mr. Hay.

Bill No. 364, for the relief of Llewellyn John Chubb.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-Hyde Park).

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 337, for the relief of Edward Ernest True.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 338, for the relief of Glennville Wesley Potter.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 339, for the relief of Elizabeth Mitchell.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 340, for the relief of Edith May Enfield.—Mr. Howden.

Bill No. 341, for the relief of Lillian Elizabeth Barton.—Mr. Boys.

STELLA PEARL DUNCAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 300, for the relief of Stella Pearl Duncan—Mr. Clark—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What about the children?

Mr. CLARK: Perhaps my hon. friend has the evidence before him. I have no doubt this has been before the private bills committee, but the evidence has not come to me.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If we have not the evidence I do not see that we should be expected to go on with the bill.

Mr. CLARK: The bill has been reported by the committee; if my hon. friend has the evidence on these bills no doubt he has the information, but it has not been forwarded to me.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If the sponsor of the bill himself has not the evidence and has no information I do not see that we can be expected to go on with the bill now.

Mr. CLARK: Then I would ask that this bill be allowed to stand for the present and that it be called later. In the meantime I will see if I can get a copy of the evidence which ordinarily is mailed to all members but which has not come to me.

Bill stands.

VERA ALICE GRIFFIN

The house in committee on Bill No. 333, for the relief of Vera Alice Griffin—Mr. Sanderson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Can we have an explanation with regard to the children?

Mr. SANDERSON: There are some children in this case but provision is being made for them.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

VIVIAN ELIZABETH PEARCE

The house in committee on Bill No. 324, for the relief of Vivian Elizabeth Pearce—Mr. Lennox—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I am moving this bill for Mr. Lennox.

Section agreed to.

Section 2—Right to marry again.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: How many children are there?

Mr. CLARK: What about the children in the Jacobs case?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have been asking only in regard to those cases where the wife is concerned; I have not been asking any questions where the man has been the petitioner, as presumably he would be in a better position to take care of the children.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I am sponsoring this bill for the hon. member for North York (Mr. Lennox), and I would remind my hon. friend that if he has the evidence before him the petition would show just what is the position of the children.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As I have said before, I have no desire to take up the time of the committee unnecessarily, but nearly three hundred divorce bills have come before us during the course of the present session and I do not think that any private member has the time to go through the evidence in each case. I have not done so, although I have tried to read a few particular cases which have been referred to me. If the consideration of these bills is not a mere formality, the least we can expect is that the sponsor be in a position to answer a few questions. If the hon. member for North York is not present and he has made arrangements for another hon. member to sponsor the bill, I should be willing to concede that point, but I think we are entitled to any information we desire. If the acting sponsor is not able to give this information the bill should be allowed to stand.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I am not suggesting that there was any arrangement; I merely thought that as an act of courtesy the bill might be proceeded with because we are instructed that the hon. member is not in good health and is unable to be present.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If the hon. member is ill and unable to be present some of his friends should have looked up those cases which stand in his name.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Perhaps the hon. member could do that himself.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think I have done as much of that as any hon. member, and perhaps more than some.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad to see that that statement at least meets with approval. Unless it is intended that these cases should go through in a purely perfunctory way, I think the hon. member should be prepared to give the information asked for.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not unreasonable in this matter. I have not had the time, and I do not think any other hon. members have had the time to read this case. At this late stage of the session I am anxious that there should be no unnecessary delay, but the members who sponsor these bills should be prepared to give certain information. The bills have been allowed to pass first reading, second reading, have been sent to the committee, and now they are be-

fore the committee of the whole, and this is the place where they should be discussed. Objections have been raised to our discussing them at an earlier stage, and I now take this opportunity to ask for certain information.

The CHAIRMAN: It is for the committee to say whether or not this bill should stand, not for the Chair. Shall section 2 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It will not carry for at least a few minutes. The members of the committee are aware of the objections which some of us have taken to the perfunctory way in which these bills have been passed. Some of us would have liked to see a divorce court instituted, but that bill was rejected by the House. Some hon. members took a stand because of religious convictions, and would not concede the principle which they believed to be involved, that is, the principle of divorce. I recall one hon. member from Toronto who said that the Anglican church was opposed to divorce, but since that time the Toronto synod of the Anglican church has met and has declared itself to be in favour of a divorce court. I think that decision should make it considerably easier for the members of that denomination, especially those who come from the city of Toronto. We have had a good deal of favourable opinion from a number of other sources, and this would go to show that the public generally is in favour of a divorce court. Two cases have been brought before the private bills committee and investigated, and in each case the petition has been refused. In one instance, the Bourdon case, the petition was withdrawn. It had been stated, and I read the letter in the house, that an operation had been performed which had rendered this poor woman incapable of bearing children, and then later that she had been, as it were, thrown on the street, by her husband who came seeking a divorce.

Mr. STEVENS: That has nothing to do with this particular case.

Mr. CLARK: I rise to a point of order; certainly this is not debatable at this moment. Furthermore, I dispute the statement which has been made in reference to a particular case.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am discussing the principle.

Mr. CLARK: It is not a question of principle; we are discussing the bill.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We were told that this was the place to discuss these matters.

Mr. BENNETT: Not in committee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We were told that it was permissible to discuss these matters.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the principle of divorce?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: When some of us undertook to discuss the principle of a bill we were told that we could not touch upon the evidence, and now we are told that we cannot touch upon the principle underlying the bill. I must submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is an absurd situation. When I was interrupted I was calling attention to the fact that when cases have been really considered in the private bills committee they have been rejected. I have no desire to go into the case now before us except to point out how necessary it is that each case should be carefully considered, and how absurd is the present practice. I am as anxious to get on with the business of the house as anyone else; I am as sick of these divorces as anyone else in the house.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not saying that the hon. member has not the right to discuss this bill at this time, but there are many other bills upon the order paper and the hon. gentlemen who are sponsoring those bills are present in the committee. I think we could make better progress if this bill were allowed to stand, and then we could proceed with the others.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is all I was asking for.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the desire of the committee that Bill No. 324 should stand?

Section stands.

Bill stands.

STELLA PEARL DUNCAN

The house in committee on Bill No. 300, for the relief of Stella Pearl Duncan—Mr. Clark—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children involved in this case?

Mr. CLARK: There is one.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has any provision been made for its care?

Mr. CLARK: The child is living with the mother of the mother.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MABEL BULLIS

The house in committee on Bill No. 328, for the relief of Mabel Bullis—Mr. Smoke (for Mr. Stinson)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. SMOKE: I find from the evidence that these people were married in 1894, thirty-five years ago. There are four chidren, all over age. The respondent deserted his wife in 1901. There are seven charges of adultery proved by the evidence.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ALICE CLARKE

The house in committee on Bill No. 325, for the relief of Alice Clarke.—Mr. Clark (for Mr. Boys)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there children involved in this case?

Mr. CLARK: There is no record of any children.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

KATHLEEN MARY HAMBOURG

The house in committee on Bill No. 326, for the relief of Kathleen Mary Hambourg—Mr. Lawson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children in this case?

Mr. LAWSON: One child born July 11, 1928, residing with the mother.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

FLORENCE GERTRUDE SINGER

The house in committee on Bill No. 327, for the relief of Florence Gertrude Singer—Mr. Lawson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children?

Mr. LAWSON: One child born June 25, 1923, residing with the mother.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

EVELYN COWIE

The house in committee on Bill No. 331, for the relief of Evelyn Cowie—Mr. Lawson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. LAWSON: One child, five years of age, in the custody of the petitioner, supported, under a court order, by the respondent.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ENID MARJORIE JUDD

The house in committee on Bill No. 332, for the relief of Enid Marjorie Judd—Mr. Lawson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children.

Mr. LAWSON: One child, born January 11, 1926, maintained by the mother, the petitioner.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CHRISTINA ADAMS BOURNE

The house in committee on Bill No. 334, for the relief of Christina Adams Bourne—Mr. Clark (for Mr. Boys)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. CLARK: No children.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RUTH AGNES TOWNSEND

The house in committee on Bill No. 335, for the relief of Ruth Agnes Townsend—Mr Lawson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. LAWSON: There is no mention, either in the petition or in the evidence taken before the divorce committee, of there being children.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

FANNY ELIZABETH REED KENDALL

The house in committee on Bill No. 329, for the relief of Fanny Elizabeth Reed Kendall—Mr. Clark (for Mr. Bell, St. Antoine)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Possibly the sponsor of this bill would give us an outline of the case?

Mr. CLARK: I thought I could, but I notice the evidence has disappeared.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then I suppose we may ask that the bill stand until the evidence can be secured.

Mr. BENNETT: This is Friday evening and the senate, I think, will not be convened to-morrow. We should do everything possible to afford these people the relief to which they are entitled.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would venture to assert that these people are not entitled to anything. That is one of the premises which we have been taking for granted and it ought to be challenged. These people come here with a petition and the senate all along seems to have been going on the supposition that if a petition is presented, it must be granted. That is not the case. We shall have a Monday, we hope, to discuss these bills. These private bills have the right of way on Monday, and there is also Tuesday. I do not think that we are holding up things unnecessarily if we ask that the ordinary procedure be complied with for the next day or so.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no such procedure.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Surely, we ought to know something about a case before we pass on it. We do not know anything about this case and the sponsor is not in his place.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the reason the evidence is printed.

Mr. CLARK: There are two ways in which my hon. friend can ascertain all about any particular case. One would be by reading the evidence, which is certainly sent to him as to other hon. members, except that I have noticed there has been an oversight in one or two cases. The other is by appearing before the private bills committee, where the case is fully considered.

I should like to point out to my hon. friend that this is the end of the session and there are at least some hon. members who have other things to do besides attending to private bills. There are many things to be done at the end of a session, and at this stage I think it is expecting too much to ask that members should be ready to examine the evidence and read it to the house, in the face of the fact that the whole case has been thoroughly considered by the private bills committee and by the senate committee, where there has been a full trial. Some consideration ought to be shown to hon. members, some of whom live a very long distance from Ottawa. In my own case, for instance, railway accommodation to Vancouver must be arranged for fully ten days ahead at this time of the year. It may be that there are members of this house who have been obliged to leave with their families, having reserved their accommodation ahead, and the session may go on for a day or two beyond the date they expected. They are obliged to go and yet my hon. friend would hold up these bills because they are not here. These bills are wished on members. Not one out of the 245 members of the house knows why his name appears as sponsor for a divorce bill. Somebody has to sponsor them. Some of us are lawyers, and there are legal firms in the city of Ottawa who use our names perhaps because we are lawyers and friends of theirs. I have no objection to that; if a lawyer friend of mine puts my name to a bill, all right. But these litigants have also some rights. They have just as much right to have their case heard as my hon. friend has to speak in the house. They have just as much right to justice at the hands of parliament as my hon. friend has to sit in and speak in the house; yet because the sponsor of one of these bills happens to be out of the house—and I believe it is our duty to sponsor them—my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre says he will deny justice to the bona fide litigant. Outside the provinces of Ontario and Quebec any one of these people could go before a court of justice and have the case tried just as it has been tried here, and the court would be bound to give a decision. But these people have been denied by the members of this house the right to go before a court of law.

Mr. LAFLAMME: No.

Mr. CLARK: Who says "no"? My hon. friend voted against the bill to establish divorce courts in the province.

Mr. LAFLAMME: I was right too.

Mr. CLARK: And now he says "no." What does he mean?

Mr. STEVENS: He does not mean anything.

Mr. CLARK: He does not mean anything, no, certainly not. If my hon. friend had anything to do but read a newspaper, if he had any desire to do justice—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CLARK: I say that advisedly. If he had any real desire to do justice he would inform himself as to the merits of these cases, and vote according to the dictates of justice. What we are up against is that some members of this house refuse absolutely to consider the merits of the case, which they are bound from every point of view to do, while others refuse these litigants justice because some hon. member, who happens to be the sponsor of a particular bill is not in his seat. They will refuse justice to these litigants despite the fact that the senate committee has fully heard the case, that the evidence has been printed and every hon. member given the opportunity to read it and size up the merits of the case; that the case has been before the private bills committee. There might be a rehearing of the case before that committee, as has been done in several cases this session, and they might refuse to report the bill. I have the evidence here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not feel quite as chastened as I might do if I did not recall that the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard has had a good deal to say with regard to a number of the estimates. He considered that it was perfectly proper for him to challenge at considerable length estimates with which he was not satisfied. I just happen to be working along a different line. I am concerned in this particular case rather than about some particular estimate.

I frankly concede that there is some ground for what the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard has said. I know that in the past it has been the practice for various members to sponsor these bills without their having any idea they would be called upon to present the case. I do not wish to be unreasonable in the matter. But unfortunately the hon. member has buttressed his plea with some false statements.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CLARK: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I withdraw; I should have said that he had buttressed his plea with some unsound arguments. He suggested that these people ought to have justice. I am pleading for justice for them, and the way to get justice is to have their cases considered instead of having a large number of bills passed here en bloc, as has been done in the past, or having them passed without any consideration at all, as has happened with some of these bills even to-night. To get justice for these people we should not attempt to rush the bills through without any consideration, indeed without even the sponsor being in his seat.

It is further stated by the hon. member—and this is what I had reference to when I said that he had buttressed his plea with false statements, which I changed to unsound arguments—that these bills have been carefully considered by the private bills committee. I do not think that statement is absolutely accurate. The fact is that any case that is not challenged passes the private bills committee without any consideration whatever. There are ten steps in the procedure for divorce. First it is dealt with by the Senate divorce committee, which examines the case to the extent it considers necessary; then the bill is reported, given its first and second reading in the Senate, considered in committee and given a third reading. The bill then comes to this house where it is given a first and a second reading, goes to the private bills committee, comes back into committee of the whole, is reported and given a third reading. There is only one real examination made, and that is the preliminary examination by the senate committee. All the other processes are simply equivalent to a rubber stamp, and we put on the rubber stamp ten times. Now, that is what I object to. I would rather sweep away this whole elaborate procedure, but if there are those who insist on retaining it, it is not quite fair for them to blame us when we insist on following the regular procedure. They accuse us of holding up the house. I have now held up the house about as long as the member for Burrard, and will let him proceed with the evidence.

Mr. CLARK: There are no children. That is all I have to say.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Thanks very much.

Mr. IRVINE: In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the speech of the hon. member is an indictment of the entire house and is well deserved. He simply indicated by his very fair and straightforward criticism of the members of this committee and of the house generally that we are incapable of doing the work of a divorce court. No one is prepared to admit that more readily than I am. While we are allowing these bills to go through this session on the strength of the Prime Minister's promise that next session there will be some alteration in this regard, yet we are conscious that we are not doing the business in a proper way. Some one has suggested that we consider these matters in the private bills committee. We do nothing of the sort. In that committee bills are simply read off; that is all that is done. In my experience during the last five or six sessions of parliament I have only seen three or four cases really considered in that committee. And those were cases that had been specially referred to the committee; all other cases are passed without anybody reading or discussing the evidence. I am afraid that what the hon. member for North Centre Winnipeg desires will not be attained in this house. We are not a divorce court; we cannot seriously treat ourselves as such, and the whole proceeding is the most shameful and disgraceful that I have ever seen anywhere.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. IRVINE: The sooner we get rid of this divorce work the better. I do not know whether I would be in order in serving notice on the government that at the next session of parliament they will not get any business through in this way.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

The house in committee of supply Mr. Johnston in the chair.

National revenue—salaries, $745,840; contingencies, $50,000.

Mr. KAISER: When the committee rose at six o'clock I had just arrived at the island of Miquelon, that beautiful, barren isle of the sea where liquor flows and nothing grows, and during the remainder of my remarks I wish to refer to this island as representing conditions at other points on the Atlantic ocean.

I suppose the Minister of National Revenue must realize that the conditions which exist on this island cannot be taken seriously; there are elements of fraud in connection with what is going on there. We will say a cargo of liquor leaves the port of Halifax and goes to Miquelon, or pretends to go to Miquelon, and a certificate is brought back to the department showing that the cargo arrived safely; the customs officer certifies that the cargo has landed and this certificate is accepted by the department as proof that the liquor has reached its proper destination, so no excise duty is charged. I understand that the government of Canada became rather suspicious of this beautiful little island and insisted that the governor of the island should also sign this certificate.

I want to point out that if this cargo really arrives at Miquelon and is unloaded at that point a duty is charged by the government of the island; in fact they charge three duties, one of which is called a customs duty, another a consuming duty and the third by some other name, but the three duties total $1 per gallon. That cargo, paying no duty in Canada and a duty of only $1 per gallon at Miquelon, has an advantage of $8 per gallon over a cargo sent to the United States or any other part of Canada, and I want to know why we charge an excise duty of $9 per gallon on liquor going direct to the United States when it goes out the back door by way of Detroit or Niagara Falls and when we know it is going to the United States, with everything pointing to that fact, while if it goes out the front door and lands at this little island there is no excise duty collected. I wonder if the minister imagines that we are so devoid of intelligence in Canada as to suppose that the people of Miquelon consume all this liquor. I pointed out the other night that Canada alone sends annually over 50 gallons of liquor per capita of the adult population or 42 gallons per head when calculating every man, woman and child on the entire island. Some one says that is not enough, but I think it is quite sufficient; if all the inhabitants of that island consumed that much liquor per head for two years there would be only about two or three individuals left alive, and they would be regarded as perambulating distilleries. It is absurd; the government of Canada must know that the liquor landed on that island is not consumed there.

I am not going to discuss the question whether our excise duty on liquor going direct to the United States is too high or too low but I do claim that we should charge the same duty on liquor exported to Miquelon or to any other foreign country as we charge on liquor for home consumption, because I believe one of two things happens; either this liquor finds its way back to Canada or it reaches some other market such as that of the United States. In any event it is objectionable. Why does the minister say that there is such a wide open door at Detroit and Niagara Falls, when we have evidence that that door is not open on the Atlantic ocean? A vessel was found two hundred or two hundred and twenty miles off the shore of the United States and a government cruiser shot it down, and yet we are told that the same government has a green light up and it is perfectly safe to smuggle liquor at Detroit and Niagara Falls. There is something a little suspicious about the statements given to this house by the minister but I do not care whether he is right or whether he is wrong, what I want to say is this: The people of several provinces of the Dominion of Canada have come to the conclusion that they can best handle this liquor question through government control. I do not know whether they are right or whether they are wrong, but it is a great experiment and I want to say here that I ally myself with those people of Canada who are trying to eliminate drunkenness from society. This is the method which has been adopted, and I plead with this government to ally itself with those provinces which are trying to do something with regard to this liquor question. The government should do something to help them and not leave the door wide open and thus circumvent the efforts which are being put forth by those who believe in government control. We give these smugglers an eight dollar advantage on every gallon. We are told that the smuggler and bootlegger has been eliminated from Ontario. He was eliminated when the Ontario Temperance Act first came into force and he did not reappear for two or three years, but he found out how to get around that act. In three or four years' time he will find out how to get around this government control act, and I am afraid we will have the same conditions. I believe that act is a good law but I think a fair chance should be given to the provinces to better the condition of society. No headway will be made as long as this government stands still and permits the conditions which exist at the front door of our country, which conditions only tend to circumvent the efforts being put forth by those who have faith in government control. As a Canadian I consider it of great importance that we should endeavour by every means to prevent the export of liquor to the United States. We should do that, but our greatest duty is to the people of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, one can understand the concern in the United States about this traffic in liquor from Canada by examining the statistics. The figures show that in 1923 liquor to the value of $3,178,000 was exported from Canada to the United States. That was the legal exportation, and one can only guess as to how much was exported illegally. In 1925 the value of the exportations had risen to $11,610,000 and in 1928 the figure had grown to $24,403,000.

To come down to the particular issue which is being discussed at the present time, as to whether or not Canada should refuse to grant clearances to vessels laden with liquor for the United States, it seems to me that we are only being asked to extend a courtesy to that country which we would not for a moment refuse in our social relations with each other. I read the minister's speech of some days ago, and I take it that his opposition to carrying out the request of the United States is based on four arguments. His first argument was that we should not be asked to assist in carrying out the laws of another country. Then he claimed that the United States made no effort to curb the shipments of liquor into Canada when conditions were reversed during the war. His third argument was the obvious insincerity of the United States in enforcing her own laws, and fourthly, he doubted the efficacy of the remedy suggested by the United States, that is, for Canada to refuse clearances to vessels loaded with liquor for that country.

In my opinion, this is not an issue between what we commonly call the wets and the drys. I take it that there are tens of thousands of people in Canada who believe in government control of the sale of liquor, that is, they support what is commonly called the wet side, and yet they are in favour of the government using every means at its disposal to prevent the export of liquor into the United States. They object to Canada failing to grant what seems to be a most reasonable and modest request on the part of the United States.

The United States are not asking us to assist in enforcing their laws. In a recent issue

of the Toronto Star an American official is quoted as follows:

> We do not want Canada to help clean up our backyard, but just to stop throwing dirt over the fence into it.

It seems to me that that covers the situation very well. He went on to say that they did not ask Canada to aid in the enforcement of their law, but they did ask Canada not to aid in the violation of it.

Every member of the house knows the difficulties a government encounters in enforcing any prohibitory law. We have heard that old cry for generations, that a government was not sincere in enforcing such and such a law. I have heard the charge made in western Canada against the minister's own department, that his officers were not sincere in enforcing the Inland Revenue Act. I do not believe those charges because I think his officers are doing everything that is humanly possible to stop the illegal manufacture of liquor. Just because there are still many infractions of the American law and because the law does not absolutely prohibit the opinion is expressed that the government is not sincere in attempting to enforce the law. It is not for us to judge whether or not the government of the United States is sincere in its efforts to enforce a prohibitory law; all we have to do is to grant this reasonable request and refuse clearances to vessels loaded with liquor.

The next point in the minister's argument was that the United States had made no effort to curb shipments of liquor into Canada during the war when that country was wet and Canada was supposedly dry. I am not sure that Canada ever made any particular requests to the United States for assistance along that line, and I have no proof that if such requests were made they were ignored. But that seems to me to be a most illogical argument to use, to say that because someone committed a crime or a misdemeanor some years ago it justifies the doing of the same thing to-day. That is one of the most unsound arguments anyone could use, and I did not expect it to be used by a minister of the crown. If there has been insincerity on the part of the United States government, or on the part of their officials, in enforcing this law, then Canada is just playing into their hands, because certainly the impression is being created from one end of the United States to the other to-day that these laws are not being enforced on account of Canada's failure to grant that reasonable request. If the minister is convinced that there is that insincerity to which he refers, then he is helping along and strengthening that insincerity in the United States by refusing its request. If the request were granted and there still were no particular improvements in the situation, then the people of the United States would find out the insincerity, if any, on the part of their government.

[Mr. Campbell.]

May I remind the minister that there is a good deal of ill feeling, I may say, in Canada to-day over the action of the United States congress in raising the tariff against many Canadian products? But let us consider that there is being engendered in the United States as well a feeling just as bitter and probably more so; a grievance is developing there against Canada because of the failure of the government to grant that request. It is just possible that even the tariff action of the United States congress is influenced to some extent by the inaction of the Canadian government in this regard.

May I refer to a series of articles which were published in MacLean's magazine beginning in the issue of December 1 last and concluding in the issue of January 1. These articles are headed: "Men will Kill for Whiskey", and they are written by Mr. Frederick Edwards. They cover the whole situation on the lake front and they point out with great force that this is not merely the business of the United States. The minister may assume an attitude of complacency and perhaps we as Canadians may thank the Lord that we are not as other men are; that we are not bothered with this thing ourselves; but these articles show very clearly that all the crime and viciousness that have developed in the wake of the liquor traffic have penetrated Canada as well as the United States. I say that for our own protection, our own benefit, for the upholding of law, order and decency in this country, we should cooperate with the United States to stop this illegal traffic. May I quote from the article of December 1? This article refers to the attempt of the border cities to get rid of the underworld that had developed there due to this illegal liquor traffic. The writer points out that they have met with much success. Many of the dives were closed up; many of these crooks had to decamp to the United States. Yet the writer goes on to say:

> Yet, in May of this year, Jack Kennedy's dead body was found in a Toleda woods; and his murderers have never been apprehended.
>
> Yet, during the summer, Charlie Williams, responding to a telephone message from Detroit, crossed the river, a lamb going in panic to the slaughter, and paid $40,000 to Detroit gangsters, refusing later to lay a charge against the one man the police were able to entrap.

This is one of the most terrible features of the whole thing. Even where these men were spotted; even where the police had their fingers on them, we find the parties were so much in terror of these crooks that they refused to invoke the law to punish them. They were more afraid of the crook than of the law. The writer goes on:

Just a few weeks ago Sam Low was attacked on the highway between Windsor and London, bound, blindfolded and held for ransom.

This man was later released on ransom. Further on the article says:

We in Canada are rather proud of our reputation for law enforcement. It is a thought not consoling to our national consciousness that American thugs are able to ferry themselves across a narrow river to our Dominion and there kidnap, blackmail and arrange even for the murder of our citizens without encountering a swift and just retribution; but here are three examples of outrageous crime perpetrated within our boundaries during the past year, and in each case the guilty parties originating from the American side of the line, have been able to escape with a casual ease which cannot but be an invitation to further similar outrages.

The article continues:

It is a blazing affront to Canadian dignity, a menace to the peace and order of the Dominion, that such things as the Kennedy killing, the Williams hold-up and the Low kidnapping should go unpunished. And yet no one has been arrested.

The writer asks the question: Why? And he goes on to give the reason. The reason is quite obvious—the enormous profits that are made in the liquor business. I will deal with that presently. He gives many instances of men who have testified before the commission and the various criminalities which many of them were guilty of, such as false statements, brewers falsfying their books and all that sort of thing, a story of crime and wickedness that would make any Canadian blush for shame.

In his article under date of December 15, the writer has this to say:

A geographical accident compels the peaceful, industrious and thrifty populations of Windsor, Walkerville, Ford City, Sandwich and the rest of the border towns, to accept as a close neighbour the overcrowded, cosmopolitan, rowdy metropolis of Detroit. So it came about that at the very moment that the honest burghers of the Border Cities were dusting off their palms, rolling down their sleeves and congratulating themselves that last years strenuous campaign had triumphantly routed the forces of evil which had infested their communities for years, the worst elements among the yellow parasites who feed greedily on the illicit liquor traffic were chuckling grimly in the depths of their Detroit and border ratholes, and remarking "is that so?" Whereupon these dangerous gangsters proceeded at once to demonstrate that in this day and age, with the aid of fast automobiles, telephones and automatic pistols of deadly precision, the bloody business of murder for money is not in the least discommoded by a mere mile of smooth water.

The writers goes on:

Against the banditti of the turbulent motor city the folks of the border towns on the Canadian side are powerless. Everything that the rsidents of the Border Cities can do in their own behalf, they have done.

May I refer again to the article of January 1? He gives an instance or two to show the enormous wealth that is acquired by those engaged in the traffic. He quotes the case of Cecil Smith. He says that two years ago Cecil Smith was a taxi driver without any money. Two years after he had set up as a bootlegger, Smith boasted in open court that during the previous twelve months he had paid more than $90,000 to officials of various grades and services in return for immunity granted a score of valuable liquor cargoes smuggled across the river. In this case we have Canadian as well as United States officials bought and corrupted by these men, yet the minister assumes an attitude as if it were none of our business, as if it did not affect Canada in the least, and he refers to the United States request as one for our assistance in enforcing their laws. Surely our own law is at stake; surely law, order and decency are at stake in Canada as well in the United States. This condition is not one that is creditable either to the minister and his department or to the people of Canada as a whole.

The writer refers to the evidence given before the commission. I have not time to quote much of it, but it is most illuminating and it would be worth the while of any member of the house to read all he has to say. He gives an account of the murder of Jack Kennedy to whom I referred a little while ago. It appears that Jack Kennedy was an employee of a brewery on the lake front. He was an accountant and probably he was one of those gentlemen who was called upon to fake the accounts in order to defeat the minister's own officials. When he knew he was going to be called upon to testify before the commission, he suddenly disappeared. He spent part of the season in Florida, most likely under the pay of the corporation. Later on he came back to Toronto. Just a few days after he arrived there, he was served with a subpoena to appear before the court, but apparently he was a decent, honest fellow, just as good a fellow as you could get in that class of business, and he said, when asked by one of his friends what he proposed to do,

that he was going to tell the truth. Before the time arrived for him to appear before the court he was kidnapped, taken across the river, and his battered and mutilated body was found a few days later. As this article points out his murderers have never been apprehended.

The article goes on:

And finally listen to this. The speaker is William C. Dunford, a Canadian, and a liquor exporter of Windsor. He is giving testimony in one of the series of government actions against the brewers, in Toronto, last May. He has admitted that he has sold many cargoes of liquor to American bootleggers with headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio. He has been asked by the court to give the names of his customers. Here is his reply:

"My lord, in the United States a man is marked if he is a squawker or is a stool pigeon. I would sooner face a charge of contempt of court than be taken for a ride when I return to the United States."

The article concludes:

How do you like that, Canadians?

Yet the minister adopts the attitude—as if it were none of our business—that it is the fault of the United States wholly when that kind of thing can go on. But I say that when a man admits in open court that he is more afraid of the thug who has threatened him than of a sentence of a judge of a Canadian court, it is not to the credit of Canadian institutions, and unless we deal with this matter we shall soon have as bad a condition in Canada as they have on the other side of the line.

What is the remedy? In a case of this kind I do not think there is any clear-cut distinction between right and wrong, or good and evil. It is a case of choosing the lesser of two evils, and to my mind the only conclusion from that standpoint, choosing the lesser of two evils, is completely to nationalize every brewery and distillery in Canada. I know that there are objections to that. Many will say that it would lead to political corruption and a certain amount of graft in connection with government. Undoubtedly there would be some graft, but certainly there would be nothing like there is to-day. The main thing is to take the private profit out of that liquor traffic, and I think that is as far as public sentiment will permit us to go at the present time. I know that constitional questions will be raised as to the relative rights of the provinces and the Dominion, but I suggest that the federal government take action to nationalize these breweries and distilleries. Wherever there is a province that has government liquor control and it desires to exercise that right, let that province be allowed to do so. I think that would help to a considerable extent to clean up the situation.

I wish to quote from the Toronto Star of Saturday last, which gives an account of a speech by the Hon. Grant M. Hudson, representative in congress of that section of Michigan which is across the river from Windsor. He disputes many of the statements which the minister made in this house some time ago. The minister's statements to-day would seem to conflict with what this gentleman says, and of course we must accept the minister's statement. However, I will read this for the benefit of the minister because, although there may be other inaccuracies in this statement, it must be taken seriously because it is the speech of a congressman in the House of Representatives at Washington.

The minister made the statement that vessels of five tons and under did not have to take out clearances in the United States, but Mr. Hudson points out that it is only in the case of passage from one American port to another American port that these boats are not required to have clearances. He points out that under American law, if these vessels leave for a Canadian or foreign port, they must secure clearances.

Mr. EULER: I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend, but would he mind reading that part of the law to which he now refers, that it is necessary for American boats to obtain clearances when they leave for a foreign port?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have no law here.

Mr. EULER: I am quite sure the law is quoted there, because I read that myself.

Mr. CAMPBELL: This is a statement of the Hon. Mr. Hudson.

Mr. EULER: Yes, and I think he quotes the American law.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Perhaps so. The minister gave the house the impression that none of these boats of five tons and under were required to secure clearances from the United States.

Mr. EULER: Nor are they required to do so because they leave the United States without cargo. They come to Canada for their cargo.

Mr. CAMPBELL: This gentleman says they have to have a clearance regardless of whether they have a cargo or not.

Mr. EULER: What I stated was confirmed by the representatives from Washington when they met with our representatives.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Referring to the remarks of the Minister of National Revenue regarding five-ton vessels, Mr. Hudson quotes this statement of the Minister of National Revenue:

I am not going to suggest any reason but, peculiarly enough, we were requested by the United States government to discontinue the giving of notices to the collector at Detroit and in accordance with that request such notices were no longer given at that port. They asked us then to give weekly reports rather than daily reports by telephone and we have acceded to their request.

Mr. Hudson then asked:

What are the facts? The United States officers did not ask that these notices be discontinued until the Canadian government had refused to give information that would be of some real value. In doing this the fault did not lie with the Canadian customs officers, who undoubtedly acted within their instructions. The difficulty was apparently higher up.

Of course I realize that that conflicts with the statement which the minister made in the house this afternoon. Mr. Hudson goes on:

The vessels of less than five tons, to which Mr. Euler refers, are not registered in the United States by name but, like automobiles, by number. Every owner must take out a license, as he would for an automobile, and receive an identification number, which the regulations require shall be prominently displayed. This number is the only means of real identification. The Canadian authorities have been asked to give the identification number of the vessels that were cleared. This they have refused to do.

I realize that that conflicts with the minister's statement this afternoon. Mr. Hudson points out that on the Florida coast the Bahamas government does give them this information, and that it has been very useful to them in identifying vessels. He points out that one cannot rely at all on the identification given by the Canadian authorities. A boat may be called The Bat, The Bug or The Rambler, and the United States officers find that there is no such vessel. The names of the owners are fictitious and their addresses are often inaccurate or fictitious.

Mr. IRVINE: Might not the numbers also be fictitious?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I suppose there would be a license plate the same as for an automobile, and that would be some means of identification.

Mr. EULER: None at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Hudson points out that on account of the action of the Bahamas government the rum-running in that section has been clamped down very substantially. This has been done by arrangement with the British government, and he says that Canada has been asked to do this but up to date has refused to do so. He goes on:

If Canada will not stop granting clearances, will she at least take steps to make the rum-running business honest, in this regard at least, that the correct names of the vessels and the correct names of the owners shall be given, and that there shall be an insistence that the vessels clearing reach the destination for which they clear. . .

Surely it is not too much to suggest that the government of Canada should not be a knowing accessory to the falsehood and perjury that now characterizes the rum-running business on the border. The evidence is irrefutable that at present boats are cleared by Canadian customs officers under what they know to be a fictitious name of the boat and with what is known to be a fictitious name of the master, and to what is known to be a fictitious destination. This action is unjustifiable by any standard of international ethics.

He quotes the minister again:

Mr. Euler says: "Exportation of liquor from Canada is entirely legal. If we pass a law prohibiting clearance, the liquor will then go out in any case, but it will go out illegally and secretly instead of openly, above board."

Mr. Grant replies to that. He says:

"Here surely is a new principle in jurisprudence—that the law should be made to suit the would-be law violators, and that when their wrong-doing cannot be prevented by law it should be facilitated by law; that where you cannot prevent an evil thing from being done secretly, then provide that it may be done openly."

The same argument might be applied to murder, because you cannot detect all murderers and then make murder legal. He goes on to say:

"I wonder in what other regards would Mr. Euler apply this principle. It would work fine with hold-up gangs and burglars. Certain hours in broad daylight might be provided during which burglars and hold-up men would operate, and certain sections reserved for them. Apply this to obscene literature or immoral plays. Provide that insted of this being driven into the dark and underground it be brought right out into the open. Let the obscene literature be displayed on certain corners during certain hours. Let the immoral plays be given in the open park."

Then he proceeds to challenge the minister's statement that the United States government was not sincere in its attempt to enforce the law.

As a proof of the earnestness of the United States in seeing that their officials do their duty, there is the fact that to-day there are

nine officers in gaol in the city of Detroit for the taking of bribes and ten others under indictment awaiting trial. It may be further said that the bribing of these officers was done by the very rum-runners and the interests behind them with whose infamous business Mr. Euler declines to interefere.

Mr. Hudson claimed that Mr. Euler was in error regarding United States law when he claimed that all boats under five tons sailing from United States ports are not required to take clearances and do not need to report when they return.

"It is true," Mr. Hudson said, "that these vessels do not need to take out clearance papers when going to another port within the United States, but they do require clearance papers when going to a foreign port."

Mr. BIRD: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say one or two persuasive words in the hope that the minister will yet choose the better way. I have given this matter very careful attention and I have considered the reasons advanced by the minister and also by his officials. I maintain that anyone who impartially considers those reasons cannot say that they are impressive, except in the sense that they are unimpressive. It seems to me to be a case of alleging reasons to support a position that has been come to without the aid of reason. I am reminded of the story of the old British squire who sat down to write out his reasons against prohibition. He jotted down twelve reasons, and then to bring them to a close added a thirteenth, which read, "and for any other reason." Now, when I read the reasons that were concocted by the minister's officials after the January confabulation with the officials from the States, that story came very strongly to my mind. When I read over those eleven points, each succeeding point seemed to destroy the force of the whole case.

I think there are three very clear reasons—not thirteen, but three—why the minister should prohibit clearances of these liquor-laden vessels going to a friendly country; three reasons that stand out so spontaneously in one's mind that I would have thought they could not have been gotten around even by the official mind. The first reason is that public opinion has already expressed itself in a most articulate form in this house. In 1926 a committee of this house declared clearly that the only ethical thing to do was to prohibit these clearances. What has the minister to offset that clearly expressed will of the people of Canada? One should hardly need to bring forward any other reason. But surely if I were asked to appreciate the work of the Liberal government in the last few years I think I would say in their commendation that they had been very sensitive to the will of the House of Commons, that they had sent out feelers almost constantly to find out what the Commons were thinking, what they had thought, and what their position was on any given question. I would say that very freely. But here is a case where, for no adequate reason at all, the minister is going counter to the clearly expressed declaration of the House of Commons. And the onus is altogether on the minister. "But" he says, "my officials"—my officials—"considered this thing, and they outlined their reasons, and I accept their reasons." He did accept their reasons. His speech the other day was a very faithful recapitulation of the points that were drawn up by his officials. I have the greatest respect for the officials of the government. I have never yet in my contact with any of them had any cause for anything but respect. But I have yet to learn that government officials in the position in which they are ought to formulate government policies on these all-important things. They are there to carry out policies already formulated by responsible government. Do not let us hear too much about this "responsible government" business because whenever it is convenient to do so ministers and governments are prepared to shoot the whole thing to the winds. The Minister of National Revenue cannot shoulder this on to his officials, because people will immediately ask, "Where do the officials get their hunch from?" Either they got their eleven points from the minister or the minister got his eleven points from them. "Oh", you say, "well,"—and the minister actually said it—"the man in the street has pronounced on this thing. The man in the street says we have no business to try to enforce the laws of the United States."

Well, I have not much respect for the "man in the street", because I have never met him. That is one of the fictitious personages from time to time invented by people who have axes to grind in order that they might put into his mouth sentiments that would be unpopular if they came from their own lips. The man in the street indeed! He has appeared again, as he will often appear, speaking popular phrases, well-conceived catch words, that have no foundation in reason and are not meant to appeal to reason, but are meant to appeal to passion, to that ignoble passion that one nation has inherently against another. It does not matter what crisis occurs, from somewhere, from some dark corner, from some anonymous source, the man in the street, this imaginary phonograph, will get off the popular catch-word—"Oh, it is not Canada's place to enforce laws in America". And that is sufficient.

The brewers of Canada are not without influence; they are not without brains; they are not without ingenuity; they are not without knowledge of this time-honoured game, the instinctive sense of psychology by which you can make use of the gullibility of the so-called man in the street. Someone has said that if you will let him write the songs of a nation anyone who likes may make its laws. One might also say, "Let me coin the catchwords of a party and I don't care who makes its policies"; because the catchwords will eventually rule. A very clever catchword indeed, displaying remarkable genius: It is not our business to enforce the laws of the United States—no truck or trade with the Yankees—our whole history of politics is bespattered with these despicable phrases invented by self-interest and put into the mouth of this fictitious person, the man in the street. One would have thought that a clear expression of public opinion through parliament would have given the minister his steer and not this shady and suspicious voice out of this puppet which no one knows or calls brother, the man in the street.

Another reason equally conclusive is the dictate of international good feeling. I saw on the bulletin board this afternoon that the British embassy at Washington had refused to sign any more requisitions for the importation of liquor into that embassy. That seems a small thing, and it is a small thing. But the less demonstrative a gesture the greater its value. It is not the big things that affect relationships between nations. Anyone who reads the story of the great war as told by Sir Edward Grey will discover that the things which exacerbated relations between the European nations were all despicably small things, little slights we should be ashamed almost to show between individuals. These are the seeds that eventually become dragons' teeth. If we did something openly against the United States, if we made some blatant brag, they would probably laugh at us and that would be the end of it. But no nation can afford to overlook these little courtesies and felicitations, because they are the things which ultimately determine relationships between nations. A little spark kindles a great fire and a little mustard seed will some day grow into a big tree. You may say that this is a small thing. I know it is a small thing. But when one great nation comes along to another, looks over the fence as it were and asks some small courtesy, some small concession that costs very little, it seems to me there is an opportunity we cannot afford to overlook. But it is going to be overlooked. I think that the minister, for whose common sense and human feeling I have conceived the very highest regard, has overlooked some of the simplest impulses of our nature. I do not think the minister has ever kept chickens, for instance, on a thirty foot lot.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BIRD: There is sometimes a display of a very inferior type of humour in this house, and I rather thought this remark would elicit it.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Who started it?

Mr. BIRD: At any rate it is plain to see that the minister was never in that situation, because he would have found out that a principle of human justice, dating back to the time when Justinian himself kept chickens, is that a man who keeps chickens must fence against them; it is not the man on the other side of the lot who must do the fencing. The man who keeps the chickens must do the fencing, and God forbid that the minister should ever keep chickens; for what is going to happen to his neighbours? Every morning the minister is going to go down when he takes the milk in and open his garden gate and shoo his chickens into his neighbour's yard; so to speak, he is going to give them clearance into his neighbour's garden. In other words, he is going to disregard a principle of justice recognized by all civilized peoples in the memory of man.

I appeal to the minister to lend an ear to such simple dictates as begot the golden rule, to such simple impulses that make for neighbourliness everywhere. The principles by which we live harmoniously together in little communities are ultimately the principles by which nations live harmoniously side by side.

I want to suggest another principle before I conclude. I think the dictates of reverence for law and order ought to have guided the minister. But the puppet in the street says it is not our business to help the Yankees to maintain law and order. "I am not my brother's keeper" is a form of cynicism as old as human writing; the disavowal of any obligation for the life of our neighbour is not a new thing in the earth. But the most surprising fact is that it should find modified expression on the humane lips of the minister. It is not our business to interfere; it is not our business to help them to maintain law and order. I want to point out, however, that it is our business in a very real sense. It was Carlyle who told about a tragic occurrence in a Scottish city, when some poor people caught the typhus fever in the slums

of that city. The wealthy people in the west end said, "That is not our business; they must look after themselves." But the typhus germ, being a very democratic animal, did not stay in the slums; it strayed over into the other end of the city and the city was decimated. Now that is what is going to happen on our border if we disavow responsibility for helping the United States to maintain law and order. If we refuse to recognize that responsibility, do you think we are going to be able to stem the flood of lawlessness and disorder that will break through that invisible line? I do not think we can expect it.

We have heard a good deal this session about the tragedy of divorce, the breaking up of homes. You know that homes do not break up spontaneously; all kinds of moral influences contribute to that result. Do you think these influences can be stopped at the border? Do you think that by talking about divorce or social ethics in this house you are going to put up an insuperable barrier at the border? That cannot be done in that way, but it can be done by showing some sincere effort to maintain social conditions, not only here but on the other side of the line as well which will lend themselves to the establishment of our old-time institutions. No, we cannot be indifferent to what is going on across the line; sooner or later our homes will be exposed to the same influences.

In closing I want to remind hon. gentlemen that this house spoke two or three years ago, and as far as I can learn no one has spoken since except the "man in the street," who does not exist. The dictates of international good feeling implore my hon. friend to take a different course; respect for law and order on both sides of the line also pleads with him to yield this simple point, which will cost Canada practically nothing. He is asked simply to place his prohibition on the clearance of these vessels.

Mr. ROBINSON: I do not want to prolong the debate or take up the time of the house unnecessarily, but I should like to add a word or two to this discussion. During the days of the Drury government in Ontario it was a popular pastime to picture the border along the Detroit river as a terrible place and the people who lived there as outlaws; it used to be suggested that it would not be safe for decent or respectable people to walk the streets after dark, and apparently some of our hon. friends in the southeast corner have caught the fever. I would like to tell them that the distillers, the brewers and the exporters are doing an honest business and are living up to the law. Whenever churches, hospitals and other charitable institutions want help they do not forget to call upon these people for money, and they are usually very generous in responding.

With regard to the articles in the Toronto Star and in MacLean's magazine, I want to say that these articles are written in the most sensational manner possible. In order to illustrate the unfairness of the Toronto Star I might tell the committee that prior to the last election they sent to the border a couple of reporters who laid indiscriminate charges against four exporters in East Essex, four in West Essex and two breweries, but when the magistrate called the cases the next day these men were not to be found; they had gone over the river. After the election was over the cases proceeded, with the result that these men had not a tittle of evidence to support their charges, and they received a severe reprimand from the magistrate.

I am firmly of the opinion that it is not up to Canada to attempt to enforce the Volstead act of the United States, a law which they themselves make very little attempt to enforce. For instance, when the river was frozen over and the boats could not cross, all through the day there was a long stream of automobiles and sleighs carrying goods across the river below Ojibway from the Canadian side to Detroit, and hundreds of people watched them unload and reload their cargoes in broad daylight.

Hon. gentlemen spoke about these thugs and bootleggers and implied that they were Canadians, but that is not the fact. Last fall they had an investigation on the American side and discharged about one hundred or more preventive officers, many of whom were found to be criminals themselves; some of them were house-breakers, thieves and hijackers. I was very much amused at the reference by the hon. member for Kindersley as to the number of automobiles that had been seized. They may seize an occasional automobile in Detroit, which is sent to the police department to be sold; a friend of the bootlegger usually buys back the car for $5 or $10, and that is all there is to it. A number of boats were seized and taken to anchorage, and when the time came to sell them it was discovered that they had all disappeared.

I claim that if the United States officials were in earnest they could stop the bootlegging across the Detroit river, but they are not in

earnest. I also think the United States owes Canada a debt of gratitude for allowing their bootleggers to import this liquor; if they were not able to get a supply of good liquor and beer their people would be drinking squirrel whiskey and all that sort of stuff, which sends them to the hospital and blinds them, as had happened in a hundred cases, especially a few years ago. I do not know that I have anything further to say except to add that I am heartily in accord with the statement made by the minister a few days ago.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Like the hon. member for West Essex I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I do wish to say that I agree with very much of the statement the minister made in the house a few days ago, and my chief reason for taking this attitude is that I believe the minister and his department have more than they can handle in enforcing the Canadian laws with regard to liquor.

I did not rise to hand out any compliments; I am going to criticize the department, because I believe their decision of a few months ago to close a number of preventive stations and outports in the maritime provinces will make a paradise out of what was formerly a garden of eden for the smugglers. I need scarcely say that when vessels were obliged to enter and clear at the different ports, the department had a close check upon them; they were able to follow the course of these vessels from day to day and from week to week, and they knew pretty well what was going on. The present plan is that all coastwise vessels may enter and leave these ports freely, without the necessity of either entering or clearing. What will be the result? Look at the advantage it will be to the smugglers if they are not obliged to report anywhere during the whole season, if they do not choose to do so; they can go into and out of practically all the different rivers and harbours of Prince Edward Island; they can go out to the gulf and meet the mother ship loaded with liquor and return to any of these harbours openly and freely. So I say the department has done more to assist the smuggler than can be overcome by any means at its disposal.

I have a further complaint to make with regard to the closing of these offices; I refer to the inconvenience this action will cause a great many people in many sections of the country. I believe the minister has received a petition signed by a large number of the residents of one of the ports where the office was closed, and as it is short and concise I will read it in order to show in some measure the inconvenience these people will suffer as a result of this action. This petition is addressed to the hon. minister, and reads as follows:

The undersigned residents of Cardigan and vicinity, in the county of Kings, Prince Edward Island, having learned that your department proposes to close the customs office in the village of Cardigan, take the liberty of making the following representations in connection therewith.

(1) This office has been an established institution since the province joined confederation, and is a very great convenience to the people of a large and prosperous section of country.

(2) The village of Cardigan is the customs and railway centre shipping port for a number of large and populous settlements, some of which are twelve to fifteen miles from the railway, and all of which will be seriously inconvenienced by the closing of this office.

(3) The entering and clearing of vessels is a matter of much importance, and while this does not bring in revenue, and we realize that the office may not be profitable from that standpoint, we beg to submit that the service given to the public generally is so great as to more than justify its maintenance in view of the very small salary and expense connected with it.

(4) In stressing the urgency of this matter we wish to represent that the question of revenue should not be the department's only guide in such cases. Accommodation to the public is being given in most branches of government service without regard to financial returns, and we believe this is a case in which the needs of a large section of country should be considered rather than the small economy which can be effected by closing the office.

Therefore we earnestly pray that your department should give further consideration to this case, and trust you may see your way clear to meet our views, and the needs of this district, by maintaining the customs office at Cardigan.

The same arguments could be applied to several other districts where the offices have been closed, notably at Murray Harbour, Murray River, and St. Peter's Bay, and to a lesser extent at Annandale. During the summer time there is a considerable traffic from the United States to Prince Edward Island. Many of our people who have gone to that country to work return for a visit to their friends, and of course the custom is to check their baggage through from Boston or New York, or whatever point they depart from. Take the case of Cardigan. A man writes to his friends at that point advising them that he expects to arrive by a certain train, and he checks his baggage through. Perhaps his friends have to drive twelve or fifteen miles to meet him, and then it is discovered that they cannot get his baggage. What are they going to do about that? They will have to go back home and make another trip to some other place where there is a customs house in order to have the baggage examined. Considerable hardship will be caused through

closing this office, when it could be averted by continuing to pay the small salary which was paid to the official at that point. The reason given is that the customs returns have been so small, but if the same principle were applied to other branches of the government service many offices would have to be closed. It would be found necesasry to close most of the post offices if they were considered on a revenue basis.

There is another port which I would like to mention, the port of Georgetown. This is the winter port of Prince Edward Island, and is the port of call for many vessels. I have made representations both to the minister and to the commissioner of customs regarding this matter. I made them as strong as I could, and I wish to repeat them here. The only expense at that port is the salary of the official, because there is a government building which houses both the customs and the post office. That building has to be maintained, heated and lighted for the post office, regardless of whether or not the customs house is maintained. This customs office was established long before confederation. Last year fifty-three foreign vessels entered and cleared; there were two hundred and fifty-three coastwise entrances and clearances, or over three hundred in all. Some of these are large foreign steamers which carry away our potatoes in the fall for delivery to the southern states. I have received information that the postmaster is to be authorized to enter and clear the foreign vessels, while the coastwise vessels are to be allowed to trade back and forth without being subject to entrance and clearance. Even though it has been thought desirable to close this office, the department has a man down there who is costing the department possibly over $2,000 per year, while the man they dismissed was only receiving $660 per year. How long this expensive officer will be kept there is a problem, because at the present time there is no postmaster and there may not be one appointed for many months. Surely if it is necessary to maintain a man there it would be far better to retain the man receiving a salary of $660 per year than to continue to employ one who is costing over $2,000 per year.

Mr. EULER: Is the hon. member referring to the postmaster?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I refer to the officer of the department who is at present at that port. The man who was dismissed had been at that port for the last eighteen years, and although it was thought necessary to close the port they sent an official from Charlottetown to take charge of the office and keep it open.

Mr. EULER: Is the hon. member referring to the present time?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Yes.

Mr. EULER: What officer is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): The officer's salary is $1,500 per year and he is receiving his expenses, which I estimate would run to at least $500 per year. A considerable amount of money was spent on repairing the bonded warehouse at this point, even though the office has been abolished. I think this matter should be reconsidered by the department and a decision arrived at to keep this office open, in the interest both of the province and of the shipping traffic to and from that port.

What are we going to do when a vessel which must have qualified officers who must be under articles arrives at the port of Georgetown or one of the other ports I have mentioned where the offices have been abolished? How can we put the crews upon articles and start the ship out? How are we going to pay our sick mariners' dues? What will happen to a vessel which has no clearance papers when it is forced by stress of weather to seek shelter in a foreign port? Under the marine laws a vessel without clearance papers is liable to arrest. These things, taken in connection with the statements which I have previously made regarding the advantages accruing to the smugglers, should, I think, convince the minister that this matter should be reconsidered and the offices which have been closed reopened.

Mr. EULER: I did not reply sooner to the speeches made by some of my hon. friends, chiefly in the far corner, because I had spoken briefly this afternoon to what seemed to me to be the only points of importance that were brought up. I might add to and enlarge upon what I said some two weeks ago when the question was previously discussed in order to strengthen the arguments I made at that time, and which do not seem to have force with some of my hon. friends on the other side. I shall refrain, however, from doing that. It is not my intention to reply particularly to anything that has been said to-day, because with all respect to my hon. friends I do not think they have refuted anything I said ten days or two weeks ago. There may be one or two exceptions. Apparently, there are differences of opinion be-

tween a certain United States congressman and myself, but I must adhere absolutely to what I said on the occasion to which I refer.

Something was said with regard to vessels crossing from Detroit to Windsor, and the matter of clearances. I must maintain that boats that leave the United States shore without cargoes, as those boats do leave, do not obtain clearances. They leave Detroit, we will say, with no cargo, because they expect to get their cargo on the Canadian side, and they do not obtain clearances.

With regard to marks of identification, these boats may be marked with a number similar to that carried by an automobile; but surely if a man is bent, as he is in United States waters, on an illegal errand, he is not going to continue to carry that identification mark, and it is very easy for him, before he reaches the Canadian side, to remove the little name or license number that his vessel bore when he left the city of Detroit. I put it to the common sense of the committee whether a Canadian customs officer, in giving clearance to the United States vessel, can do anything to find out whether the name of the master of that vessel or the name of the boat itself is real or fictitious. He cannot do it. As I said this afternoon—and I say it with no intention of giving offence—if it were felt by the United States authorities that we were not giving the proper information, surely they would have accepted the invitation extended to them by this government only two months ago to place on our docks their own officials who could themselves give the necessary information to United States authorities at Detroit or any other point on the United States side of the border. As I said at the outset, I do not propose to enlarge on the matter. I stated some days ago my position and that of the government. What I have heard to-night has not led me to feel that any change should be made in the statement I made then; nor have I any reason to believe, after listening to the debate, that the opinion of the great majority of the members of the house is opposed to what I then said.

With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Kings as to the closing of ports, I may say that in the last year or so some 230 of them have been closed, and this has been one of the most disagreeable experiences I have had since I have been in the office. It is not an easy matter to close a port. In practically every instance strong objection is raised to the closing of a port, no matter how small it may be; there is an element of local pride involved, also the matter of convenience, and of course somebody will be inconvenienced when a port is closed. We have endeavoured to reduce that to a minimum. I might state to the committee the course upon which we proceeded. Perhaps a year and a half ago, when we had time to get down to this particular phase of the work, we called in the inspectors of the various districts and they got together with the commissioners and officials of the department at Ottawa. They sat down at a table with a map showing the various ports and they discussed very freely what ports might be closed without injury to public business. A large selection was made and as yet they have not all been dealt with. As I say, we have closed some 230 ports. The matter of revenue has not been in all cases the deciding factor, although it has been in some. The matter of entries and the matter of convenience are involved. We have been more disposed to leave open the ports on the border than those smaller ports inland. But the matter of revenue is important. For instance, take the case of Cardigan, one of the points mentioned by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. The import duties amounted to $324.54 and the salary paid, $360. We are not trying to single out any particular province. In Nova Scotia there were more than 100 ports and outports where the revenues were smaller than the expense of maintaining the ports. The amount of expenditure and revenue is not necessarily the deciding factor, but it should have a very important bearing on the matter. The closing of the ports was one of the things recommended both by the parliamentary committee of inquiry and by the royal commission inquiring into the customs.

Mr. KENNEDY: I should like to get this question clearly—

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend will have his opportunity later. It is also recommended by the auditors, Clarkson, Gordon and Dilworth. I may say frankly that it was done because I thought it was the right thing to do. That is why we are doing it and continuing to do it.

As regards the entries and clearances of vessels and a good many of the revenues in connection with imported commodities, in the smaller places we have tried as far as possible to meet the conveniences of all concerned. For instance, all postal parcels may be entered at the post office by the postmaster himself. Foreign vessels may be cleared by the postmaster. In that way we have tried to reduce the inconvenience to a minimum. I fully appreciate, as my hon.

friend says, there will be considerable inconvenience, but I may inform him also that ports have been closed of a great deal more importance than the ones to which he has referred, ports with revenues a great deal higher. I do not see how this is going to be avoided; the house approved some years ago the principle of closing some of these ports, and it simply cannot be done without offending some of our people.

Mr. MANION: In that regard, may I ask the minister about Cardinal and Iroquois? I brought the matter up before. A friend of mine spoke to me about it. Cardinal was closed; Iroquois was not, yet Cardinal was doing the greater amount of business. Is Iroquois still open?

Mr. EULER: Yes. The matter is still under consideration. I rather expect to receive some criticism because a certain port may have been closed while another port is still open, although that other port may have a smaller revenue than the one that has been closed. I shall have to admit that there may be instances of that kind. My only answer is that we have not yet completed the work. We hope to settle those matters after a time.

Mr. MANION: I had it pointed out to me, and I am sure the minister has had it pointed out to him, that a large amount of money, some tens of thousands of dollars, is being taken in by the national railways at Cardinal. It is very important from a revenue standpoint. I should like the minister, in view of the facts which I and others have laid before him, to give the matter further consideration. It is rather unfair to have closed this port, particularly in view of smaller places having been left open.

Mr. EULER: I am informed that, as regards Cardinal, the matter has all been settled quite satisfactorily. In many of these places, while the total of the revenue may be quite large, the number of entries may be quite small. The work of the collector is very much less on that account.

Mr. MANION: In what way has it been satisfactorily settled?

Mr. EULER: Most of the importations I understand are coal and corn. The boat will unload directly at the port, but the duty may be paid at Prescott. I understand that the Canada Starch Company, who are the chief business people there, are quite satisfied with the arrangements we have made. I would say further to the committee that there is no absolute finality about this matter. It may be found that a mistake has been made in closing a certain port, and if we are convinced that such is the case I have no objection to reopening the whole question with a view perhaps to opening a port again.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): When I spoke before I overlooked mentioning that the port of Georgetown was considered of sufficient importance by the legislative assembly of Prince Edward Island for them to take the matter up in session last spring, when they heard that the port was to be closed, and I have in my hand a resolution that was passed unanimously by the house, and signed by the Speaker, protesting against the closing of this port. I have also a resolution to the same effect from the town council of Georgetown. I should like to know what is going to be done about vessels in connection with the points I have brought up—a vessel gets blown off her course and has to go to a foreign port without a clearance; also with regard to a vessel that wishes to pay the sick mariners' fund.

Mr. VENIOT: They can arrange that through the post office.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): How would you get articles for the crew in connection with a vessel over 100 tons?

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend is dealing with a technical point that I do not understand, but I will take a note of what he says.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I happen to know these matters because it is a part of my business. There might be very serious inconvenience in that connection.

Mr. EULER: In any event it is a matter not for the customs department, but for the Marine department.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): The collector of customs always handled that. It is the only way that I know of.

Mr. VENIOT: As an old collector of customs may I say in connection with the signing of an articled crew that there is a fee charged, and it can easily be arranged for the chief collector to go to the outport or sub-port and sign on the crew. The commission he would get would be sufficient to pay the expenses.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): That is what I am trying to get at. I want to know what arrangement is being made, because something will be necessary. I think we are also entitled to know why the man at Georgetown was dismissed and a man drawing three times as

much sent to take his place for the time being, and how long that condition will continue. I stress the point for the reason that the collector of customs had been there eighteen years, and being a man with a family and receiving only $660 a year, he has not been able to save any money. It was a full-time job and he was not able to take on any other work. Now he is let out without notice. Surely it is unfair to let him out in that way. If anybody has to be kept on it should be the man who has been there for years.

Mr. EULER: I am sure there must be an error. It may be the man to whom my hon. friend refers as receiving $2,000 or $3,000 is a preventive service man.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): No.

Mr. EULER: The incumbent of the office received a salary of $660 a year. He was superannuated, and the office, according to my records, was closed on May 1 of this year. I cannot understand how there can be a man there now drawing the salary that my hon. friend mentions. I should like to ask where he gets his information that a man has been sent there drawing a salary of $2,000 or more a year to replace another man who was drawing $660 a year. Perhaps his information is personal, but if he can prove it I think we are very seriously in error. There must be a mistake somewhere.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): That is why I brought the matter up. I consider it is entirely wrong. I was there only two weeks ago, and I know the man is there.

Mr. EULER: What is his name?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): Nicholas Murphy, from the Charlottetown office; and I see from the report of the department that his salary is $125 a month. He is boarding at the hotel, and certainly that would be not less than $500 a year. The reason he was there was that there was no postmaster.

Mr. VENIOT: The post office is not closed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): No, a girl is running the post office temporarily because no postmaster has been appointed. The position became vacant a month or so ago, and no appointment has yet been made. This man was sent down there to keep the customs office open. In fairness to the man who was eighteen years in charge of this office, I say that if some person had to be there to carry on those duties, he should have been retained, at a lower cost to the department, and to his personal advantage.

Mr. EULER: I can only say what I said before, that it comes as a surprise to me to hear that there is a man there drawing $150 a month, replacing the man who had been drawing a salary of $660 a year, and was superannuated in the ordinary course. I think my hon. friend must be in error. There is a mistake somewhere. We all make mistakes and perhaps the mistake is here, but none of the officials know of any such man having been appointed. I promise my hon. friend that I will make an investigation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): That was the condition only two weeks ago.

Mr. SHORT: I also am interested in the closing of these ports because in my constituency ten or twelve of them have been closed, and practically every one of them is on the coast line. That leaves practically the whole coast line free for smuggling, because there is no one there to prevent it. The postmasters are not interested in this matter. They may be interested in the entering and clearing of vessels, but not in knowing what cargoes those vessels land.

Mr. EULER: There are preventive service men along the coast.

Mr. SHORT: Not a preventive service man. You closed the office at Tiverton, on Long island, a point which a preventive service officer has never visited more than once in six or eight months, and there are vessels plying between the United States and that port right through the whole season. It is not on the mainland. There has been an office there since confederation. I have been informed that the office at Bear River is also to be closed. The reason given by the department is that the revenue was only $2,000 a year. I do not know whether that office has yet been closed, but my information from the minister personally and in a letter from his secretary was that it was the intention to close it. That port has had a customs office ever since confederation, and it would be a great inconvenience to have it closed. I can quite understand the department closing a lot of little offices in the interior, but to close the ones along the seacoast such as those I have in my constituency is a great mistake. It is a great inconvenience to the public. It may be that many of these small offices do not pay a sufficient revenue to keep them up, but it is not only for revenue purposes that you have offices along the coast; it is to prevent smuggling and for the convenience of the public. Take a point like Tiverton. Perhaps that is not an office producing revenue sufficient to defray the expenses, but there is

a great deal of shipping in and out of there, vessels plying between Canada and the United States. The postmaster who has the authority to enter and clear those vessels is not interested in whether they are smuggling or not; all he is interested in is the fifty or seventy-five cents that he gets for entering and clearing each vessel. You are leaving the whole coast wide open for smugglers. That is a great mistake.

I understand the minister stated to-night that the postmasters in these places will collect the duty on parcels. Now, that is not the case. As I understand it, under the new regulations these parcels will come to the main point—in my constituency the Digby customs office—where they will be opened by the collector, and he will assess the duty. He makes the entry, not the postmaster in the place to which the parcel is addressed. Then the collector sends the parcel to the postmaster to collect the duty. You are putting the work of several offices on to the main office. You are not going to save anything, because you will have to give the main office more help in order to take care of this parcel business, which is very large in many of the country places. You have also to give a commission to the postmaster on the duties collected. You are saving very little by this change, and you are inconveniencing the public very much indeed. I think the minister should have considered these things before he took this step. He should have looked into the situation more thoroughly and found out just what the public inconvenience was going to be. Let me ask him: how many of these offices have been closed in the constituency next to mine, Shelburne-Yarmouth?

Mr. EULER: I cannot tell my hon. friend. I have not the information in that form.

Mr. SHORT: You should have the information. You must have expected that this matter was going to be brought up.

Mr. EULER: I certainly did, but I did not expect members would ask me how many offices were closed in their respective constituencies.

Mr. SHORT: There is a good deal of partiality shown in this thing.

Mr. EULER: I question it.

Mr. SHORT: I do not question it.

Mr. VENIOT: I know in my county alone they have closed five.

Mr. SHORT: That is all right. How many are closed in the constituency of Shelburne-Yarmouth?

[Mr. Short.]

Mr. EULER: At least five are closed there.

Mr. SHORT: There were twelve closed in Digby-Annapolis. I think we have more coast line in Digby-Annapolis than they have in Shelburne-Yarmouth; in fact I feel confident that is so. I think there is partiality shown in the closing of these offices. You say there is no politics in this at all. Well, has the Bear River office been closed?

Mr. EULER: No.

Mr. SHORT: The minister changed his mind in that case, then.

Mr. EULER: It is not closed yet.

Mr. SHORT: He changed his mind.

Mr. EULER: Not necessarily.

Mr. SHORT: He told me personally that he was going to close it. His secretary wrote me it was to be closed, and that the collector would be sent to the office at Halifax. Why was it not closed?

Mr. EULER: I told my hon. friend it is under consideration.

Mr. SHORT: But the minister had already made up his mind, because I have in my office a letter from his secretary in which he states the office was to be closed and the collector sent to Halifax.

Mr. EULER: That may be quite true.

Mr. SHORT: Will the minister tell me why he did not close it?

Mr. EULER: If my hon. friend wants me to say so, I cannot tell; I do not know as yet. I do not recollect everything that is done in this department. I will get the information for him if he wants it.

Mr. SHORT: But the minister must have those records. He certainly must have expected that these questions would be asked, because he has closed these offices all over the country. He should have come here prepared to answer these questions.

Mr. EULER: If I came here prepared to answer every question asked by hon. members I would fill every desk in the chamber with papers.

Mr. SHORT: His deputy must have the records. I am very glad indeed that he has changed your mind in connection with the closing of Bear River. But he certainly had made up his mind to close it, and had given instructions to close it. Undoubtedly political pressure was brought to bear on him, and that is the reason it has not been closed.

Mr. EULER: I am quite sure it would be no use to deny that; my hon. friend would not believe me anyway.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): I think, Mr. Chairman, we are all in the same position wth regard to the closing of ports. This action is certainly unpopular in the different districts throughout the Dominion and especially down in the maritimes where those ports have been used by the people for a great number of years. I do not think any partiality has been shown. If there has been any we have not discovered it, because in the county which I represent all the ports have been closed with the exception of two. There were two ports there that we were very anxious to have kept open, Tignish and Alberton, in the extreme western part of the province, fifty or sixty miles from the town of Summerside, which is the headquarters. We felt that although those offices were not remunerative to the department, still they were of benefit to the people and their continuance would be greatly appreciated. We took the matter up with the minister and did our best, but the policy which he is following throughout the whole Dominion has, I suppose, to prevail. With what my hon. friend has said regarding the port of Georgetown I quite agree. It is the winter port of the province, and I know the provincial government took a very strong stand that it should be left open. If, however, arrangements have been made through the Post Office department whereby vessels can be cleared so that no inconvenience will result to the people, it may be all right; but otherwise we would like to see the ports left open. We have received very strong protests against the closing; we have sent those to the minister, and all I can say is, we are sorry we were not able to prevail on him to leave the ports open.

Mr. EULER: There is one thing I should like to mention that I overlooked. The chief purpose in the closing of the ports was to follow out the recommendations of the parliamentary committee and the royal commission as they commended themselves to myself and the department. With regard to this one thing in particular, the complaint was that the department was losing large revenues because of undervaluation. True, is was not only smuggling, it was undervaluation, which has not entirely been gotten rid of. You can only get proper valuations by getting proper appraisals; you can only get proper appraisals through good appraisers; and you cannot get good appraisers in a very small port. That was one of the compelling reasons for the closing of those ports. I should like to ask those who are objecting so strenuously to the closing of these small offices, what principle they would advise the minister to follow in closing them. If they are going to base their objection entirely on the score of local inconvenience, then no ports at all would be closed.

Mr. SHORT: What is the necessity for closing them? They have been there for twenty years.

Mr. EULER: I am afraid that nothing I might say would appeal to the hon. member. In the town of Tiverton the salary was $360 per annum while the import duties amounted to only $234.10. He speaks of the large number of vessels arriving and departing, only twelve foreign-going vessels arrived in the course of the year.

Mr. SHORT: But those twelve might bring in thousands of dollars.

Mr. EULER: The entries were only forty-three, not one a week. This, it goes without saying, is a reason for closing the port.

Mr. CANTLEY: That is not a conclusive argument. We are keeping post offices open at various places, the revenue of which is, comparatively speaking, very small; but they are a convenience to the public.

Mr. EULER: Would my hon. friend give me the benefit of his advice as to what principle should be adopted in the closing of ports?

Mr. CANTLEY: I would not close an office that had been open for sixty years until I had good evidence that by so doing the public service would be enhanced. Will the minister tell me how many offices were closed in the county of Pictou, and the names?

Mr. POWER: May I point out to the hon. member that the difference between a post office official and a customs officer is that one is a convenience and the other a nuisance.

Mr. CANTLEY: That is your point of view.

Mr. EULER: I cannot give that information; it is not given by counties.

Mr. CANTLEY: Have you closed the custom house at Pugwash?

Mr. EULER: Since there seems to be a charge of favoritism I might point out that in Prince Edward Island there were twenty-three ports and the number has been reduced to four. In view of the political complexion of that province I do not think anyone will contend that there is favoritism there.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings): I did not charge favoritism in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EULER: I was not thinking of my hon. friend in that connection. Pugwash is closed.

Mr. CANTLEY: I regret that. Pugwash has been open since long before confederation—seventy-five years and more. In that port we have some foreign shipping and the closing of that office will be a distinct inconvenience to the people there; it is, I think, a very great mistake from every point of view. I appreciate the fact that the minister is guided by the very best intentions, but in this matter he has gone too far. A few years' experience will demonstrate that to him. I am not suggesting political favouritism. I do not think there was any political interference at all; I am not making that charge so far as Pugwash is concerned. But I do say that it was a mistake to close the port and I should like the minister to reconsider his decision with respect to this particular port. I might advance various reasons but I will not do so now, because I have faith in the good intentions of the minister and I think that after consideration he will reverse his decision.

Mr. EULER: I will not say that I will not give every consideration to the matter in any event, but I can give the hon. member this information. The salary paid was $560 per annum and the collections amounted to $162.89. The entries were seventy-four, a little more than one a week. The export entries were eleven; foreign going vessels arriving numbered four in the whole year and foreign vessels departing, eleven; coasting vessels arriving during the year numbered twenty-four and departing, seventeen. The postmaster is authorized to make collections on postal parcels and to enter and clear foreign going vessels. I have given the import duties, which amount to $162, and I have given the salary paid, $560; on the face of it there is a fairly good argument for closing the port.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am not arguing from the revenue. Where a certain number of foreign going vessels enter and clear they have to change crews; how will they do it now?

Mr. EULER: I am not familiar with the situation.

Mr. CANTLEY: They must go to Pictou to do it. They have to engage new crews and pay off the old crews, and to do that they are obliged to go to Pictou, whereas formerly they did it in Pugwash.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. VENIOT: The Pictou collector can go to Pugwash.

Mr. CANTLEY: That is not the point. The point is that we have had facilities for over seventy-five years and you have taken them away and we are not satisfied and will not be satisfied under these conditions.

Mr. VENIOT: The same in my county.

Mr. SHORT: That does not help the matter.

Mr. VENIOT: I was reasonable enough to accept it because I saw the necessity, if we are to follow the report of the Royal Commission on Customs and Excise, as some hon. gentlemen opposite suggest we should. But when we do so they blame us.

Mr. SHORT: You have never heard anyone say you must follow it altogether.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes; I have heard you say so.

Mr. SHORT: You have never heard us say you must follow it in toto.

Mr. VENIOT: I have heard hon. gentlemen blame us for not following the recommendations of the customs commission.

Mr. SHORT: Not in everything; that is a lame excuse. I say that the closing of these ports which have been in existence for years and years is creating a good deal of hardship in many cases in Nova Scotia. I have cited the case of Bear River; that was a point where the collections were over $2,000 a year, and instructions have been given to close it. How can the minister justify that?

Mr. EULER: Ports have been closed with a much higher revenue than $2,000.

Mr. VENIOT: For example, Port Elgin, in New Brunswick, with $9,000.

Mr. KENNEDY: The minister the other day made a statement which is reported in Hansard to this effect—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): By leave of the house, I beg to submit the fifteenth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Saturday, June 8, 1929

The house met at 10.30 o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Mr. ROBERT McKENZIE (Assiniboia, for Mr. Morin, St. Hyacinthe) presented the ninth report of the select standing committee on standing orders. He moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that this report contains a request for the remission of money. When money has been paid to the officers of the house and the bill is not proceeded with or is not in order, that money automatically reverts to the Receiver General and can be refunded only by the Minister of Finance bringing in an estimate to that effect. Therefore, I think this motion should stand.

Motion stands.

YUKON MAIL CONTRACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, as there probably will not be time to have a question answered in the regular way, I would ask the Postmaster General to state how many tenders have been received for the Yukon mail contract, the names of those who have tendered, the amount of each tender, and the successful tenderer.

Hon. P. J. VENIOT (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) consulted with me before deciding to ask this question, and I have an answer prepared. Nine tenders have been received, as follows:

Gorst Air Transport Limited—$750 per round trip carrying 1,000 pounds of mail each way with at least 50 round trips per season, $37,500.—And any trips in excess of 50 will be carried for $650 per trip (round), 1,000 pounds.

The department asked that tenders be submitted for the carrying of 62,000 pounds of mail. This tender would amount to $45,300 for 62,000 pounds. The following tenders were for the full tonnage of mail:

Thomas Cecil Richards Whitehorse, $44,000.
P. Martin and J. R. Alguire, $45,000.
John L. McLennan, A. Dubois and E. E. Hickey, $49,750.
J. E. Greenfield and J. E. Pickering (Greenfield and Pickering) Whitehorse, $56,000.
Christian Gloslie, $56,900.
George Camden Smith, Whitehorse, Yukon, $57,250.
Greenfield and Pickering, Whitehorse, (J. E. Greenfield and J. E. Pickering), $60,000.
Robert Lowe, Whitehorse, $60,000.

Those are the nine tenders. The question was to whom the contract would be awarded. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, namely, Thomas Cecil Richards, Whitehorse, $44,000.

For the information of the house I may say that since they brought up the question of carrying increased poundage, I have looked into the matter and it appears that a certain quantity of second-class matter accumulates during the winter time at Dawson or Whitehorse and is not transferred to the Yukon until some time in the spring or summer. I am endeavouring to make arrangements with the man who has been awarded this contract under the general call, to have that extra accumulated mail taken over at certain periods as it accumulates, perhaps once a month, and, if possible, twice a month. If that cannot be done in the regular way by the trail, we will endeavour to have it done by aeroplane so that when the spring arrives there will be very little, if any, accumulated mail for that section of the country.

The question has been raised of having that mail service carried out by aeroplane. I have not accepted that suggestion for the reason that if we accept the proposition of transporting mail to the Yukon entirely by aeroplane, we shall be taking away from the people of the Yukon the assistance they are now getting through a mail contract, of keeping the trail open in the winter time. By this system of transportation of the mail we aid that territory by keeping open the winter trail, and I thought it in the interests of the people there, while permitting a certain amount to be carried by aeroplane, to continue the old system of getting the mail through in order to assist those people by keeping the trail open during the winter.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 313, to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), the chairman of the committee, will, I think, be in a better position than I am to explain the amendments to the house.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): There are a few amendments which are really corrections of typographical errors which have crept into the printed copy. One amendment of a very serious nature is the following. The clause reads:

Any appointment made by the chief electoral officer may be made by reference to the title of office of the appointee.

The Senate in their revising capacity have thought well to make it read:

By reference to the title of the office.

There is some discussion amongst authorities learned in the law as to whether or not we should say a man has the title of office or the title of the office. In view, however, of the importance of the legislation, I would not suggest to the house that we appoint managers to consult with the Senate as to whether this matter was seriously discussed with them. The other amendments are not of any consequence and I suggest that the house accept them.

Motion agreed to, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

National Revenue—salaries and contingencies, $795,840.

Mr. SPENCER: Yesterday we had a good deal of discussion with regard to clearance papers for vessels carrying liquor to the United States. If the government carried out the expressed wishes of this parliament in 1926 and refused clearance papers to such vessels, what difference would it make to the revenue of this country? If clearance papers were refused, would it cost a great deal, and if so, how much, in the minister's estimation, for any increased force that would have to be engaged to do this work?

Hon. W. D. EULER (Minister of National Revenue): I am not sure that I can give anything like an accurate estimate of the amount of revenue that would be lost if clearances were discontinued. It might not be very great. The committee, of course, understands that all excise is paid on liquor when it leaves the distilleries. The collections last year of liquor cleared for the United States amounted to $12,421,000. If those clearances were discontinued, I do not think it would at all follow that a large amount of liquor would not go to the United States, and whether it entered the United States by way of clearance or without a clearance, that liquor, if it came from Canadian distilleries, would still have paid us revenue, but it would not then appear under the heading of clearances to the United States, because clearances would not be granted. It would appear, no doubt, as domestic consumption. The liquor would be purchased, I suppose, from the government stores in Ontario or from the liquor commission in Quebec. It might be exported and yet it would not appear under clearances to the United States, so that we could not calculate what amount would be lost. It would all depend upon how much the exportation to the United States would be reduced by the discontinuance of clearances.

The other question, I understand, was how much it would cost—

Mr. SPENCER: For an extra force to try to prevent people from breaking the law with regard to importing liquor into the United States.

Mr. EULER: I cannot say definitely. I have heard it estimated at anywhere from $1,000,000 upward a year. It would depend upon the size of the preventive force you would require to establish. You might have to put boats on the lakes in order to watch vessels going out illegally without clearances.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the minister give the house the increase in the preventive service in the last three years?

Mr. EULER: In the land forces in 1927, there were 142 employees, and in 1928, 342. It was in 1928 that the chief reorganization took place. Last year there were 318 employees, a slight reduction as compared with the previous year. The personnel of the shipping crews amounted in 1927 to 283; 1928, 649; 1929, 544. To the latter should be added 48 men for two new vessels now building, one of which I understand will soon be in commission. The number of employees on cruisers and patrol boats in 1927 was 16, and in 1928, 39.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What was the total number of employees in the land and sea forces of the preventive service in each of the last three years?

Mr. EULER: I have just given those figures.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the total?

Mr. EULER: For this year the total is 544, and last year, 649. The reduction is caused by reducing the crews on some of the boats, and in some cases we have reduced the land forces as we thought it advisable.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am at a loss to understand the figures just given by

the minister. There may be an explanation. In reply to a question I put on the order paper some time ago I was given the total number of employees in the preventive service, including boats, during the fiscal years 1922-23, 1923-24, 1924-25, 1925-26, 1926-27, 1927-28, and the grand totals for the years to which we have just been referring were 299 for 1925-26 and 400 for 1926-27. The minister now says 649. For the first nine months of 1927-28, apparently the last figures available, the number was 662. The minister makes that 544.

Mr. EULER: In 1928 the number was 649 and in 1929, 544.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I was informed that the number for 1927-28 was 662. The minister now says 649.

Mr. EULER: The figures vary from time to time. The ones I have just given are up-to-date.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What was the total for 1927-28?

Mr. EULER: The total was 649.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): For the first nine months it was 662, so I take it that there were some dismissals.

Mr. EULER: There may have been.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister does not know why there is this difference?

Mr. EULER: Sometimes a boat is taken off for a while. There have been dismissals, and probably will be some more from time to time.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I guess so, under patronage.

Mr. EULER: Under patronage you do not dismiss.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the total for 1928-29?

Mr. EULER: Up to the 1st of April this year, 544.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is no doubt that the minister is doing something to try to straighten out the preventive service. I notice that in 1922-23 the total number of employees, according to the figures furnished me by the department, was 127. What the figure of the minister is for that year I do not know. In 1923-24 the total was 170; 1924-25, 186; 1925-26, 299; 1926-27, 400; for the first nine months of 1927-28, 662. So there has been a very heavy increase in recent years. One would expect that there would be quite a bit more in seizure collections. It may be, however, that the mere establishment of the preventive service has had the effect of curtailing smuggling to some degree.

Mr. EULER: That is the meaning of the word preventive.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Exactly, but I am at a loss to understand one very striking comparison that I have before me. In the year 1923-24, the total customs seizures amounted to $334,877, and excise seizures, $268,148, or a total of $603,026. Those are the figures given me by the department. That total amount of seizures, $603,026, was made with a total staff of 170. In 1926-27, almost exactly the same amount of seizures was made, namely, $429,603, but that required 400 men, or at least 400 men were employed. In 1923, 170 men made seizures amounting to $603,026, and in 1926-27, 400 men seized approximately the same amount.

Mr. EULER: The answer simply is this: The preventive service was doing what they were supposed to do, preventing smuggling. If smuggling were not going on, there would be fewer seizures.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If that is the case, take the year immediately preceding in each case. In 1922-23, with a staff of 127 men, the seizures amounted to $326,434. Either the staff was not doing its duty at that time or there was very little smuggling. The attempted smuggling must have very much increased next year or the staff improved its service, one or the other, to collect the enormous amount they did that year. Between 1923-24 and 1924-25 there is a drop of $200,000 in the seizures. There seems to be a very striking fluctuation in the activities of the preventive service.

Mr. EULER: Not within the last few years.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The figures are striking because in the year 1922-23 the seizures amounted to $300,000 and in 1923-24 to $600,000, and in 1926-27 to $429,000.

Mr. EULER: If a big seizure of liquor is made it runs into money. Sometimes you may get seizures periodically and sometimes none at all.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister will perhaps not overlook the fact that seizures of liquor are tabulated separately, I

understand, because I find at the foot of one of these columns a note that, in addition, 70,534 gallons of liquor were seized having a duty paid value of $830,000. It does not say for what year that was.

Mr. VENIOT: I might be permitted to say a word or two on the preventive service, on the increase in the personnel, and on the variations in the value of the seizures in 1923-24, and in 1927, when the staff was larger. I think it is well known to the house that I live in a seaport myself. The county which I have the honour to represent is situated partly in the Restigouche Bay, partly in the baie des Chaleurs, and partly in the gulf of the St. Lawrence. Included in the lower section of the county we have Shippigan island and Miscou island, part of one island being entirely in the baie des Chaleurs and the other island drawing an imaginary line from East Point, Miscou, to Point Maquereau on the Quebec side, half in the gulf of St. Lawrence and half in the baie des Chaleurs. The balance of the county from these islands down to the county line of Northumberland is entirely in the gulf of St. Lawrence. I myself served in the customs department for eleven years as chief collector of the port of Bathurst, having under me four or five outports. During those years we had trouble with smuggling, and we had no organization to cope with it except the ordinary customs officials and tide waiters. There was no such thing between 1900 and 1911 as a real preventive service to stop smuggling on the high seas. Whatever the department did at that time was done through the officials who had their land duties to perform, which took up most of their time. When prohibition came into force in the several provinces down by the Atlantic seaboard smuggling increased, especially after the high duties placed on imported liquors. Up to 1925 there was not a sufficient staff to prevent smuggling to any great extent. The fishing fleets of the islands of Miscou and Shippigan in the county of Gloucester, numbering some 350 sail, would leave their home ports on a Monday and go codfishing on the banks in the strait of Northumberland, remaining away the whole week. At that time there was what was known as a "rum row" not only in the gulf of St. Lawrence and the Northumberland strait but also in the baie des Chaleurs. Our fishermen could get all the liquor they wanted at a very low price in exchange for their fish. When those men arrived home on Saturday they had smuggled liquor galore for distribution and sale. After the organization of the preventive force which the minister now has at his disposal, on that section of the New Brunswick coast rum row disappeared; we are no longer bothered with vessels lying twelve or fourteen miles out in the gulf of St. Lawrence or in the baie des Chaleurs loaded down with liquor ready to be handed over the side to fast motor boats. Since 1926 smuggling has disappeared in that lower section of the baie des Chaleurs and the gulf of St. Lawrence. I am not going to speak of conditions in the strait of Northumberland, that locality being too far away from my home. In those two areas smuggling has been reduced at least 80 per cent, and to-day we in the county of Gloucester are proud to be able to say that there is no smuggled liquor to be found in the homes of our fishermen.

I wish now to compliment the minister and his officials on the way in which they have organized the preventive service in that section of New Brunswick. In the past smuggling had the effect of demoralizing our fishermen; to-day we are clear of it. Under the old system we had no preventive officers in any of the outports in the county of Gloucester. There were five outports and one main port, and the only preventive officer we had was the preventive man or tide waiter in the port of Bathurst. To-day, if I am not mistaken, we have not only some four or five land preventive officers, but we have well manned and fast patrol boats. The result is that the smuggling fraternity, knowing those waters are so well patrolled, no longer look to that section of New Brunswick as a haven for their operations. At the present time there are ninety per cent fewer seizures, not because the officials are failing to do their work, but because they are doing it so effectually that the baie des Chaleurs and the gulf of St. Lawrence is clear of smuggling, to the credit of the Department of National Revenue and to the glory of the counties bordering on those waters. That will explain to some extent why with a staff of three or four hundred as compared with the former staff of about two hundred, fewer seizures are being made. The fewer seizures made the better it is for the country, provided the organization is operating as efficiently in other sections of the Dominion as it is in the section to which I have referred in the maritime provinces. I take it that it is not so much a question of the department getting revenue out of seizures as of preventing liquor from being trafficked in on the high seas.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister's statement is very interesting, but the point I wanted to make was not that there is

any particular reduction in the number of seizures. There does not appear to be any reduction, but there is a striking fluctuation from time to time.

Mr. VENIOT: There is a considerable reduction in the number of seizures if you compare the traffic of 1925 to 1926, as we knew it living along the seaboard, to what it was in 1922 and 1923.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister means that the actual liquor traffic has been cut down?

Mr. VENIOT: Certainly, smuggling has been cut down.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I have not the figures—

Mr. VENIOT: We do not need figures there; we see it every day.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Unfortunately we are not so familiar with the happy years when smuggling was prevalent.

Mr. VENIOT: They were not happy years for us.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No. As to the elimination of smuggled liquor in certain sections of that country, well, I am afraid the minister's experience has been largely happy, or unhappy, depending on his point of view.

Mr. VENIOT: Happy from the point of view of order.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Well I happened to be down in that part of the country, not New Brunswick—

Mr. VENIOT: I am referring only to New Brunswick.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River) —and I had a very happy experience. A car followed the one in which I happened to be driving, and on reaching an open stretch of the road it tooted its horn. I said to the driver of my car, "You had better let this chap pass. He wants to go by." "No," said my driver, "he does not. Wait a minute. When the road is quite clear we will stop." He stopped. A lovely bottle of Jamaica rum was produced from the rumble seat of the car behind. I asked where this stuff came from. I never saw rum in my life before I got down into that part of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VENIOT: You lost a lot of fun.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But, frankly, I want to hand it to the people of Nova Scotia. If they can drink that darn stuff and live—

Mr. EULER: You tried it, did you?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): —there is no danger of climate or anything else spoiling their health. The man said quite frankly, "This is brought in by the fishermen." I asked, "Is there much of this being done?" He replied, "Oh, a little." "How much?" He could not tell me, he was not in the business himself, but he had a bottle, in fact he had two or three, and they were all gifts. So I am not so sure that the minister has made out such a magnificent case for the maritimes generally as he thought he had.

Mr. VENIOT: I was not speaking of the maritimes generally—only of New Brunswick.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I know he was not; but as he is a minister from that country it might be taken that he was speaking for conditions down there generally. It is just as well to clear it up: he was speaking only of New Brunswick.

Mr. VENIOT: That is all.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): When I can afford it I am going to take a trip to New Brunswick, when I hope to find everything the minister says is correct.

Mr. VENIOT: If he will let me know a little ahead—not that I wish to prepare anything—I will follow him up and make him a present of a silk hat—

Mr. GUTHRIE: Make it a bottle of rum.

Mr. VENIOT: —the best he can buy, if he can discover any smuggling of that kind along the shores that I have just named.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If I wanted to find out anything of that character I would hardly send out a brass band like my hon. friend the minister to prepare the way.

Mr. VENIOT: No, I would keep it secret.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would hardly take any chances of that even then. Could the minister give me the total salaries and total expenses for 1928-29? My list is not complete in that regard.

Mr. EULER: The figure is $1,650,133.28.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is the total salaries.

Mr. EULER: The total expenditure. I can give the details: maintenance and operating expenses of cruisers and patrol boats, includ-

ing salaries, $1,038,319.34; patrol cars purchased, $40,881.22; land officers' salaries, $528,366.37; travelling expenses, $42,566.45. This makes the total.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the minister believe that he has now reached the limit of his requirements in the preventive service? Is the thing pretty well checked now?

Mr. EULER: It should be less, so far as expenditure is concerned, because in these figures there are sums paid for boats. We are building two final boats now and hope these will meet the requirements, so that next year the estimates may perhaps be less. I do not care to make that statement too definitely because we cannot tell what developments may occur which we shall have to meet; but I should judge that in future we should have a smaller estimate than this year's.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister might circumscribe his remarks by his mention of the number of boats. What about the personnel, the staff itself? The increase has been considerable; in the last few years the number has increased from 186 to over 600. I wonder whether the minister has any idea as to when the limit will be reached. I have no doubt he is doing good work and knows just how well the preventive service is functioning. The excise seizures are falling off, I assume he believes that, although I do not know whether it is a fact. As a matter of fact, are the excise and customs seizures falling off?

Mr. EULER: The excise seizures in 1927 were 1,618 and in 1928, 1,148.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What about the value?

Mr. EULER: I have not that. It would hardly be a question of value, because where an illicit still is seized there is no question of value.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Well, how does the department get the figures if the minister cannot supply them to me? The department says that in 1926-27 the excise seizures were valued at $123,260, and in 1927-28, for nine months, $106,658. Perhaps the minister will check up those figures.

Mr. EULER: The commissioner informs me that there is an appraised value taken which is usually too high. I cannot add anything to that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister cannot answer.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. EULER: What is the exact question?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The exact question is as to the total value of the excise seizures made in 1928-29.

Mr. EULER: We have not got it here but can get it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister has the figures for the salaries, for the boats, for the employees and the expenses; the only thing he lacks is the value of the excise seizures.

Mr. EULER: It would be only an estimated value in any case.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That was not suggested in the reply given to me by the department. The figures from the department are very definite; they are given in two columns, side by side, the total value of customs seizures and the total value of excise seizures. There is no question of an approximation; the exact figures are given. I must presume that documents from the department are accurate and not deceiving.

Mr. EULER: The significant fact is the number of seizures made. But when a still is seized it is destroyed and whatever alcohol is there is also destroyed, so that the value disappears.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): On what basis does the minister estimate his requirements in the way of personnel, staff, boats and so forth for the period immediately succeeding? He does not jump at a conclusion and say, "We shall require 1,000 men and 200 boats". He estimates the amount of work to be done and, I presume, he also estimates the number of men required to conduct the preventive service properly and efficiently; then he puts in his estimate. What I want to know is this: Does the minister think that we have now reached the limit?

Mr. EULER: I have answered that question.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes; but on what does the minister base his opinion?

Mr. EULER: On experience, of course.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But that varies.

Mr. EULER: The experience of a practical man, I should say, would be a pretty good indication. If we know that last year the number of men we had was about right, we shall know that that is what we ought to

have in the following year; and if, during the following year, developments show that we have either too many or too few, we shall make our adjustments accordingly. That is ordinary common sense.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But the expenditure, you see, is going up.

Mr. EULER: It includes capital expenditure for the construction of boats, which capital expenditure I said would no longer be required to be included inasmuch as the department would have all the boats needed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the capital expenditure on the boats alone?

Mr. EULER: We are building two new cruisers this year, costing $600,000—$300,000 each. That is entirely capital and that will not be needed next year.

Mr. IRVINE: What is the tonnage of the new cruisers, and what speed will they have?

Mr. EULER: They will have a speed of 17 knots; as to the tonnage, I am not much of a nautical man and I do not know. The speed is 17 knots and the crews will number 24 each. The length is 165 feet, the breadth 21 and the depth 13 feet.

Mr. SPENCER: How does that speed compare with that of the boats chased?

Mr. EULER: In the outside service it compares favourably with the speed of the large boats that come into the 12 mile limit, where these large boats operate. The small launches and speed boats that engage in smuggling within that limit are of course faster, but we have some boats to compete with them, attaining as high a speed as 35 miles an hour.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the minister give the total number of excise and customs seizures by provinces?

Mr. EULER: The excise seizures by provinces last year were: Prince Edward Island, 40; Nova Scotia, 64; New Brunswick, 21; Quebec, 328; Ontario, 312; Manitoba, 120; Saskatchewan, 202; Alberta, 41; British Columbia, 20; Yukon, none—making a total of 1,148.

Mr. SPENCER: How do you account for the small number of seizures in British Columbia, only half as many as those made in Alberta?

Mr. EULER: British Columbia is a difficult territory to operate in.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What are the customs seizures by provinces?

Mr. EULER: The commissioner is trying to get that information; I will have it in a moment.

Mr. SPENCER: I have listened with great interest to this debate and to the statement made by the minister. With reference to the recommendations made by the special committee of this parliament in 1926 and the recommendations of the royal commission, I notice that a great many of the recommendations have been carried out, but one which was made both by the commission and the special committee in connection with the refusal of clearance papers for boats carrying liquor to the United States apparently has been entirely ignored, and as yet I have not heard a clear and definite statement from the minister as to why this recommendation has not been complied with. It seems to me this is the most important point in the discussion, and I should be glad if the minister could give us a clear statement as to why that recommendation has not been followed.

Mr. EULER: I have given the explanation, but I will give it again. I think I made very clear what perhaps was not well understood by the committee or by members of the house, that clearances cannot be refused under the present law; that is the opinion of the Department of Justice. In order to refuse clearances, therefore, it would be necessary to amend the law by an act of parliament, and I am not sure that this was the intention at that time. I will say, however, that we have made many changes according to the recommendations contained in these reports, as we thought advisable in the light of experience and what we thought was necessary. If this parliament decides that clearances should be refused, then parliament will have to enact new legislation, and I will say to my hon. friend that personally I do not feel that advisable at the moment, for reasons which I gave in a former address some two weeks ago. I would say further that even during this debate I have found no reason to believe that this parliament, which at the moment is in the control of the destinies of this country, desires that change to be made; I have had no intimation from parliament or at least from more than a limited number of members that they desire any such change in the law.

Mr. SPENCER: To me it seems an extraordinary statement that at present clear-

ance papers cannot be refused under the law. Is it not a fact that some of the commissioners who conducted that inquiry were learned legal gentlemen, who were paid fabulous fees for their services? If that is so why should they make recommendations apparently in ignorance of the laws of the country?

Mr. EULER: I am sure my hon. friend does not suggest that even judges are infallible.

Mr. SPENCER: I do suggest that if we are to pay such men $150 a day or more, certainly they should understand what they are recommending to this parliament.

Mr. EULER: So far as the department is concerned there is no doubt whatever that under the present law we cannot refuse clearances. I think my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre, who acted as minister of this department for a short time, desired to refuse these clearances, but he also found that under the present law he could not do so. I personally made inquiries in that regard and was informed by the Department of Justice, whose guidance we must accept in matters of law, that under the law as it stands now there is no authority for the minister to refuse these clearances.

Mr. CAYLEY: The government has already undertaken to reduce the number of docks from which clearances may be made, and I was wondering why these docks could not be eliminated altogether.

Mr. EULER: As I explained some time ago, when the excise is paid on the liquor it becomes free, as is the case with any other commodity; it is in the same category as any other article which may be legally exported from Canada, and where a customs port exists anyone may avail himself of that port for the purpose of making exports. While we can limit the number of docks within a port we can do nothing which will prohibit any legal commodity from passing through that port. For instance, within the confines of the Windsor district there were some forty or fifty docks from which liquor went out. We cannot stop the liquor going out from that port but we can tell the exporters that they can ship only from certain designated docks, although of course that has not the prohibitory effect. Shipments may be carried on, but the traffic may be limited in that way, which also gives us more control.

[Mr. Spencer.]

Now I will give the customs seizures according to provinces:

Nova Scotia	480
New Brunswick	122
Prince Edward Island	58
Quebec	284
Ontario	783
Manitoba	145
Saskatchewan	78
Alberta	37
British Columbia	147
Headquarters	45
Total	2,179

The total for the year previous was 2,240.

Mr. GARDINER: How does that compare with seizures in former years, say 1923 and 1924?

Mr. EULER: I am sorry I have not that information.

Mr. IRVINE: I have heard a good deal of discussion, particularly from this section of the house, with regard to this question of refusing clearances. I am not going to discuss it at any length, but I want to say that I think if we began refusing clearances we would get into a great deal of real trouble. I should like to suggest to those people who are interested in preventing liquor from going to the United States that they go a little further and advocate prohibiting the manufacture of liquor in Canada, or as an alternative, suggest that the government control the whole business. Then we would not be faced with this question of refusing clearances, and we would not be permitting individual corporations to make money out of the business. Otherwise Canada will have to assume a large responsibility and a considerable expenditure to try to enforce a law which we have proved to be at least very difficult if not almost impossible to enforce.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If the house should decide to abolish the manufacture of liquor in Caanda where would the political parties obtain their campaign funds?

Mr. IRVINE: That is a question I will have to relay across the floor to the government and to the acting leader of the opposition; I do not know anything about such matters. If it so happens that the party campaign funds come from that source, they might be considerably reduced if we abolished the manufacture of liquor, but that might be a good thing and I do not think that is a reason why we should not take that step. However, I have every confidence in the present Minister of National Revenue; I think he is doing his work very well and I think the people of Canada believe that the Department of National Revenue is perhaps

the most efficient department of government to-day. Just in closing I might add that personally I am opposed to the drink traffic. I do not think that we can assist the United States government very much by refusing these clearances; we would be making a great deal of trouble for ourselves. I am going to suggest, as the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) suggested last night, that the government consider a more fundamental way of dealing with this matter. I believe the people of Canada should take over the whole business and nationalize the traffic with a view to abolishing it as soon as possible. Those who have become so accustomed to drinking that they cannot live without it will soon die off and younger people will be coming along who do not require liquor, and we can get rid of the whole business. I think the only course which can be followed is the one the minister is following, and I suggest to him that this question of nationalization be considered. I do not think that prohibition will be successful because it seems to be very difficult to enforce and I think the same results would be obtained through nationalization of the business. In that way the supply could be stopped at its source and we would have full control over the traffic.

Mr. BOURASSA: Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the minister took a very strong stand in regard to the enforcement of the law as it concerns the government of the United States, and I hope he will not do anything to weaken that position. The majority of the people of Canada, irrespective of province, party or race, as well as many people in the United States, support his position. Some people take the opposite view, quite sincerely no doubt, and I respect them, but there has been too much hypocrisy introduced into this question. Of course if one believes that Canadians have come down to the low level of the decadent and degraded races of the world, and find it impossible to control their habits of drinking, then one is right in asking for prohibition, but I am one of those who believe that we still retain some of the elements of civilization and are able to control our own habits in matters of drinking, as well as eating or anything else. Blue laws such as were necessary to be enacted by the French government in dealing with the Indians in the early days are not required to moralize the people of Canada. If people believe that the white population of this country has reached a point where the Indian population was centuries ago, or the Negro tribes of Africa are at the present time, then they are right in asking for prohibition, but the majority of the people of Canada still come up to the civilized standard of humanity and I do not think it is the business of the government to interfere with the ordinary habits of human beings.

I have no desire to throw any cold water upon the enthusiasm evinced by some members as to the effectiveness of our preventive service, and so forth, and I do believe that prevention is now much more effective than it was. However, there is another factor which must be considered, the fact that several of the provinces of Canada have come back to their senses and are now allowing a reasonable amount of controlled liquor traffic within their borders. This applies now to every province in Canada, Ontario as well as the western and the maritime provinces; they have come back to a normal standard in this matter. The Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) has made a good case for the province of New Brunswick, but I do not think the number of seizures in that province would have diminished as they have if it had stuck to its old policy of prohibition.

As was pointed out to the minister last year, another factor in the increase of smuggling and the manufacture of moonshine liquor is the high duties which were imposed upon liquor during the war times. Last year the minister intimated that the time might come when these duties would be decreased. A few weeks ago I received a letter from a missionary who has been stationed in northern Ontario for many years. He deals especially with the Indian tribes and asked me if it would not be possible for the government to do something to prevent the enormous amount of bad alcohol which is being distributed among the Indians of Manitoulin island and along the northern shore of lake Superior. He told me that he had been in that district for years and had noticed a very marked increase in the supply of bad whiskey ever since the high duties had been imposed. He said that before that time there was some drunkenness among the Indians but there was not the same inducement to illicit traffic as was given by the imposition of these high taxes. The minister intimated last year that he might take the sense of the house with regard to the lowering of these duties, and I think he would do well in not losing sight of that suggestion.

The position taken by the minister and his department with regard to the issuance of clearance papers is, in my estimation, the right one to take. I marvel at the way some people in Canada boast of our national pride but then seem to be prepared to make the officials of the Canadian government police agents for

the United States. I have no desire whatever to put Canada in a state of aloofness or difficulty with the government of the United States, but even the people in the United States realize that Canada is not on the northern border of their country simply as a police station for the American government. Mr. La Guardia, when speaking in the House of Representatives last week, said that the government of the United States was handicapped in putting its own laws into operation in the state of Maine because some of the best people in that state were the real lawbreakers. What justice would there be, and what sense would there be in asking the Canadian government to use its public services to enable the government of the United States to enforce a law which they are unable, and a good many of their agents are unwilling, to enforce in the United States. It has been demonstrated by public inquiries that the agents of the government of the United States are themselves smugglers into their own country.

To come back to our own country: my hon. friend from Bow River spoke of his experience in New Brunswick. I might speak of a similar experience I had in Ontario in holy prohibition days. I was once travelling through the western part of Ontario with a party of friends from Montreal. Some of us wanted to go ahead to prepare the reception in one of the inland towns. They were going at a pretty high speed in order to make time, when they saw a car coming after them and making certain signals which were understood by the chauffeur who said: "These are speed agents; I am afraid we will be held up for a fine." To this my friend said: "Very well, we will pay the fine and make the best we can out of it." So the police agents came up and said: "Gentlemen, you are from the province of Quebec?" "Yes." "Well, we want to show our spirit of hospitality," so they took out of their car a case of beer and they said: "You know this is not—" what was that famous beer? —"two point four per cent?" I tasted it once and I will never taste it again. It is far worse than any kind of rum the hon. member for Bow River may have tasted in New Brunswick. They said: "This is real beer, made in Quebec." My friends were very thankful, and I cannot, any more than they did, blame the police agents for their generous spirit of hospitality. But this shows the difficulty of enforcing blue laws in any country whatever. I think one of the most sensible things that has been done by the Ferguson government is the amendment of their liquor laws, and if the number of seizures decrease in Ontario, this will be largely due to the sensible policy of that government. I hope we will keep on that footing of common sense. We should not always endeavour to imitate what is done by the people of the United States or by any other people. Let us have laws that suit the conditions of the average Canadian and let us try to enforce such laws as are capable of enforcement. Let us not endeavour to make laws under the pretence of making people perfect. We are not perfect and we have no mandate to moralize by laws the people of Canada or the people of the United States.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I notice that the number of customs seizures in Ontario was 783 and in Quebec, 284. In other words, there were about three times the number of customs seizures in Ontario that there were in Quebec during the past year. Is there any difference in the method by which these seizures are made in the two provinces? Why is there such a discrepancy?

Mr. EULER: This is largely the result of seizures made at such points as Windsor and Niagara Falls. Many people cross at Detroit and Niagara Falls and probably more people come from the United States into Ontario than over the Quebec border. Many of the seizures are very small.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the procedure in regard to seizures the same in both provinces?

Mr. EULER: Certainly.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has been rumoured that in Quebec seizures are not made without consultation with the sitting member for the riding in which the offence takes place.

Sir EUGENE FISET: I wish that were true.

Mr. EULER: I wish to contradict that absolutely. So far as I know—and I think I should—there is no difference in practice in any part of Canada. All sections are treated alike.

Mr. ROBB: This is not the first time that we have had insinuations that the people of Quebec were the only smugglers throughout Canada. This morning we have from the acting leader of the opposition again the old insinuation—

Mr. GUTHRIE: I asked a straight question.

Mr. ROBB: —that the people of Quebec are greater smugglers than those in any other parts of Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The figures do not show that.

Mr. ROBB: We have the statement from the hon. gentleman who is administering the law, who himself comes from Ontario, that the methods of administration are identically the same in both provinces. It is about time for my hon. friends of the Conservative party to cease this continual attack upon the province of Quebec.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Very cheap stuff for the Minister of Finance.

Mr. KAISER: After the castigation administered by the Minister of Finance, an hon. member from Ontario had better think twice before he says anything. That kind of talk from a minister on the front benches is rather uncalled for. I want to ask the Minister of National Revenue one or two questions in order to get things clear in my mind. I understand that an excise duty is a tax paid for the release of liquor for consumption in our own country. The minister says that he charges an excise duty of $9 a gallon on liquor, when he knows and everybody else knows that it is going to be exported to the United States.

Mr. EULER: We do not know that.

Mr. KAISER: Then the minister releases the liquor not knowing where it is going to go. Supposing I, as an individual, go to a bonded warehouse and pay the excise duty, is there no question asked? Can any individual get all the liquor he wants from a bonded warehouse?

Mr. EULER: No.

Mr. KAISER: Then how is is that these people can get all the liquor they want for export to the United States?

Mr. EULER: As my hon. friend knows, under the act passed last year, nobody can purchase liquor in Ontario or in any other province except the government-controlled provincial bodies in the various provinces, unless for export.

Mr. KAISER: But the Canadian practice or law of export is that when the master of a vessel comes and asks for 10,000 gallons of whiskey, he has to put up a bond for twice $9 a gallon, and when he gets a clearance certificate from the customs officer in the foreign country and brings it back, the bond is released. This is not the practice in sending the liquor to the United States. How does it come about?

Mr. EULER: For the simple reason that the men cannot produce a landing certificate in the United States. The United States, being presumably dry, cannot give a landing certificate. These men who export liquor to the United States, one may be sure, will never even apply to United States officials for a landing certificate. They land the liquor secretly or, at least, fairly secretly sometimes. They cannot obtain a landing certificate in the United States showing that the liquor has been legally landed there. For that reason they pay the excise tax and then there are no questions asked. Our duty as a department of national revenue is ended when we collect the revenue on that liquor. If it is clearly proved to us that the goods have been legally landed in a foreign country, under our laws we are not entitled to any excise. That is why as regards liquor shipments which go to St. Pierre and Miquelon and other foreign countries which are not dry, where the purchase is legal, when the landing certificates are produced, the bond is released and we get no duty.

Mr. KAISER: This is not clear to me yet.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps it my fault.

Mr. KAISER: Perhaps it is and perhaps it isn't. We are not all given to understand things as readily as the minister.

Mr. EULER: I am admitting it may be my fault.

Mr. KAISER: The minister said that this liquor was released in Ontario only if the government control commission there gave him authority.

Mr. EULER: I did not say that.

Mr. KAISER: The minister said at the beginning that was the only condition under which it was released.

Mr. EULER: No, I said that it was sold only to government control commissions or for export to others.

Mr. KAISER: Then your only legal method of knowing that it has been exported is when you get the clearance certificate from a foreign country, and you say that the United States cannot give you a clearance certificate. What I am endeavouring to ascertain is why you make an exception in regard to sending liquor to the United States contrary to the usual regulations; why do not the same regulations apply to liquor going to Miquelon or anywhere else?

Mr. EULER: We cannot be absolutely certain that the liquor is going to the United States. We cannot be certain, legally speaking, that it did go to the United States unless we get an official certifi-

cate from the United States authorities that it is landed there. That certificate is never produced; therefore we have no knowledge that it actually goes to the United States. It may be perfectly true that the greater part of it does go there; I think it does, but so far as the law is concerned, unless we have the official certificate from the United States authorities that the liquor has been landed in the United States, we cannot excuse these people from paying the excise, and that is why they pay it. When the liquor is exported to some other country where proper landing certificates can be obtained the excise is not payable.

Mr. KAISER: But you do release that liquor to the United States without that certificate? How is it done?

Mr. EULER: It is done because they pay the excise, and then it is free goods the same as any other commodity, because we have received our revenue.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How do we get in our trade returns the shipments of liquor to the United States when you do not know whether it goes there or not?

Mr. EULER: The export entries are made that way.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are export entries showing that it goes to the United States.

Mr. EULER: Yes, but under the law unless they produce a landing certificate from the other side of the line we cannot excuse them from paying the excise.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But there is some entry of the transaction as an export to the United States, because I read in the reports that the shipments amounted to over $23,000,000.

Mr. SPENCER: During the customs investigation in 1926, it was noted that other goods besides liquor, silk and clothing, for instance, were being smuggled into this country. I would ask the minister what goods have been attempted to be smuggled into this country during the past year.

Mr. EULER: We have had letters from those who are interested in the silk trade in Canada, complimenting the department on the fact that that practice has been discontinued and I think that is true. If it were not true you would surely be receiving complaints. I think that that practice has been almost entirely stopped.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. SPENCER: The minister mentioned liquor seizures that were made from time to time. This liquor does not come from Canada or it would be transported by rail. From what countries does it come?

Mr. EULER: Most of the rum comes from the West Indies, almost altogether in fact. I think much of the liquor that comes in through the gulf of the St. Lawrence comes from St. Pierre de Miquelon.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, and temporary buildings and rentals, $7,815,975.

Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and in connection with the board of customs, and amount required to create positions, make appointments and pay salaries and expenses of Dominion appraisers, investigators of values and claims for drawbacks, $1,175,755.

Miscellaneous—Printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, instruments, etc., for various ports of entry, express charges on samples, stationery and legal forms, legal expenses, premiums on guarantee bonds and uniforms for customs officers, $700,000.

To provide for expenses of maintenance of revenue cruisers and for preventive service and amount required to create positions and make appointments of officers for the prevention of smuggling and to investigate reported frauds against the revenue, also to provide for expenses of such officers and for the purchase or charter of vessels, and for the purchase or hire of automobiles to be used in the prevention of smuggling, or other offences against the revenue laws, $2,007,933.

Amounts to be paid to Department of Justice to be disbursed by and accounted for to it for secret preventive service; amount required to create positions and make appointments of officers for the prevention of smuggling and to investigate reported frauds against the revenue; notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act, and the said positions and staff so appointed to be wholly excluded from said Act, $100,000.

To provide for the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and the Income War Tax Act, 1917, and amendments thereof, and authority for this purpose to create positions and make appointments, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act, and the said positions and staff so appointed are hereby wholly excluded from the operation of the said act and salary of $8,000 for the commissioner of income tax, $2,200,000.

To provide for payments to Messrs. Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle and Nash for services in connection with the investigation and prosecution of brewers, $15,000.—Total, $14,014,663.

Mr. EULER: I think we have discussed practically everything that comes under this particular vote under the previous vote.

Mr. SPENCER: I notice that income tax comes under this vote. We have not discussed that. There has been a great deal of criticism from time to time with respect to the small amount of income tax raised from the agricultural classes. Those of us who happen to represent largely agricultural constituencies do not like the criticism that is often made that collections are not made from the agriculturists because the farmers do not send in proper returns. I do not believe that for one moment because if the departmental officers are doing their work properly they will see that no one escapes paying the tax whether they are farmers or engaged in some other occupation. I would ask the minister if his department has any difficulty at all in collecting income tax from farming localities where they have had good crops and should have a revenue sufficient to pay income tax, or whether he thinks more money could be raised by way of income tax upon that particular calling than is being raised at the present time.

Mr. EULER: We have no complaint whatever to make with regard to the collection of income tax from the farmers.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How about the Business Profits War Tax Act? How much is there in arrears now in respect of that act?

Mr. EULER: Very little, less than $200,000 or $300,000. It is being wound up very rapidly.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is that the total accumulation of years?

Mr. EULER: That is all that is outstanding.

Mr. GUTHRIE: About how many firms or individuals are in default?

Mr. EULER: Out of 27,000 files there are about 50 outstanding, the commissioner tells me.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are only 50 still in default? Has any of this been written off or has it all been paid?

Mr. EULER: It has all been paid except what is still outstanding.

Mr. CAYLEY: How many farmers pay income tax?

Mr. EULER: The statistics for last year are not yet available, but for the year before, the number of farmers—they are called agrarians here—paying income tax was 3,201, and they paid a total of $241,281.12.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: With reference to the first item in this vote for the salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, there is an increase of $277,515. The minister stated yesterday that the number of ports had been decreased by 230. That brings the total number of ports, if the figure given in the report of the royal commission on customs is correct, from 773 down to 543. Why should there be such a large increase in the salaries and contingent expenses in the several ports in the Dominion if the number of ports has been decreased by 230?

Mr. EULER: Is my hon. friend referring to the first item?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Yes, on page 68.

Mr. EULER: Of the $277,000, $108,320 is directly attributable to statutory increases. Those are uncontrollable. Then there have been some additions to the staff, which, less a decrease in other appointments and promotions, total the balance of $147,000. While the royal commission stated that possibly the staff could be reduced, with a resulting reduction in expense, that is not exactly the fact. Hon. members will understand that in view of the fact that a certain degree of reorganization has taken place in the department, and also in view of the fact that the business of the country is expanding—we are making treaties with other countries which require an increased staff; we are building highways and attracting tourists which requires the maintenance of officers at the border in larger numbers than before—it is absolutely impossible to reduce our expenses; on the contrary, there must necessarily be an increase. I have no apologies to make in regard to that at all, because I think the increased expenditure is reflected in the better service and the larger revenues that we are collecting. That is my general explanation, and I think it is quite sound.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I assume that the figures in regard to the number of ports now open are fairly correct. Instead of 773 we now have 543 ports.

Mr. EULER: That is substantially correct.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How many are there in the United States?

Mr. EULER: Seventy odd.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I fail to understand why with a reduction of 230 the expense should not be decreasing rather than increased.

Mr. EULER: They are all very small places.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: But surely it costs money to operate even a small place; it has to be manned. Withdrawing 230 men, supposing there was only one at each port, ought to result in a decreased rather than an increased expenditure.

Mr. EULER: Quite a large number of the men to whom my hon. friend refers were absorbed into other branches of the service where they were needed because of the demands of which I have just spoken. Let me give my hon. friend an instance of how the staff must expand. When the bridge from Detroit to Windsor is finished we must put on 75 more men for the protection of the revenue. When the Peace bridge was opened not long ago we had to put on 40 men. That cannot be avoided. Every highway from the United States to Canada is now a route for tourists to come here. We must maintain watchmen and customs officials to guard these highways. In addition to that, as I stated last night, one of the chief recommendations of the royal commission was in the matter of appraisals in order to stop undervaluation. In order to get proper appraisals you must have proper appraisers. We have had to increase our appraisal staff, and we have had to increase the number of investigators here and in other countries in order to make sure that the valuations in the invoices of imported goods are correct and proper so that the revenues may be conserved. That in general is the explanation for the increased staff.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I suppose the minister will also have an explanation for this other question, in regard to the administration of the Business War Profits Tax Act and the Income Tax Act. The former tax was imposed in 1916, and the latter in 1917. I notice that for 1922-23 the total cost of administration of these acts was $2,200,000, and for the present year, 1929-30, it is exactly the same. Surely the expenditure should not be as large in view of the fact that the business profits war tax is almost eliminated, and the income tax in one of the past years was $102,000,000,—

Mr. EULER: It was never $102,000,000;

Mr. CARMICHAEL: —while at the present time it is only a little over half that amount. Under the circumstances I do not think we should be spending the same amount of money for the collection of these taxes.

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend will understand that it might cost just as much to collect $50,000,000 as $100,000,000. Take, for example, with regard to the sales tax. At three per cent it might produce sixty or seventy million dollars; you reduce it to two per cent and get only two-thirds of that amount; but it will cost you just as much to collect the two per cent as the three per cent, because the work involved is just as great. The same is true of the income tax.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I think not, Mr Chairman, because the sales tax, whatever the rate may be, is still applicable to every person; but the income tax is not now applicable to as many persons as it was formerly.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the minister give the committee the total amount of the business profits tax collected in each of the last five years?

Mr. EULER: In reply to my hon. friend from Kindersley, in March of 1927 the income tax collected was $46,000,000, in the following year $57,000,000, and the year after $59,000,000. So the collections have really been increasing, anad therefore we could hardly expect the work or the expense to be less.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister has not replied to my question.

Mr. EULER: I have not heard it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am sorry. The minister must be confused with the number of assistants he has around him.

Mr. EULER: I am not confused at all.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am sure if the members of the staff now assisting the minister require as many assistants in their own offices, there is no reason to be surprised at the enormous increase in this vote.

Mr. EULER: Will the hon. member ask his question?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the total amount of the business profits tax collected for 1924-25, 1925-26, and so on up to date?

Mr. EULER: If I were possessed of the fund of general information which is apparently controlled by my hon. friend, I am sure I would not need to have so many assistants about me, but I am unfortunate in that regard.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister should not take me too seriously on that particular point.

Mr. EULER: I really did not take very seriously anything the hon. member said.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I imagine the minister did. His remarks showed that he had taken it very seriously.

Mr. EULER: In 1924-25 we collected $2,704,000; in 1925-26, $1,173,000; in 1926-27, $710,000; in 1927-28, $956,000; in 1928-29, $455,000; and there is now a balance outstanding of between two and three hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the minister's staff being reduced in proportion to the reduction of collections?

Mr. EULER: There are only two men working on it now.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How many were there formerly?

Mr. EULER: The work used to be combined with the income tax collections. When the present commissioner of customs left the income tax branch he took over, because he was familiar with the work, the collection of the business profits tax. We had from 1,200 to 1,500 persons employed in the collection of the income tax and the business profits tax. What proportion of these would be allotted to the business profits tax I cannot say.

Mr. GARDINER: I notice an amount of $15,000 for auditors in connection with the investigation and prosecution of brewers. Will the minister explain this? There was the same vote last year.

Mr. EULER: We discovered a great many cases of fraud in connection with the sales tax, especially in the city of Montreal, and also in Toronto and elsewhere, and we have employed expert auditors to dig out the facts in order to enable us to prosecute and make collections; and this has paid us very well. We have collected over $300,000 as a direct result of the investigations made by these auditors, and in the city of Montreal we arrested the heads of about seventy firms; I do not know how many in Toronto.

Mr. SPENCER: Are there any fines, or is there imprisonment in connection with these prosecutions?

Mr. EULER: I have the list here but it is very lengthy. I do not suppose my hon. friend wants me to read it. Time in gaol occurs very often, but that does not mean very much, and the department is not responsible for that.

Mr. GARDINER: I suggest that the minister put that list on Hansard. These investigations were mostly in connection with brewers.

Mr. EULER: No, they were not; they were commercial firms who had been concealing sales and deceiving the government with regard to sales tax.

Mr. GARDINER: The item provides "for services in connection with the investigation and prosecution of brewers." The amount is $15,000.

Mr. EULER: I thought my hon. friend had reference to another item for which we retained this firm of auditors. The item my hon. friend is quoting from does relate to the prosecution of brewers and distillers.

Mr. GARDINER: What success did you have along that line?

Mr. EULER: We made settlement with a large number of brewers and distillers and collected several million dollars. Two cases, as my hon. friend knows, were lost, but we are appealing them.

Mr. GARDINER: Is it necessary to secure the services of this particular firm for the purpose of investigating this matter, and is their employment permanent or temporary?

Mr. EULER: They were retained by the customs commission and they are so entirely familiar with all the details of this business that we deemed it worth while to secure their services.

Mr. GARDINER: Is it not possible to use your own auditors in connection with this investigation?

Mr. EULER: We do use their services, but in certain circumstances we feel justified in bringing in experts, and it has been worth while.

Mr. GARDINER: There is another item of $10,000 for secret preventive service. Is that amount spent every year?

Mr. EULER: It is not spent every year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is it for?

Mr. EULER: For the purpose stated in the item—secret service.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What did you spend last year?

Mr. EULER: The figures are not given out; it is pretty much of a secret process.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But we always get the amount spent.

Mr. EULER: It is spent under the Justice department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But it is charged to this department.

Mr. EULER: Yes, it is charged to this department.

Mr. KENNEDY: The other night the minister made a statement which is reported at page 2697 of Hansard. He said:

> I do not question the good faith of the men at the top—but I think it is at least a fair reason for considering whether the Canadian government would be justified in going to what, I think I can show, would be a heavy expense if this law were enacted that is being asked for, in face of the fact that the United States authorities are making no very earnest effort to do it themselves.

Will the minister show us in a general way what the expenditure would be and whether it would be due to additional staff or to a loss in revenue or to both?

Mr. EULER: I answered that question about an hour ago.

Mr. EVANS: Will the minister tell us why some of the advice offered by the customs commission has not been carried out with reference to some of the most barefaced cases that came before that body, particularly in Saskatchewan, in connection with the bribery of customs officers, the evasion of the sales tax and so forth. Why was prosecution not entered against these people in accordance with the recommendations of that commission?

Mr. EULER: The recommendations of the commission with regard to prosecutions, including the prosecution of Harry Bronfman, were acted upon so far as the Department of National Revenue is concerned. The prosecutions, I may say, take place under the Department of Justice, and the Minister of Justice some weeks ago, in reply to a question raised by my hon. friend from Rosetown, made a statement. I do not know that I can go beyond that. I may add, however, that as regards the case of Harry Bronfman it was the opinion of the Department of Justice, for reasons which they gave and which were disclosed to one or two members of the group in the corner, that it was impossible under the law to succeed in any prosecution.

Mr. MANION: In regard to the number of delinquencies in connection with the sales tax, how does the situation stand now in the matter of collections?

Mr. EULER: Two or three years ago when I went into the department there was a large sum in arrear; a large number of firms were behind and we had to deal with them as best we could. In many cases the firms were in liqudation; in other cases they were in the courts. Many of them were struggling along as best they could. We did not desire to put them out of business, obtaining nothing, and we nursed them along. We have reduced the indebtedness substantially. The figures as they stand now are: $974,000, which we are in process of securing through settlement by means of correspondence and urging them to pay without actual prosecution; there is legal action in respect to $2,774,000; and there is, in connection with people in liquidation, $679,000. This makes a total of $4,427,000. I think I should add in all fairness that of the amount under legal action, a large sum applies to brewers and distillers, in connection with which we are now proceeding in the courts.

Mr. MANION: Has the minister written off any of that money or is this the whole amount?

Mr. EULER: Where firms have gone out of business we may get something or we may not; in many cases firms have entirely disappeared.

Mr. MANION: Can the minister tell me in round figures the amount written off in that way, because really that is what it amounts to?

Mr. EULER: I have not that information, but where firms have become insolvent, when the assets are distributed of course we rank with the other creditors.

Mr. GARLAND: I take it that the amount involved in connection with arrears of sales tax and so on in regard to the breweries amounts to about $4,000,000?

Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Has that money been collected?

Mr. EULER: I have just explained the position of the various items making up the $4,000,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not wish to embarrass the minister or hold up his estimates but I am asking these questions because of a public announcement which appeared in the press stating that $4,000,000 had been collected by the Department of National Revenue from the breweries for arrears of sales and gallonage taxes.

Mr. EULER: I am very sure I made no such announcement; I have just given the details of the $4,000,000 which is still to be collected. We have collected some millions of dollars from these brewers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How much have you collected?

Mr. EULER: While that is being looked up, for the information of the committee I might say that this refers to old arrears, accruing up to January 1, 1927. At that time we passed an amendment to the act under which interest was charged on arrears, which formerly was not possible, with the result that there was a large accrual. Since that time accruals are no longer possible because, since January 1, 1927, if the monthly returns are not sent in and payment made accordingly we immediately take legal action to make these collections.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): To what does the minister attribute the failure to collect these sale and gallonage taxes in the past? Is it fair to assume that the press statement is correct and that the failure to collect these taxes was the result of slackness in the administration of his department during past years?

Mr. EULER: Certainly I am not going to say that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would it be fair to say that?

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend will have to judge for himself.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then I would like to know by whom this branch of the department was administered at that time.

Mr. EULER: The hon. gentleman knows the answer to that question as well as I do. But I might say that one of the reasons why so many firms fell into arrears was because there was no provision under the law for the collection of interest on overdue sales taxes; business men, perhaps going through a somewhat strenuous period, found that they could borrow money from the government without the payment of interest, as it were, and naturally they yielded to that temptation. That is no longer possible, and that is one of the reasons why to-day business men pay up more promptly, because they know if they do not pay up they will be liable to 8 per cent interest on the overdue amounts.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Was the only corrective for the temptations to evade payment the application of interest, or was there not some proceeding which could have been taken even before that interest was applied? Obviously the minister knows that under the act provision was made to enable the department to collect taxes which were in arrears; if the business men to whom he refers as preferring to borrow money from the government for nothing instead of going to the banks were in arrears, surely he had the means at his disposal at that time to collect these taxes. I do not refer to the present minister but to the minister in office at that time.

Mr. EULER: He could have resorted to the courts, and I am informed that he did so in some cases.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): All we know is that a tremendous accumulation of arrears occurred. The minister does not assert that the interest on the arrears amounted to a very large sum?

Mr. EULER: There is no interest on the arrears, except on those which occurred after the amendment was passed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Exactly, so the $4,000,000 of arrears can be considered altogether apart from the question of interest.

Mr. EULER: There is interest from January 1, 1927.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister knows the demoralizing effect on the general taxpaying public of this sort of thing. The business men realized that they could escape the payment of taxes and a large number of them actually did not pay these taxes which the minister now says cannot be collected because of the liquidation of some of the companies. I remember that in those days the farmers had to put up with a good deal of abuse from those who asserted that the farmers were failing to pay their taxes. The fact of the matter was that the farmers were willing to pay their taxes if they only had the income on which to pay. Now we find that the very class of people who made these charges against the farmers were themselves in arrears to enormous amounts, which are only now being collected.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Did I understand the minister to say that the decision of the Department of Justice was that they could not hope to be successful in a prosecution against Harry Bronfman?

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend knows very well that that is the case, because I showed him the papers in that connection.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The papers I saw merely expressed the opinion that there was some doubt about it; certainly I did not understand that the Department of Justice gave such a definite opinion.

Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Then the minister is giving an alleged criminal the benefit of the doubt. I submit that where there is a definite recommendation made by a royal commission, such as there is in this case, it is the duty and responsibility of the minister to prosecute, even if there is a doubt. There is a doubt in every case, but here the minister gave Bronfman the benefit of the doubt instead of giving it to this department.

Mr. EULER: I am not sure to whom my hon. friend is referring; if he says I gave Bronfman the benefit of the doubt he is wrong. I recommended to the Department of Justice that they proceed in all cases where such action was recommended by the commission. The Department of Justice must use their own discretion as to whether it is worth while to prosecute, and I may say there were some cases where the commission did err; they were not supermen even in matters of law, and it was found by the law officers of the crown that in some instances it was practically impossible to prosecute because there was no evidence. The commission recommended that prosecutions be entered if it was possible to do so with any hope of success; surely then it was the duty of the Department of Justice to decide whether it was worth while to carry on these prosecutions. In the case of Harry Bronfman I think the Department of Justice decided there was no hope whatever of succeeding, so I submit that the responsibility is not altogether mine.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Certainly the papers the minister showed me did not express the opinion that there was no hope whatever of success; I did not take it that way at all. I understood from the papers that there was a reasonable doubt as to whether an action action against Bronfman could be successful, and my protest is that in this case the benefit of the doubt was given to the alleged lawbreaker.

Mr. EULER: In any case, if it were a criminal offence it would come under the attorney general of the province in which the alleged crime was committed.

Mr. CAMPBELL: There seems to be a good deal of doubt as to that; during the election campaign which ended the other day, as the minister knows, the attorney general of that province stated repeatedly that he had no responsibility in the matter, that the responsibility rested with this government. I am not quite clear as to whether the prosecutions would be instituted by the Department of National Revenue or by the Department of Justice.

Mr. EULER: The prosecutions must go through the Department of Justice. The Department of National Revenue pass these cases on to the Department of Justice, and if that department in its wisdom—and I do not question that for one moment—decided that it should not prosecute in the case of Mr. Bronfman, then I think the department is quite right.

Mr. CAMPBELL: When the department recommends to the Department of Justice that action should be taken, does that department go ahead and act or does it use its own discretion?

Mr. EULER: The Department of Justice uses its own discretion. It is the legal end of the government; the Department of National Revenue is not constituted to act in matters involving legal action. The Department of Justice decides all cases for all departments so far as any legal action is concerned. If, after examing a case, it decides that there is no hope of succeeding, naturally it would not go on. After a case gets out of the hands of the Revenue department and into the hands of the Department of Justice, then it is a matter for that department.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Did not the Department of Justice simply act in an advisory capacity?

Mr. EULER: No.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I might have a case and go to a lawyer and be advised that my chances of winning were not very good, yet I might insist upon the case being proceeded with.

Mr. EVANS: This thing seems to be surrounded with mystery. For two years Mr. Knowles' illness was given in the Saskatchewan legislature as the excuse for the non-prosecution of this case. When the Attorney General of Saskatchewan was asked why the prosecution had not been proceeded with he replied that it was up to the Department of Justice at Ottawa, and when I asked the Department of Justice the same question the minister replied that someone must lay a charge. Did the Minister of National Revenue lay a charge before the attorney general of the province when the attorney general made the promise that as soon as Knowles was in a proper condition to go to court the prosecution would be proceeded with?

Mr. EULER: I have explained already to my hon. friend that these legal matters are handled by the Department of Justice, and that procedure was followed in that case.

Mr. COOTE: How many prosecutions of brewers and distillers have been undertaken since the minister came into the department? In how many cases has a judgment been secured, how many have been written off and how many are yet to be decided?

Mr. EULER: None have been written off. We have collected about $2,500,000 by way of settlements with brewers and distillers.

Mr. SPENCER: That is $2,500,000 which those people were trying to get out of paying.

Mr. EULER: I presume that they thought they were not under any legal obligation to pay. Some of them fought us in the courts; in several cases we won, but in the last two cases we lost. The others thought that it was just as well to settle, and they did so. Fifty-eight cases were settled in all.

Mr. COOTE: Would that number include the prosecutions up to the present time?

Mr. EULER: Nearly all those prosecutions were in connection with the collection of the sales tax. There was some doubt as to whether or not the sales tax was collectable when the goods were exported. The law has been amended since that time and there can be no doubt that the sales tax is collectable on beer or liquor whether it is or is not exported.

Mr. COOTE: Can the minister assure the committee that since the amendment has been passed the department is collecting all the sales tax and other taxes from the brewers and distillers for which they are liable under the law?

Mr. EULER: Exactly the same as with any other business which must pay the sales tax.

Mr. COOTE: Are the names of those who hae been prosecuted available in any government publication?

Mr. EULER: No but there would be no objection to allowing my hon. friend to see the list.

Mr. COOTE: In replying to a question asked by the hon. member for Kindersley, the minister explained the reason for the increase in the first item by saving that additional appraisers would be needed. According to the civil government list there would seem to be a decrease in the number of appraisers. How many appraisers are engaged by the department?

Mr. EULER: The approximate increase will be about twenty-three.

Mr. COOTE: How many are in the department?

Mr. EULER: About nine.

Mr. COOTE: Are the uniforms worn by the officers supplied by the department, and if so, from whom are they purchased?

Mr. EULER: They are supplied by the department and purchased locally. The department makes an allowance of $37.50 per uniform.

Mr. COOTE: Has the department given any consideration to having these uniforms manufactured at some of the penitentiaries and thus make use of prison labour?

Mr. EULER: The matter has not been brought to my attention.

Mr. COOTE: I see no reason why these uniforms could not be made there and possibly little money saved for the government. There is another item in the vote, "To provide for expenses of maintenance of revenue cruisers and for preventive service." How many cruisers are operated by the department?

Mr. EULER: We have eight cruisers, and two under construction, and twenty-six patrol boats.

Mr. COOTE: Does the department intend to purchase or hire additional vessels?

Mr. EULER: No, we intend to own them ourselves.

Mr. COOTE: The vote provides for the purchase or charter of vessels.

Mr. EULER: We intend to get rid of all chartered vessels; we intend to own our own boats.

Mr. COOTE: Then the wording of the item would not be correct?

Mr. EULER: The two new vessels are not completed yet.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Provision is made in the third item for subscriptions to commercial papers. What is the total amount to be so used? What is the purpose of the appropriation? Is it just daily newspapers for the department?

Mr. EULER: Trade papers that aid in giving information as to values and so forth.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is there an amount for advertising? Does the department do any advertising now?

Mr. EULER: We do in the income tax branch.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I understand there was an increase this year.

Mr. EULER: I think there was.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River)): What is the total amount now spent on advertising?

Mr. EULER: About $27,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: To come back to the Bronfman case for a moment, I have the report of the Royal Commission on Customs and Excise, interim reports Nos. 1 to 10, and I find this reference on page 54 to Bronfman:

> It was alleged by Inspector Knowles that in connection with the seizures made by him, Harry Bronfman, who was then the directing spirit of the Gainsborough Liquor Company and the Dominion Distributors, on more than one occasion offered him a bribe to disregard his duties and to desist from further interference with the operations of the firms or syndicates with which Bronfman was identified. Strong corroborative evidence was adduced before us in support of the testimoney given by Inspector Knowles, and in our view a prima facie case was made out sufficient to warrant prosecution being entered against Harry Bronfman for his alleged offence.

Under the heading of "Recommendation" it says:

> That prosecution be instituted against Harry Bronfman for the alleged bribery of Inspector Knowles.

It is inconceivable to me that men of the judicial standing of Chief Justice Brown and the distinguished attorney who represented the department there should have made that recommendation if, as the minister says, there are all these legal difficulties in the way of prosecution. I wonder, when the department finds some poor farmer out in the bush making a little home brew, whether they encounter the same difficulties. There is apparently no difficulty in haling him before a justice of the peace and having him sent to gaol for six months; but when the case is one of a wealthy bootlegger like Bronfman, all these legal difficulties seem to crop up. Whether the responsibility be on the Attorney General of Saskatchewan or the Justice department or the Minister of National Revenue, you find one passing the buck to another. This is an impossible situation, and I would expect this least of all from the Minister of National Revenue. I thought one of the best things the Prime Minister of Canada ever did was when he put the present minister in charge of that department. I give the minister credit for cleaning up the situation there and certainly making it a great deal better than it was before.

Mr. EULER: What would the hon. gentleman like me to do that I have not done in connection with the Bronfman matter?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would like the minister to take a definite stand with the Department of Justice that this recommendation be carried out. If he insists on the Department of Justice taking action, then I say he is cleared.

Mr. EULER: The hon. member knows as well as I do that the Minister of National Revenue cannot dictate to the Minister of Justice in his own department.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I know that very well, but I know at the same time that the Minister of National Revenue can make a recommendation and a very definite one, to the Minister of Justice informing him that he wants someone prosecuted who has been guilty of an infraction of the law of his department. If he does that, I can hardly believe the Department of Justice will refuse his recommendation. I have yet to have that proved to me.

Mr. EULER: I have already stated that all the cases recommended for prosecution were recommended by me to the Department of Justice for action.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Why not this one?

Mr. EULER: This was included. I said: All the cases.

Mr. CAMPBELL: There must be something wrong with the minister's recommendation.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is entirely unfair. The minister gives his word of honour that he made the recommendation, and the hon. member says that there must be something wrong with it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am not questioning the minister's word. That is not the point. I accept the minister's word that he made the recommendation.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I should like to know what the hon. member is questioning.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The minister should insist on prosecution; it should not be a mere recommendation.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Last year the minister introduced a bill providing for taking away from the Civil Service Commis-

sion the appointment of certain of the preventive service and, I think, of the appraisers. The minister also provided within his own department an examining board which was to prepare an eligible list from which were to be selected certain men required by him in his department. I should like to know the total number of men selected during last year under the act which he introduced on that occasion.

Mr. EULER: About fourteen appraisers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How many preventive officers?

Mr. EULER: Probably about thirty.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister does not know the exact number?

Mr. EULER: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the minister give the committee the personnel of the examining board in his department that takes care of these?

Mr. EULER: For appraisers, Mr. Costello and Mr. Funston.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): An examining board of two?

Mr. EULER: Yes, and occasionally another Dominion appraiser, Mr. Jones.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And for the preventive service?

Mr. EULER: The chief of the preventive service and the provincial chief in the province to which the appointment is to be made.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I understood that in the act passed last year there was a provision that after the minister had selected the men whom he wanted from those eligible lists, the names so selected were to be submitted to the Civil Service Commission for its approval: Was that done?

Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What was the attitude of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. EULER: They declined to act.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think it would not be amiss at this stage to point out that we in this corner of the house indicated last year not only our complete disagreement with the policy which was being adopted by the minister in this regard in taking from under the operation of the Civil Service Act the appointment of these men, but in answer to a statement made by the minister that he wanted to maintain a certain measure of control by the commission—

Mr. EULER: I should like to correct my hon. friend. The minister did not take from under the operation of the Civil Service Act the appointment of preventive officers; they never were under it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The appraisers. I did not mention anybody in particular. I said that the act gave the minister power to take away certain responsibility from the Civil Service Commission. But he said to the house: We are giving them the power to pass on these men.

Mr. EULER: Not the appraisers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): At that time we told him there was no use under heaven of his bringing a subterfuge of that kind before the house. No body such as the Civil Service Commission could possibly be asked to recognize and be responsible for the appointment of men in the selection of whom they had no say whatever. We warned the minister at that time that this would probably be the position taken by the Civil Service Commission. It is, and now we find the flagrant position of the thing is as we stated last year. The minister has taken away from the Civil Service Act certain persons who were formerly under it and placed them under the control of the patronage of the department.

Mr. EULER: Not at all; I deny that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Could anything be more distinctly patronage than this is?

Mr. EULER: There is absolutely no patronage in it. As regards the appraisers that have been appointed as a result of the change in the act last year, their politics are not known to me at all.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That does not evade the question of patronage.

Mr. EULER: I do not know what my hon. friend means by patronage.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): My hon. friend knows very well that it is not always the question of politics that enters into it; it is friends of friends, and the arrangement of examinations to suit certain individuals from time to time—something that is actually done.

Mr. EULER: I am afraid my hon. friend has a very suspicious mind.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister need not talk about a suspicious mind. I challenge him, does he not know of cases

to-day where an examination is prepared under the act in order to meet the requirements of a certain individual?

Mr. EULER: Not so far as I am concerned, and I am not responsible for anybody else.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is the way he gets out of it. We still hold the view that the minister made a mistake last year. The United States have recognized the mistake that they made in the past, and to-day in order to strengthen their service they have placed it under the operation of the Civil Service Commission, and they now select their whole preventive service as well as their appraisers through the Civil Service Commission. The merit system applies, and they are doing that in the hope of improving the character of the employees in the service. I say to the minister that sooner or later he will find that he has made a serious mistake in reverting to what may be a modified form of the patronage system, but is the patronage system nevertheless, by taking the appointment of these officers away from the Civil Service Commission. What was the total value of the sales tax refunds last year, or were there any?

Mr. EULER: I have not the figures here.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I want that information.

Mr. EULER: We will get it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should also like the total amount of the business profits tax refunds.

Mr. EULER: There were none.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are there any tax refunds other than income tax and sales tax?

Mr. EULER: There are refunds of customs and excise taxes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the minister let us have them?

Mr. EULER: That is all in the blue books. My hon. friend could really get that information himself.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister knows that the information in the blue books is not up to date.

Mr. EULER: The information is in the Auditor General's report.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is a year late.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. EULER: It is as much up to date as any other information that the hon. gentleman gets with regard to any department.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, the minister has given me up to date information to-day in regard to customs and excise seizures. I am interested in getting this information because frankly I am going to ask the minister to take into consideration the necessity for making refunds public. I think we recognize that this country must protect its people from any suspicion they may have that business is getting away with something.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

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

Monday, June 10, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INTERWOVEN STOCKING COMPANY

Mr. McGIBBON:

1. Did the Interwoven Stocking Company, of New Brunswick, New Jersey, ship any of their products into Canada last year?
2. If so, what was the nature of same?
3. What quantity was imported and at what price?

Mr. EULER:

1, 2 and 3. It is contrary to the practice of the Department of National Revenue to give information which would disclose the business of an individual concern.

COPPER BOUNTIES

Mr. COWAN:

1. How much was paid out of the consolidated revenue fund during each of the years 1923 to 1927, inclusive, under chapter 40, 13-14 George V?
2. Where were the industries located which received such payments?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton):

1. (a) The expenditures for administering the Copper Bounties Act are made by fiscal years and are as follows:—

	Expenditure
1923-24	Nil
1924-25	$180 00
1925-26	314 00
1926-27	376 65
1927-28	329 00

(b) The bounty rates on copper vary for different years, ending on June 30 in each case. The following shows the amounts paid during these periods:—

Period	Rate per lb.	Amount paid
July 1, 1923 to June 30, 1924	1½c.	—
July 1, 1924 to June 30, 1925	1¼c.	$ 14,551 75
July 1, 1925 to June 30, 1926	1c.	108,086 27
July 1, 1926 to June 30, 1927	¾c.	122,904 39
July 1, 1927 to June 30, 1928	½c.	62,572 24

2. Only one company has been paid bounty on copper: The Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company of Canada, Limited, Trail, B.C.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Did the government appoint a committee of the civil service to deal with the subject of superannuation, and make recommendations?
2. Did said committee meet and make a report and recommendations?
3. Is said report now before the government, and will same be acted on at this session?
4. In view of the long delay in action regarding increases to the professional class, is the government aware of the urgency of the matter as respects superannuation?

Mr. ROBB:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Several reports have been received from the committee. These have either been acted upon or await the consideration of the treasury board.

4. An inquiry containing an allegation would not appear to call for an answer, in view of rule 44 of the house.

PRIVATE BILLS

WILLIAM JOHN BLIGHT

The house in committee on Bill No. 336, for the relief of William John Blight.—Mr. Neill—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This is one of the cases to which I took exception the other day. I have read the evidence and I cannot see that on the evidence the charges have been proved. I should like to have from the sponsor of the bill a short outline of the case.

Mr. NEILL: I do not propose to read the evidence in this case. Every member has a copy of it and can read it for himself. The hon. member who asks me to give a resumé of the case, says that he has read the evidence. What more can I give him than what he has already read himself? This is neither the time nor the place to go into all the details. This case has been carefully considered by the senate committee and unanimously passed. It has also been carefully considered by the House of Commons committee and unanimously passed. I submit that the thing for us to do is to follow the example adhered to in the other two hundred cases we have dealt with and pass the bill.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Was this carefully considered by the private bills committee?

Mr. NEILL: So I am informed.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

EDITH SPENCLEY

The house in committee on Bill No. 345, for the relief of Edith Spencley.—Mr. Hepburn—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Any children?

Mr. HEPBURN: There are four children. This is a bigamous case. There was one child by the first wife and there were three by the second. The children are now in the custody of the two mothers. They are not asking that any provision be made for the children at all.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

ANNIE FARROW

The house in committee on Bill No. 346, for the relief of Annie Farrow.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask if there are any children in this case?

Mr. ANDERSON (Toronto): There are two children residing with the petitioner, the mother, and they are being supported by the father, the respondent, under an order of the court, the amount paid being $10 a week.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

EVELYN MAE WARREN

The house in committee on Bill No. 347, for the relief of Evelyn Mae Warren.—Mr. Speakman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case and is provision being made for them? The sponsor of the bill is present and I think he might give us the information as has been done in other cases.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I find just at this moment that I am the sponsor. I believe there has been an error in putting my name to the bill without my knowledge. I sponsored one bill of a similar nature which has gone through and with which I familiarized myself. I do not know anything about this bill and I did not know until this moment that my name was attached to it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then I object to this bill passing with no sponsor's name attached.

Bill stands.

LOUIS COIT DARGAVEL

The house in committee on Bill No. 348, for the relief of Louis Coit Dargavel—Mr. Casselman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SMOKE: Looking over the evidence in this case, I have come to the conclusion that the bill should not be passed on the evidence which has been presented. There has been no fair trial. The petition is dated February 7, 1929. The charge against the respondent is concerning an offence alleged to have been committed on or about June 1, 1928, at Fayetteville, New York. No attempt was made to prove this charge. No evidence whatever was adduced concerning it. A paid detective was allowed to give evidence concerning other occasions of which the respondent had not the slightest notice and in regard to which she had no opportunity to defend herself.

The respondent was without funds. The insignificant sum of $75 was advanced to her on the order of the committee—a sum totally inadequate to enable her to prepare for trial —and the sum of $75 was advanced to pay counsel—an amount not sufficient to fee a solicitor, much less to pay counsel on the hearing.

The petitioner adduced evidence to show that the respondent and corespondent were registered at a rooming house called Traymore Apartments, in Rochester, N.Y., under the name of "Mr. and Mrs. Rudd." The respondent and corespondent deny this positively on oath, and after a few days' adjournment of the case the corespondent was able to produce the man, Guy L. Rudd, who was actually registered at the said apartment house and living there with his wife, and who came before the committee and refuted the evidence of petitioner. One of the witnesses who swore that Rudd and wife were the respondent and corespondent recanted and after returning to Rochester made an affidavit that the evidence she had given before the committee was incorrect and that she had never seen the respondent or corespondent until she saw them at the trial before the committee.

The committee refused a further adjournment in order to allow the respondent to call this recanting witness who admitted that her evidence was untrue, and refused to allow the affidavit to be read before the committee. The corespondent proved that on occasions when the petitioner's witnesses had sworn he was at various places with the respondent he was actually confined to his bed by illness in another town altogether and that it was a physical impossibility for him to have been where the respondent's witnesses swore they saw him. So much of the evidence adduced by the petitioner having been positively shown to be perjury, none of the evidence on behalf of the petitioner is worthy of credence.

The respondent swore—see page 34—that the petitioner proposed that she commit the necessary offence upon which to obtain a divorce. This proposal she refused. There was no contradiction of this evidence on her part.

Without doubt further adjournment should have been granted in order to allow the respondent and corespondent to meet the charges that were made against them. In the short time at their disposal they utterly refuted some of the charges and proved the evidence given on behalf of the petitioner to be perjury. Given a reasonable time to check up the other evidence, there is every reason to suppose it also could have been shown to be perjury. Two of these charges were sprung on the respondent and corespondent without notice. They were able entirely to refute all those which could be said to be sufficient ground upon which to grant the petition. As to the remaining occasion, there is not the slightest direct evidence of impropriety. Both the respondent and corespondent gave clear and unequivocal explanation of the circumstances and deny on oath any improper relations either at that time or at any other time.

To grant this divorce on these proceedings would be highly improper. No court of law would permit a case to be presented and tried

as this one was. In any properly conducted divorce trial, the offence as alleged must be proved. Evidence of offence alleged to have been committed on "divers occasions"—which is the stereotyped language of such petitions—is never allowed by a court except to show the general conduct of the respondent and in a manner as corroboration of the evidence as charged. If the offence as charged is not proved by the evidence no court will grant a divorce.

Where the charge as alleged with particularity, giving place and date, cannot be proved, and petitioner desires to prove other charges, it is the invariable practice to have the petition redrawn alleging definitely the charges it is desired to prove, and to have the petition re-served giving the respondent an opportunity to prepare a defence and to obtain from the petitioner all particulars of the charge.

This primary rule of procedure—to disregard which would be a decided injustice—was altogether ignored by the committee, and neither respondent nor corespondent has had a fair opportunity of making a defence.

This was a contested case, Mr. Chairman, and the evidence is rather bulky. After I had read the evidence I looked back with some anxiety to see whether the divorce committee had really recommended the passing of a divorce bill. It did not seem to me possible that they should do so in view of the fact that Rudd and his wife were not the respondent and the other woman. It seems to me that the case turns very materially on that point, and it strikes me, with all deference to the divorce committee of the Senate—we all recognize that they are human and that everybody makes mistakes, even the courts—that this particular bill should be referred back to the private bills committee for further consideration.

Mr. CAHAN: I agree with what has been said by the hon. member. The only charge made in the petition against this respondent was proved to have been a case of perjury. Then other charges were made which were not included in the original petition. As I read the case, no due time was given to the respondent fully to meet those subsequent charges. If a respondent comes before the committee and swears clearly and positively that she has not been guilty of the charge made against her, and, if the original charge as made in the petition is proved to have been founded upon perjury, then any subsequent charges which may be made during the course of that hearing should be made by amendment to the petition, and a re-hearing should be allowed to the respondent in order that she may have opportunity to prove her innocence of these other charges of which she had no previous notice whatsoever before she appeared before the committee.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I am rather surprised that this bill is being opposed in the house. Just a few minutes ago there was placed in my hands the same brief that has just been put on the record by the hon. member for Brant. With many parts of that brief I cannot agree. It would appear to me that when this matter was before the private bills committee the other day, if any investigation was desired it should have been made at that time, rather than allow the bill to come back here to the committee of the whole house and then ask to have it referred back. I do not wish to suggest that the parties who are opposing this bill are not doing so in good faith, but I think it would have shown better faith on the part of the parties who are responsible for this action being taken if they themselves had appeared before the private bills committee.

With regard to the statement that the charge in the petition was not proven, I would suggest that the charges in the original petition covered the offences which were proven. I have an interest in this case, knowing the parties, and I therefore sat for several days in the committee when this case was being heard. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that this applicant had just grounds for divorce. I therefore oppose any move to have the bill sent back to the private bills committee.

Mr. SMOKE: In answer to the hon. member, I am not a member of the private bills committee; I have other committees to attend, and in any event I was not put on that committee and I did not consider it my duty to go there and present any argument. I assumed that the private bills committee would look after their own business. That is all I have to say on that point.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I wish to support the position taken by my hon. friend from Grenville-Dundas. I have read the evidence carefully. I know the parties. The applicant is a resident of the town in which I reside. His wife has not resided with him for a period of fifteen years. This case was contested before the Senate divorce committee, where every opportunity was given to produce evidence, and there was a further opportunity before the private bills committee. It seems

to me that the position now taken is one of obstruction, at this late date in the session. I submit that we ought to follow the regular procedure, and as this case has been thoroughly investigated by the Senate committee and in the private bills committee that we ought to adopt their report.

Mr. CAHAN: I wish to call attention to the fact that although these parties had not been living together they had been living separately under a separation agreement since April 17, 1915, and there is a clear suggestion that the object of these divorce proceedings is to allow the husband to escape paying the annuity which he agreed to pay under that separation agreement. In a charge of adultery there should be some time and place mentioned in order that the respondent may be upon her guard and may be able to show where she was, in what company she was, and under what circumstances she was living at the time the alleged adultery took place. In this case there is only one specific date mentioned, and that is June 1, 1928, and the place mentioned is Fayetteville, in the state of New York, and the charge with respect to the adultery alleged to have been committed on June 1, 1928, at Fayetteville was proved to be utterly false.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Referring to the separation agreement which the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George has just mentioned, it contains a clause that the payments were to be made only so long as the respondent remained of chaste character. There was that limitation, and there is an exhibit of a letter sent by the respondent to her husband in which she herself offers in consideration of $3,000 to consent to divorce and to produce the evidence that will support the divorce.

Mr. ADSHEAD: As a member of the private bills committee I wish to say a word in regard to this case. One hon. gentleman has suggested that it is the business of the members of the private bills committee to go into these cases. Personally, I may say that I have neither the time nor the inclination to go into these three hundred divorce cases. This is just another illustration to show what a farce this divorce business is so far as consideration before the private bills committee is concerned. I hope the Prime Minister will implement his promise that next year there will be a different arrangement with respect to divorce.

As regards the remark that was made by one hon. gentleman that bills that have passed the private bills committee should not be considered in committee of the whole house because the private bills committee should attend to their business, I would ask what is this committee of the whole for? Have we just to give a perfunctory approval to the bills that come from the private bills committee? I say that if any evidence has come out since the private bills committee sat on this case, it is the duty of this committee to consider such evidence and to listen to what may be said.

Section agreed to: Yeas, 41; Nays, 30.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

VERA MAUD GENDRON

The house in committee on Bill No. 349, for the relief of Vera Maud Gendron—Mr. Hepburn—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children?

Mr. HEPBURN: There are no children in this case.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

LILLIAN AINSWORTH

The house in committee on bill No. 350, for the relief of Lillian Ainsworth—Mr. Lawson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. ANDERSON (Toronto-High Park): On behalf of the hon. member for West York, I wish to say that the records show that there is no family in this case.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

GEORGE FREDERICK WILSON

The house in committee on Bill No. 352, for the relief of George Frederick Wilson—Mr. McGregor—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCER: Are there any children in this case?

Mr. ANDERSON (Toronto-High Park): No children.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported.

CHARLES EDWIN WALKER

The house in committee on Bill No. 296, for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker.—Mr. Sanderson—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

An hon. MEMBER: Explain.

Mr. IRVINE: I wish to make a comment on this bill. On the second reading of the bill the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) went over the evidence, pointing out its weaknesses, and it was assumed by the committee of the whole that when the bill was referred back to the private bills committee special consideration would be given it. As a matter of fact, when the bill did get before that committee no particular attention was given to it. It is time that consideration of the bill was postponed for two days, and the officers of the committee were instructed to inform the respondent when the case would come before the committee. The so-called agents of the respondent were not present; in fact, it happened that the respondent had no official agent, for the lawyer had received no instructions: in other words, the woman had no money and there was no way of going on with the matter. The result was that nothing was done. When the bill came up I endeavoured to present the petition to the committee, but it was another "I'm Alone" case; nobody paid any attention to it. No investigation was made and no evidence seriously presented.

I wish once more to make a plea on behalf of the respondent. First, let me say that I do not know the respondent at all. I would point out that the most material witness in favour of the respondent was unable to give evidence before the senate committee for the reason that she had passed through a very serious operation. There was no doubt about the serious condition of the witness, for there was evidence to prove that clearly. Counsel for the respondent asked that the case be postponed or that an opportunity be given for this material witness to appear. The chairman of the committee in reply said something to the effect that it was very difficult to ensure that the same personnel who had heard the evidence in the first instance would be present on a subsequent occasion, and for that reason a postponement of the case was not granted. The result was that this witness was not heard.

I understand that this witness proposed to prove an alibi; that is to say, at the time and in the places where the illegal acts were supposed to have been committed it could be proved that the respondent was not present at all, thus substantiating her claim that the case was a frameup. She denies the charge, claiming that there was a frameup, and the most material witness was unable to give evidence.

There is another feature of the case. I believe there are three corespondents mentioned. The respondent, not knowing of course the methods which would be adopted by the petitioner, did not know how many corespondents would be cited and consequently did not have an opportunity to call them. It must be remembered also that this is a poor woman who has been working for her living; she received $75 by order of the committee in order to carry on the case but could not afford to add enough to that sum to pay for her lawyers and to see that the case was properly conducted. Furthermore, if she was advised that our committee was to reconsider this bill—and I do not know whether or not she was so advised—she was working and if she had given up her work and come down here she might have lost her position.

In view of the circumstances and in view of the fact that the petitioner cannot suffer very much if this bill is left over for another year, I do not see why this committee should not give this woman the benefit of the doubt and kill this bill for the time being; it can be brought up again next year and all these further points considered. That seems a reasonable request, and in view of the fact that perhaps not over two per cent of the members of this committee know anything about this bill I think it would be a very serious responsibility for us to pass it now.

Mr. CAHAN: I also carefully read the evidence in this case and I am confident that if I were sitting as a judge I would not grant a divorce on the evidence which was presented. Furthermore the respondent, in this case a woman, came before the committee and swore positively as to her innocence, and when it was found impossible to prove the first charge that was made, if I remember correctly an amendment was allowed. Where a respondent comes before a committee and swears positively as to her innocence, in my opinion no new charges should be allowed to be presented against her without an amendment being made to the petition and ample opportunity being given the respondent to bring her witnesses in respect to the new charges. The evidence, to me, is quite consistent with being a frame-up and therefore I think there should be further investigation

in this case and that the respondent should have a further opportunity to bring a witness who was proved to be ill at the time and present her defence to the amended charge. I intend to vote against this bill.

Upon the yeas and nays being called for:

Section 1 agreed to: Yeas, 40; Nays, 34.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, on division.

EVELYN MAE WARREN

The house in committee on Bill No. 347, for the relief of Evelyn Mae Warren—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. GARDINER: Who is sponsoring this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN: In view of the lateness of the session, with the consent of the house I would be pleased to sponsor this bill.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. gentleman will take the responsibility of sponsoring the bill and if he is prepared to give all the necessary information I do not see any reason why that should not be done.

Mr. GARDINER: Then I would suggest that it be reprinted on the orders of the day.

The CHAIRMAN: That is for the committee to decide.

Mr. HEPBURN: I would like to explain that apparently this is a very deserving case, since the Senate committee has recommended the remission of the fees payable. It would be unfortunate if at this time the petitioner should lose out because of a technicality of this kind.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, this bill must be sponsored, and I object on principle to any transfer of this kind. If a bill is sent here with no name attached to it, it seems to me that we cannot possibly proceed with it; surely that is a rule of order. Permission has been granted on occasion, when the sponsor was absent, for another member to act in his place, but there is no precedent at all for permitting a bill to come here with no name attached to it. The hon. member whose name is attached to this bill denies responsibility for it; now some other member puts his name to the bill, but I do not think that can be done without having the bill reprinted.

[Mr. Cahan.]

The CHAIRMAN: I am informed that there has been some error in the committee branch and that this bill formerly was sponsored by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Boys). Through some error the name of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) has been attached to the bill.

Preamble agreed to.

On the title:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On a point of order, I object to this bill being proceeded with at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: I have declared sections 1 and 2 carried and I think the committee should decide whether or not I should declare the title carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On a point of order, I object to this bill being presented without the sponsor's name appearing on the bill. I would ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know that there is any rule which states that even though one name appears on the bill as sponsor, it may not be sponsored by some other hon. member of the house. It is for the committee to decide, rather than for any one member of the committee or the chairman. I am asking the committee to decide whether or not we shall proceed with this bill.

Mr. GARDINER: I have never heard you make a decision of this kind before, Mr. Chairman; whenever any controversial point came up you have always found a precedent on which to base your ruling, and I ask you now to rule on this point.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to my hon. friend that, as we all know, the session is drawing to a close and the question of urgency enters into the matter. Therefore I think I am not asking the committee to do anything unreasonable when I ask them to decide this point.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to direct attention to standing order 116, which is as follows:

Except in cases of urgent and pressing necessity, no motion for the suspension or modification of any standing order applying to private bills or petitions for private bills shall be entertained by the house until after reference is made to the committee on standing orders or to one of the committees charged with the consideration of private bills, and a report made thereon by one of such committees.

In commenting on this standing order, paragraph 900 of Beauchesne states:

So far the maxim is certainly true and founded on good sense that as it is always in the power of the majority by their numbers to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapon by which the minority can defend themselves from similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules and proceedings which have been found necessary from time to time and are become the standing orders of the house, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can alone be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

I suggest that in this particular case we have the regular rule that each bill must be sponsored.

Mr. BENNETT: Where is the rule?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is a rule that has come down from time immemorial that when a bill comes before the house it must carry the name of some hon. member, and I object to this general rule being disregarded.

Mr. HEPBURN: We have listened this session to the obstruction of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I object to the word "obstruction"; it is not parliamentary.

Mr. HEPBURN: I did not know what else to call it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that word.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "obstruction"; it is not parliamentary.

Mr. HEPBURN: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I bow to your decision, but I say that any one holding the radical views of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre should not object to establishing a precedent if that is necessary in order to put this bill through. If he has any of the milk of human kindness in his heart he will withdraw any objection he may have to this bill. The respondent in this case not only committed adultery but is now confined in a Michigan penitentiary, and the financial position of the petitioner is such that the senate committee recommended the remission of the fees. Surely my hon. friend is not going to have this bill ruled out on a technicality.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Acadia suggested that I rule on this point of order, and I am now ready to do so. My ruling is that, as this is a case of urgency owing to the approaching prorogation of the session, it is quite in order for us to proceed with this bill even though the name appearing on the bill is not the name of the hon. gentleman who is now sponsoring the bill.

Mr. GARDINER: Will you give me the number of that rule?

An hon. MEMBER: That is a ruling of the Chair.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Some hon. gentlemen do not like this sort of thing, but quite apart from these divorce proceedings I do not think we can afford to let a ruling of this kind go unchallenged; I challenge the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the hon. gentleman's privilege; this will necessitate a report to the house.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair, and the chairman of the committee made the following report:

When Bill No. 347 was under consideration in committee of the whole, Mr. Hepburn moved,—That section one be carried. Objection being taken that Mr. Hepburn was not the sponsor of the bill, the chairman ruled that in a case of urgency any member other than the one whose name appears on the order paper could sponsor a bill.

Whereupon, Mr. Woodsworth appealed from the ruling of the chairman.

The question being put by Mr. Speaker: shall the ruling of the chairman be confirmed: it was decided in the affirmative on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),	Geary,
Bancroft,	Glen,
Barber,	Gray,
Bell (St. John-Albert),	Grimmer,
Bennett,	Guthrie,
Blanchard,	Hall,
Bock,	Hepburn,
Bouchard,	Jenkins,
Bowen,	Johnstone (Cape Breton North-Victoria),
Bradette,	Ladner,
Cahan,	Laflamme,
Casselman,	MacDonald (Cape Breton South),
Cayley,	Macdonald (Kings),
Chaplin,	MacLaren,
Dickie,	MacLean (Prince),
Edwards (Waterloo South),	McKenzie,
Elliott,	McMillan,
Euler,	McRae,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),	Morrissy,
Forke,	Motherwell,
Foster,	Neill,
Fraser,	Perras
Garland (Carleton),	

Pettit,
Plunkett,
Ralston,
Rennie,
Robb,
Robinson,
Ross (Moose Jaw),
Rowe,
Sanderson,
Senn,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Queens),
Sinclair (Wellington North),
Smoke,
Spence,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Stewart (Leeds),
Stirling,
Telford,
Thompson,
Thorson,
Tummon,
White (London),
Young (Saskatoon),
Young (Weyburn).—71.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,
Campbell,
Carmichael,
Coote,
Evans,
Fansher (Last Mountain),
Fansher (Lambton East),
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Irvine,
Kellner,
Kennedy,
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
Macphail (Miss),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Woodsworth.—18.

EVELYN MAE WARREN

The house again in committee on Bill No. 347, for the relief of Evelyn Mae Warren—Mr. Hepburn—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Bill reported.

ISABELLA HENDERSON

The house in committee on Bill No. 357, for the relief of Isabella Henderson—Mr. Heaps—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. NEILL: As the precedent has been set in the case of the other bill, I suggest that we extend the same courtesy to the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) in the case of Bill No. 357. As this is the only one left on the order paper, I would be glad to sponsor it.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. CAHAN: On the motion to report the bill, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there should be a clear understanding. So far as I can ascertain from my experience in this house, when a bill is in committee any member may move that a clause be adopted or struck out, and that it is not necessary that the person whose name is printed on the bill should make a single motion before the committee.

Bill reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—REPORTED

Bill No. 344, for the relief of Kenneth Blackwood Gibb.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 351, for the relief of Sarah Berkovitz.—Mr. Sanderson.

[The Chairman.]

Bill No. 353, for the relief of Roy Franklin Beattie.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 354, for the relief of John George Laney.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 355, for the relief of Albert Nott.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 356, for the relief of John Thomas Legge.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 358, for the relief of Emil Henry Hornburg.—Mr. Edwards (Waterloo).

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, when the Kellogg treaty was being debated in this house I made a suggestion to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that it might be a good thing to call a disarmament conference if, as we hoped, all the governments that signed the treaty were sincere. I find now that such a conference is being suggested by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the new Prime Minister of Great Britain. In this morning's newspapers it is announced that probably Mr. Mackenzie King will be invited to accompany Mr. MacDonald in his conference with Mr. Hoover. I should like to ask if any invitation of this character has been received by the Prime Minister, and what his intentions are in respect thereto.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, who is now receiving a delegation, I shall direct his attention to the inquiry made by my hon. friend, and possibly he may be able to answer it at a later stage in the day or to-morrow morning.

REPORTS OF HARBOUR COMMISSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) if he can make any reply regarding his telegraphic communication with the harbour commissioner of St. John.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): At the request of my hon. friend I wired the commissioners in regard to the report, and the answer I have received is that it is being printed.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 26, to amend the Fisheries Act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. CARDIN: I may explain, Mr. Chairman, that this bill has been before the committee on marine and fisheries on several occasions, and as now presented it is in the form accepted by that committee.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The committee recommended that trawlers be licensed. Where does that recommendation appear in this bill?

Mr. CARDIN: Clause 7.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Another bill is now being handed around. There was an amended bill on the commons bills file which did not contain what is in the bill now being handed to us.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Which portion of clause 7 deals with the licensing of trawlers?

Mr. CARDIN: Clause 7. Let me read it:

7. The said act is further amended by inserting the following section immediately after section sixty-nine thereof:—

69a. (1) Every person shall be guilty of an offence, and shall incur therefor a penalty of not less than one hundred dollars and not more than two thousand dollars, recoverable with costs upon summary conviction, who at any time, except under license from the minister,—.

And the following section indicates in what circumstances a license may be obtained. There is also subsection 4 on page 3:

(4) The minister may determine the number of such vessels that shall be eligible to be licensed.

(5) Regulations may be made under the provisions of section forty-six of this Act,—

(a) Prescribing the form of license;

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I desire, Mr. Chairman, to offer a few comments on the bill. This bill, I take it, represents the government's intention in the matter of implementing the findings of a commission appointed to inquire into the difficulties, problems and disabilities of the fishermen of the eastern section of the maritime provinces. It must be a matter of deep regret to those of us who come from fishing communities, as I know it must be to the fishermen themselves, to find that this is the only piece of legislation that the government has to offer in connection with the findings of a commission which has cost this country upwards of $100,000. As a remedy for the deplorable conditions depicted by this commission this bill is practically valueless. There are upwards of seventy recommendations made by the commission. The government had this report in its hands for over a year, and I regret to see that after a year's consideration the only legislation that the government was able to bring down is this bill, which is entirely innocuous and leaves the situation in exactly the same condition as it was when the commission was appointed. The only difference is that, as the hon. minister has said, the words "licensing of steam trawlers" are inserted in this bill.

Among its many recommendations the commission recommend that the fishermen should be properly organized so that they might be able to get more of the consumer's dollar for their product. They also recommend the establishment of co-operative organizations to be assisted by the department, and that an organizer be appointed and paid by the federal government for a period of time in order to start the work. This is the crux of the situation and yet the government has done nothing.

The royal fisheries commission states that if the inshore fisheries in the maritimes are to succeed, organization and co-operation are absolutely essential among our fishermen. On page 81 of the report the commission recommends that in certain districts or zones, co-operatives should be formed and supplied with small brine or rapid freezing plants, having small auxiliary cold storage buildings in connection. These should be placed within a days transportation of a larger cold storage plant, the latter having a waste fish product plant in connection. This would take care of the surplus from the smaller plants. They also recommend a marketing sales board to control the output of the product to various sections and that selling agents be appointed in the larger communities to control distribution and protect the market. Equipped with this organized power of bargaining, the fishermen could dictate reasonable prices to the consumer as well as secure a reasonable profit for their labour. Under such a plan long term loans for the purchase of boats, equipment and also insurance of fishermen's property could be arranged through the fishermen's organization. The royal commission believes that these suggestions would solve the fishermen's problems, and would establish a profitable industry and secure for him an assured market and a bargaining power which he has not thus far possessed, and a greater portion of the consumer's dollar than he has hitherto received.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as far as I can see, those recommendations have not been carried out. As regards section 5 of the old bill, I take the stand taken by the fishermen in the eastern section of Nova Scotia, that the beam trawler is to a large extent responsible for the condition that now exists in our maritime

province fisheries, and I claim it is the duty of this government to accept the majority report of that commission if they are going to do anything for the fishermen of the maritime provinces.

I am unalterably opposed to the beam trawler fish landing in Canada, and I ask this government what it has done to protect our north Atlantic fishing grounds from the depredations of the foreign trawler. The fisheries report has asked for a conference of the nations concerned in reference to this destructive method of fishing. Thus far nothing has been done. Mr. Chairman, I claim that the use of the beam trawler is one of the most destructive methods that could be devised; firstly, for the reason that large quantities of immature and inedible fish are caught through this method and are destroyed. These fish are either thrown overboard dead, or taken to a fish meal plant for reduction and placed on the market as fish meal or fertilizer. Secondly, the beam trawler destroys the spawning fish, thus seriously interfering with fish propagation. Dr. W. L. Fulton, superintendent of scientific investigation in Scotland, claims that thirty per cent of the trawler catch consists of immature inedible fish. The spawning fish taken by the beam trawlers on our banks are not taken to any extent by the methods employed by the inshore fishermen, as sick fish spawning will not readily take the hook and line. I submit that means should be taken to restrict the trawler method if we are going to conserve our fisheries in the maritime provinces, and especially our north Atlantic coast fisheries. Thirdly, the beam trawler net with its iron shod doors drags the bottom of the sea and disturbs and destroys the algae and the fungi on which the fish depend for food.

My contentions are borne out by the fact that in the North sea fishing grounds off the coast of England where beam trawling originated, the fish catch is decreasing year by year on account of the employment of the trawler method. Where formerly they fished an area of 152,000 square miles, they are now compelled to extend over an area of over 700,000 square miles, and are not supplying an amount equal to that of former years.

Spain, Portugal, France and English beam trawlers are to-day compelled to come to our north Atlantic waters and fish on our banks, by reason of the depletion of their own fishing grounds. The United States consuming public are becoming disturbed over the depletion of haddock in the north Atlantic and are to-day advocating a conference between Canada, the United States and all nations operating beam trawlers in order to arrive at ways and means whereby this most valuable fresh fish product may be conserved. The beam trawler method of fishing gives to the consuming public an inferior product. Fish are by far the most perishable of all foodstuffs and if they are not frozen by the rapid freezing, or what is sometimes known as the brine freezing, method as soon as they are taken from the sea, they lose their texture, that is they become soft; they lose their flavour and also become a prey to bacteria, resulting in rapid deterioration, giving rise to ptomaine poisoning.

The fish taken by the beam trawler are injured by their own weight and by the foreign material taken into the trap. The lower portion of the catch are bruised and crushed by the great mass of material in the trap before they reach the deck of the trawler. This fish is placed in bulk in the hold of the ship or in pens or on shelves and there iced, and the melting ice pours down on the fish below, further softening it, and carrying with it products of bacterial decomposition. The greater part of this fish is kept from five to nine days sometimes longer before being landed. This fish is then placed in cold storage to be frozen by the slow method. Depending upon the amount landed by each trawler, some 200,000 to 300,000 pounds, this requires some two or three days. The fish is then held in storage for three to six months before being placed on the market for human consumption. The product is much inferior to our inshore catch, which is generally marketed the day it is caught. The inshore fish retains its texture, its flavour, and is a very much superior product. The condition in which the beam trawler fish reaches the consumer is the reason it is so difficult to retain the market of central Canada.

In my opinion the greatest objection by inshore fishermen to the beam trawler method is the glutting of the market by over production, giving to the inshore fisherman a very restricted market and consequent low prices —prices which will not permit of an adequate livelihood. Our shore fisherman is thus compelled to give up his occupation, close his home, move to the United States and engage in the American fishing industry, which to-day gives him a livelihood denied to him in his own country. Since 1912, ten thousand fishermen have left the maritime provinces. In one school section alone thirty-three children left with their parents and moved to the United States in a little over three months, and in March, 1929, practically five hundred fishermen left the small section of Isle Madame for the United States to engage in the American fishing industry. Some two hundred have left the river Bourgeois section of Richmond county during the past

two months. The result is that the New England fisheries are to-day almost entirely manned by Nova Scotians. Would it not be a better policy to try to do something for our own fishing industry and retain our native sons instead of spending $20,000,000 as we have done in eight years to bring aliens into Canada?

The mass beam trawler production of which I have spoken has driven our inshoreman from his customary rights, rights which have been his from time immemorial. Our inshore fisheries have played the most important part in the colonization and development of the maritimes. The thriving, happy and contented fishing villages of earlier days are now a thing of the past, and in their places are to be found ruined fishing establishments, boats and gear decaying, homes closed, their former occupants to-day in a foreign land, lost to this country forever.

The problem to-day is a choice between the dividends paid to a group of capitalists who are operating a destructive method of fishing, producing an inferior article, employing some two hundred and forty-nine men, with an invested capital of $990,000, and the livelihood of sixteen thousand fishermen, with an invested capital of $24,000,000. One or the other must go, and it is up to this government to protect the interests of our native born inshore fishermen.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the sixteen thousand fishermen my hon. friend refers to be shore fishermen only? There are some forty thousand altogether.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): That is, in Canada. The friends of the beam trawler claim that the inshore fishermen cannot supply the demand. That is their only claim, and I would ask the minister whether this government has ever given the inshore fishermen of the province of Nova Scotia an opportunity to try to supply the demand for fresh fish. The government has not done so. In 1928 the inshore fishermen of Nova Scotia furnished about one half of the fresh fish marketed by our various corporations, and they have also sent to foreign markets, in its dried and salted state, almost double the quantity supplied by the beam trawlers. The fishermen in that province have not been given an opportunity, and under this legislation—although we have spent $100,000—we are receiving no consideration. I regret that, in spite of the conditions which have been described by the royal commission, this government has treated the situation in the way it has done.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): With much that my hon. friend has just said I must agree, though not with all. The condition of the fishermen in the maritime provinces is a great blot on the economic life of Canada to-day; there is no other class of the communitiy I know of which is in such a pauperized state. I have not lived in that country long enough to know just what has brought this about, but I had the opportunity of going down there twice in recent years.

Mr. BENNETT: And caught a salmon.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Thank you; I was fortunate enough to do that. The hon. gentleman is not a fisherman, I take it, or he would enjoy with me the thrill I had in catching it.

Mr. BENNETT: It was the first you caught.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No; I had caught several on the Pacific coast before that. I found that in some districts many of the fishermen were wholly illiterate. Even to-day some families are growing up without education. The average fisherman, in Cape Breton at least, is fortunate if he has an income of $500 in the year. I wish hon. gentlemen would just try to fix their annual budget on the basis of $500 a year. These men, for years, for generations, have lived by such a low standard that their intelligence and aggressiveness have poured out of that country into other countries or into other parts of Canada, or have been completely suppressed by the economic conditions under which they exist. I see now, however, a ray of hope in the fact that they are at last beginning to think cooperatively, and if the government could find any means whatever of helping to ignite that little spark that has just started they would have performed splendid service.

Travelling up the west coast of Cape Breton you will find at the north end of one shore the old Scottish Hectorians, if I may use that term, the descendants of the first Scottish people who came to Canada. These people have not only retained their original facial appearance and general physical structure, but even their tongue is as pure to-day as when they came here. I was a little alarmed on one occasion in this house, Mr. Chairman, when a barbaric sound broke out from immediately to your left; but after visiting Cape Breton I find that these hon. gentlemen who on that occasion started some Gaelic songs were simply carrying out the

practice which is quite common down there. On the least temptation hon. gentlemen like my good friend from Richmond-West Cape Breton (Mr. Macdonald) will burst forth into Gaelic song. If you could jump across the island—you cannot very well do that; you would have to fly across, because there is no road over the island at the moment unless you go around by Wycocomagh—you would find on the other side the Acadians, just as their ancestors were when they established there in the first place. They are a hard working, thrifty, good living race of people; yet they are in such desperate economic straits that I fancy that if hon. gentlemen visited them and lived with them a little while they would register just such a protest as I am now making against the continuance of the conditions that now prevail in that part of the country. From one hon. member to your left the other day, Mr. Chairman, we got an idea of at least one of the difficulties. He thought that one and a quarter or one and a half cents per pound this time of year was pretty good pay. In my opinion, that sort of pay for the hazardous occupation of catching fish is positively ridiculous. Men cannot live and maintain a decent standard and become or remain good citizens under such conditions. The result is that these fishermen have left the country by thousands, until we find at last, when it is almost too late, business men, clergymen and even doctors, beginning to take a real interest in the condition of the fishermen down there, and urging the necessity for organization. In that part of Canada they have established some locals of the fishermen's federation and in the future their voice will be heard in no uncertain terms. The government is aware of this, at least to some extent. The stream is gathering force and, unless something is done to avert it, it will break with perhaps unfortunate results to hon. gentlemen of the government who come from that part of the country. On this question of organizing the fishermen there is no doubt that the government will have to act with caution. As a result of our experience in the west I can say definitely that government organizers hardly could be expected to be successful; there is always the natural antipathy and suspicion with regard to officials sent around by any government agency, and naturally enough in that part of the country where politics are so partizan there would be a tendency to appoint organizers of the same stripe as the political party in power. Down there you have a large number of people of the opposite political persuasion, and these men would not take kindly to lectures on cooperation by those of another shade of political opinion.

Another point which might be raised at this stage is that we have not found it advisable in any case, in organizing cooperatives in the west, to make grants of money where organizations do not exist, nor have we found it advisable to make grants of money in any case directly to individuals who were not organized or who did not agree to pay back part or all of the money. In other words, I would suggest that if the fishermen are to be really assisted, a plan such as was established some years ago in connection with the bait freezing plants should not be recommenced. I think the chief reason for the failure of the bait freezing attempt was the fact that the fishermen had no monetary commitments in regard to it, and its usefulness was dependent almost entirely upon the initiative or aggressiveness of one or two fishermen in each district. That sort of voluntary work, without responsibility, is good enough in its way, but it does not carry with it the prospect of success. I would submit to the minister that if he could induce the professional classes and the busines men to take a greater interest in the fishermen, and above all if he could induce the fishermen themselves to study cooperation, he would be moving in the right direction. He might have lectures on cooperation broadcast from the radio stations in that section of the country, and he could have men preaching and teaching cooperation all over the country. My hon. friend from Wetaskiwin has just asked what the minister knows about cooperation. I am afraid he knows very little, and that is one of the great difficulties I see in carrying out the recommendations of this report. At page 81 the report recommends the establishment of cooperative organizations of fishermen and suggests that they be assisted by the department as soon as possible, and they further recommend that an organizer experienced in cooperative methods be appointed and paid by the federal government for the period required to initiate and complete this work. Then the report proceeds to deal with other matters. I think if you could get the fishermen to undertake the work themselves it would be far better in the long run; in fact, ultimate success in cooperative enterprises of this character can be only counted upon when the rank and file of the fishermen have become cooperatively conscious.

To-day there is greater hope of success with regard to cooperative enterprise amongst the fishermen than ever before, because of the

recent discovery of the brine freezing plants to which my hon. friend referred. I am informed that small brine freezing plants suitable for fishing villages of average size could be established at a cost of from $1,200 to $1,500, and I would strongly recommend to the minister that wherever organizations of fishermen are now established, he get into communication with them and find out if they are willing to put up a small amount of money, say ten per cent or even five per cent, with the government advancing the balance, in order to establish these brine-freezing plants. The government might hold a mortgage on the property and the fishermen could pay the money back to the government in yearly instalments spread over a given period of years. The fishermen also should have some system of long term loans, which they do not have to-day; they have no cash of their own, and if you could give them an opportunity to secure better equipment with which they can fish more efficiently, probably they would be in a better financial position to repay any loans which might be made to them. However, if you can raise the standard of living you have taken the first great, necessary step in order to help these unfortunate men out of the economic destitution in which they find themselves to-day.

There is a great deal more I would like to say on this subject, Mr. Chairman, but I do not wish to delay the house unduly at this late stage of the session. I simply suggest to the minister that there are examples in other departments which he might well follow. There is the question of marketing; the federal Department of Agriculture conducts certain marketing services, such as the swine and sheep marketing service, and indeed I understand that the first really successful marketing of maritime dressed meats in the city of Montreal was carried on under the Department of Agriculture. I suggest the application of something of that nature to the fish business. The trawler question probably will be the most difficult to solve; I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Richmond for sentimental reasons. I think if you can do anything to make our present fishing population happier and more contented you will have done a great deal more for Canada than can be done by making a few maritime fish corporations rich. After all, this would not be putting any obstacles in the way of scientific progress, because I understand that this government, which now protests that it cannot help the fishermen by removing the trawlers, did prevent the catching of walruses off the coast of Labrador in order that the Eskimos and Indians of that district might live. If it was a good thing to prevent the commercial catching of walruses in order to enable the Eskimos to continue to exist, surely there is justification for the limitation and close restriction of trawlers in order to enable the maritime fishermen to exist in Canada.

The minister has not carried out the recommendations contained in this report to any real extent. I do not know whether he has anything more to offer the fishermen; I have looked over his estimates, but have not found any striking change in them. There are a few small increases, but they contain nothing calculated to improve the general condition of the fishermen. I submit that the minister himself would be well advised to go down to the maritime provinces this year and live among these people for a month or two, in order to find out their actual condition. Then he could come back to this house next year with a real remedy.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): I would like to ask my hon. friend a question. Do I understand that he is in favour of the majority recommendation of the royal commission with regard to the abolition of beam trawlers?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Sentimentally, yes, but as a practical proposition I do not see how you are going to abolish a trawler which is international in character. That is the difficulty I see; you have beam trawlers coming from all parts of the world, from France, from Portugal, from Spain, from England, from Norway and from the United States, and it seems to me it would be a very stupid thing to destroy Canadian trawler fishing unless it were done by international agreement, and so apply to the trawlers of all nations. I think there should be a limitation, and you should try to build up the morale of the shore fishermen and give them more confidence in their future. You should do what you can to help them market their fish at a better price.

An hon. MEMBER: Get them trawlers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The way to help them get trawlers is to assist them in organizing first and then lend them the money, taking security on the trawler itself. I believe the trawlers cost from $135,000 to $150,000; that is not a very large sum of money, although it must appear a tremendous sum to the shore fishermen. To a government it is a mere bagatelle which is chucked away here and there several times in the course of one day when we are passing estimates sometimes without even decent consideration. If you can only get the fishermen to organize

they will be quite willing to undertake the responsibility in these matters if they see an opportunity of ever getting their heads above the economic slough in which they are immersed at present. Frankly, I would hesitate to picture to the house conditions down there, as I saw them. They were deplorable. I went into one home where there were five children, the eldest of whom was a girl of seventeen, very polite and very pretty. I had heard that she had never been to school, but I wanted to find out for myself, and when I asked her she told me that that was the case because her mother had to go to work in order to make fifty or seventy-five cents per day to keep the home going, and so the girl was required to look after the other four children. The next child was a boy of eleven years of age, and when I asked him if he had ever been to school, he told me that he had not because his father was getting along in years and required his services in the boat in order to steady it while he set the lines for fishing. It is necessary that these boats go out from five to ten miles from the shore, depending on the condition of the weather and the fish, and someone is needed to steady the boat and the sons, and in many cases the daughters of the fishermen, are taken along to do this work because the fathers cannot afford to hire any help; the result is that we have in Canada in the year 1929 a condition of illiteracy which is a disgrace to the country. This is brought about as a result of economic conditions which the minister would be well advised to look into to see if this question cannot be solved in some way.

I must say quite frankly that I am puzzled as regards the trawlers. If I thought it would save the lives of ten or twenty thousand fishermen and keep them in Canada and build up their business, and if I thought it would not damage the Canadian fishing industry, I would be in favour of abolishing the trawler, but I am in doubt as to just what the effect would be. In Great Britain and other places where the trawler has been used for many years the fishing has become almost non-existent, or at least it has been very largely destroyed. Any hon. member who comes from that part of the world knows that that is the case. Reference was made to agricultural machinery and it was said that it would be just as foolish to prevent the use of the binder as it would be to prevent the use of the trawl, but that is not a fair comparison to make, the binder does not destroy the land, nor does it destroy the grain, and it has been stated on fairly accurate authority that the trawler does both; it destroys the fishing beds and destroys a lot of immature fish. On the other hand, other authorities state that that is not the case, so I find it impossible to arrive at an intelligent answer to this question. I think the minister should take the whole matter into consideration and give it his personal attention, as the conditions which prevail in that part of the country are not a credit either to his department or to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: During the recess, would the minister be good enough to secure the file in connection with the Ellis royal commission. The report was tabled a short time ago, but one of our members is very desirous of having this report.

Mr. CARDIN: The report has been tabled.

Mr. BENNETT: But not the file connected with it. There are some matters antecedent to the report which some members are very anxious to inquire into, as it affects their ridings.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Minister may cancel license.

Mr. CAHAN: A number of licenses are issued by the minister under the provisions of chapter 73 of the revised statutes. For instance, under section 9 of that statute there is a license in respect of whale fishing; in the same section there is a license for whaling in Hudson bay and northern waters. Under section 10 there is a license for manufacturing fish meal; under section 20, a license in British Columbia waters for boats and buyers of fresh salmon; under section 22, a license in British Columbia for the herring fishing; under section 23, a license for lobster canning or curing; under section 28, a license for lobster pounds, and so forth. Again I am not suggesting any amendment expressing want of confidence in the minister, but the proposed new section 8A provides:

> The minister may cancel any license issued under the authority of this act, if the operations under such license are not conducted in conformity with law.

That leaves the cancellation as a mere exercise of discretion on the part of the minister. It does not provide for any evidence

being presented to the minister of any violation of this statute. I suggest that, in case of its being alleged that any holder of a license has not acted in conformity with the law, he should have an opportunity to be heard and to present evidence in support of his innocense of any such alleged violation. These licenses are held in many cases by persons and companies who have invested many thousands and sometimes tens of thousands of dollars in the particular fishery for which they have obtained a license, and it seems a hardship that their licenses should be cancelled without an opportunity being given them to be heard. Therefore I move this amendment:

That section 3 be amended by inserting beween the words "if" and "the" in the seventeenth line the following words:

"It has been ascertained by the report of a commissioner appointed under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, that"

The clause as amended will then read as follows:

8A. The minister may cancel any license issued under the authority of this act, if it has been ascertained by the report of a commissioner appointed under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, that the operations under such license are not conducted in conformity with law.

We are now laying down the law for future time with regard to such cancellations, and this amendment provides simply that the licensee, in case a charge is made against him, may be heard under the Inquiries Act. I would be willing to adopt any other method of inquiry that might seem more suitable, but this is the form of inquiry which we have provided for by statute. I have shown my amendment to the minister and I trust that, after due consideration, he will be prepared to accept it.

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend was kind enough to communicate to me the amendment he proposed to make to this section of the bill. After looking into the matter, I am quite agreeable to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend and to incorporate his amendment in the section.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): I think this amendment should be considered a little. I should like to ask the minister if the licenses referred to include licenses granted to lobster and other fishermen under the Fisheries Act?

Mr. CARDIN: All licenses.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): My hon. friend who moved the amendment should take into consideration the fact that when we issue licenses to lobster fishermen, it is simply a matter of regulating the fishing and seeing that they obey the law. One of the most objectionable features in connection with that fishery is the difficulty of getting the fisherman to leave the spawn lobsters in the water. We give him a license and if he is found to disobey that regulation, which is important to the industry, his license is cancelled. That is the only control that we have over him. You could not get a commissioner under Inquiries Act to investigate a case of that kind.

Mr. CAHAN: Why not.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): Are you going to send him out on the water to watch the men? That is impossible. If the department is satisfied from the evidence that the fishermen is not acting in conformity with the law, then the word of the inspector or police officer or whoever is enforcing the act should be sufficient to have the license cancelled.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How do you manage it now?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): It is now in the hands of the department.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What do they know about the evidence against him?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): They have the word of the officer who is enforcing the law.

Mr. IRVINE: Would not the commissioner have that?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): The commissioner could only investigate the case afterwards. I think the amendment is entirely unworkable from a practical standpoint.

Mr. CAHAN: There is no reason why you could not appoint the officer who is enforcing the law as a commissioner to investigate the case. It is certainly not an objection that the commissioner cannot be on board one of these boats because the fishery inspector is not on the boat either when it is on the water, and he must decide on hearsay or other evidence of some sort.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): Evidence, but not hearsay. A commissioner under the Inquiries Act would not decide on hearsay.

Mr. CAHAN: Of course not, and I wish to avoid the possibility that any partisan or any person who is personally hostile to this particular fisherman can merely by writing a letter secure the cancellation of his license. In some cases these men have thousands of dollars invested and the cancellation of the

license destroys the entire property value. Therefore, there should be some method whereby, before the license is cancelled, the particular licensee complained of should have the opportunity to be heard on oath or to present the evidence of his witnesses on oath. That is what I am suggesting. I quite agree with the hon. member that if the fishermen do not conform to the law their licenses should be cancelled, but the cancellation of the license should depend upon an inquiry at which those who are opposed to its cancellation may have the opportunity to be heard; and the minister should have a report from the person who conducts that inquiry on oath, upon which in the exercise of his full discretion he may cancel the license. I am not proposing to take away the discretion of the minister to cancel. I am simply providing that he should have evidence on both sides, if available, before such cancellation takes place.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): I have heard of no complaints from the fishermen or from the officers enforcing the law with regard to trouble in getting information. I think the law is being administered fairly to both, but the amendment of my hon. friend would set up too much machinery and there would be too much expense connected with it. You might as well take away the license to fishermen altogether, so far as preserving the industry is concerned, if you enact such an amendment into law.

Mr. CAHAN: I cannot possibly understand that, because under the law as it is at present this license may be cancelled by order of the governor in council, and it is proposed now to vest the sole discretion in the minister.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): As it is now.

Mr. CAHAN: No, as proposed by this amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): As it always has been.

Mr. CAHAN: Not so. Under the law, as it stood before, the minister had not that discretion. In exercising his discretion the minister was acting under an order of the governor in council authorizing it, and the governor in council assumed full responsibility for every such cancellation.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): It would be cancelled upon the recommendation of the minister of the department.

Mr. CAHAN: Quite so, but there was full governmental responsibility in the exercise of that power of cancellation. I am simply trying to ensure that those who hold licenses shall not have their licenses cancelled without being heard in their own defence as to whether they have violated the law or not. We are now enlarging the act so that it refers not only to lobster fishing. The old act refers to whale fisheries and a great number of fisheries conducted by large undertakings, and we are now making the act apply to licenses for trawling and the like, under which business is done in a large way. I think there should be opportunity given to these people to be heard before their licenses are cancelled. That is my suggestion.

Mr. NEILL: Rather than see the amendment pass in the form suggested by my hon. friend I think it would be better to drop the section altogether. I can see the point he makes as regards the large vested interests being injured if licenses are cancelled, but the member for Queens and myself have in mind the operation of the law as it applies to the fisherman's license, the one dollar license. Out in British Columbia the Japs get a license and they farm it out. They get a license in their own name and sell it to somebody else; it may be to someone in a remote fishing place, and if we have to put into operation the clauses of the Inquiries Act before we can take that license away, the fishing season will be over. The amendment would also involve an enormous expense because there would have to be advertising, and notice given of the time and place where a meeting was to be held. It would be of no use whatever in protecting the individual fisherman, and would be a great burden on the department in administering the law. No one has ever heard of anyone having been unjustly treated, and I really think it would be better to drop the section then to accept the amendment.

Mr. CARDIN: I think the amendment may at first give rise to some suspicion, but I believe it is workable. There is no objection to it that I or the deputy minister can at present see, and no objection to our fishery officers being appointed commissioners to make these investigations. I think that can be easily done under the law.

Mr. VENIOT: Is the decision left to the minister after the evidence is taken?

Mr. CAHAN: Absolutely.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6—publication.

Mr. CAHAN: Under the law as it now stands and under the proposed amendment the regulations go into effect on being published in the Canada Gazette. In addition to that, under the statute as it now stands, these regulations are subsequently published with the volume of statutes for the year. Nearly every country justice of the peace has access to the statutes of Canada as published from year to year, and it gives greater publicity I think to these regulations if the statutes for the year can be examined, as they are now examined, to ascertain the purport of the regulations made from time to time. The sole difference is the very slight cost of publishing these regulations with the annual statutes. The regulations come into full force and effect immediately upon publication in the Canada Gazette, but at present in order to give greater publicity they are also published in the appendix to the statutes for the year. Throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion few people have access to the Canada Gazette; but in almost every country village they have access to the annual statutes and the information contained therein as to such regulations.

Mr. CARDIN: This amendment has been suggested to us by the Justice department. Their contention is that the publication of these regulations in the appendix to the yearly statutes has on many occasions unnecessarily delayed their publication. So we have decided to act on that recommendation.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Penalty for using trawls, etc.

Mr. QUINN: Subsection 2 provides:

No such vessel shall carry on fishing operations from or to any Canadian port or ports, unless such vessel is registered as a British ship in Canada.

I move that subsection 2 of section 7 be amended by adding after the word "is" in the third line the words "built and." The subsection will then read:

No such vessel shall carry on fishing operations from or to any Canadian port or ports, unless such vessel is built and registered as a British ship in Canada.

I move this amendment because of the fact that for years criticisms have been made in this house and elsewhere that our shipbuilding plants have been allowed to remain idle. When the government was building the merchant marine ships several tenders were let to the Halifax Shipyards and other shipbuilding plants throughout the Dominion, and the ships they turned out, were equal to any built in any other part of the world. I was very much surprised when tenders were let to British concerns for the ships for the West Indies service. The reason given was that they could be built so much cheaper on the other side of the Atlantic. I do not consider that a sufficient reason. We have been spending millions of dollars on immigration and colonization, and this expenditure has been criticized on many occasions on the ground that facilities were not granted to our people to produce what they consume and use. Here is one means of helping to solve our immigration problem. If we want ships for our mercantile marine, let them be built in Canada, and so give our workmen an opportunity to demonstrate what they can do. We ought to make ourselves as far as possible a self-contained nation. Let us give every advantage to the Canadian producer; that is real protection. Let us enable our Canadian workmen to demonstrate their ability to build fishing trawlers, instead of giving advantages to workmen abroad.

Mr. CARDIN: Although I am in sympathy with the policy advocated by my hon. friend from Halifax in regard to encouraging our shipbuilding industry, I cannot accept his amendment. It would have the effect of practically confiscating a certain number of vesesls which are now in operation and have been for a period of years. We are not losing the benefit of that operation, because most of these vessels are fishing from Halifax. As to the future, the recommendation of the committee on marine and fisheries, which we are accepting by this bill, provides a remedy. If my hon. friend will refer to paragraph (c) of subsection 5 of section 7, he will see that regulations may be adopted to fix the conditions under which a license shall be issued. Then we may make any other provision respecting licenses. So that in so far as the future is concerned, the bill empowers the minister to meet the situation suggested by my hon. friend. I submit, however, that it would be most unfair at the present time to provide that no licenses shall be issued to an existing trawler on the ground that it was not built in Canada. I hope my hon. friend realizes the position in which his amendment would place us; it would bring about an injustice. I would ask him, therefore, to withdraw it, assuring him that the views he has expressed with respect to encouraging shipbuilding in Canada are shared absolutely by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. QUINN: I have listened carefully to what the minister has said and I wish to impress upon him my motive in proposing this amendment. We have been studying, year after year, the problem of maintaining our Canadian citizenship, and how best to meet the immigration question. I have looked over this bill carefully and have come to the conclusion that the amendment I suggest is one way of making a beginning. We are anxious to give employment to Canadian men and women, and if the minister wishes to make a beginning in this direction the amendment I have offered suggests a modest way. Millions of dollars in the way of contracts have been awarded to shipbuilders in other countries notwithstanding that we have in Canada craftsmen, mechanics and builders who have demonstrated clearly that they can build ships the equal of any produced in any other part of the world.

Mr. CARDIN: No doubt.

Mr. QUINN: The minister agrees. In my own native province we had many years ago a splendid record for shipbuilding; we could build wooden ships from our own native material, and manned by our own people, and filled with the products of our own province, sending them to the seven seas of the world. But because of what I was going to describe as an unfortunate, but perhaps I had better say a fortunate agreement arrived at in 1867, the province of Nova Scotia, realizing its duties as a British possession, entered confederation, threw in its lot with the other parts of Canada, and became part and parcel of this great Dominion. It has been shown beyond question that Nova Scotia has lost, has suffered as the result of that agreement. We have not been able to convince the people, particularly of the western provinces, of the sacrifice Nova Scotia made in 1867; they do not realize the important part Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces have played in this great confederation. We have been the sufferers, the losers, and I regret to be under the necessity of pointing out the fact that the western provinces have failed to realize the position we occupy and the contribution we have made to confederation. Our duty as representatives of the maritimes in this parliament is to bring this fact to the attention of the people; other members from those provinces realize their responsibility as fully as I do, and it is important that this government should do something to place the maritimes in the position they occupied previous to confederation. At that time we had control of our own resources and revenues and we played an important part in the commerce of the world. But we have been gradually going back, suffering as a result. Now here is an opportunity to give the maritime provinces a chance. In my native city we have a shipyard which has demonstrated that we can build ships equal to any turned out anywhere in the world. In proposing this amendment I say in all sincerity that if trawlers are to be used on the Atlantic and on the Pacific the shipyards on both coasts should be given an opportunity to construct these vessels.

I have nothing further to say except once more to emphasize the sentiment generally prevailing in Canada to-day that every effort should be made to give Canadian workmen the right to produce the goods which we consume. We should do that to the greatest extent. Turn to the country south of us: will they give us any opportunity to build ships for them? Do they give contracts to Canadian shipbuilding firms? No chance. They build their own ships, giving employment to their own workmen. I am asking that the same consideration be shown Canadian workmen and that in every case our own people be given an opportunity to build the ships which are required for the development of our fisheries and other lines of commerce.

Mr. SHORT: I thought this matter had been all threshed out in the committee and had been agreed to almost unanimously.

Mr. QUINN: No.

Mr. SHORT: Well, there were three out of twenty or thirty members who disagreed. In my opinion subsection (c) covers the situation thoroughly and I agree with the explanation made by the minister. I do not see how we can possibly accept the amendment because we have already a number of trawlers that are now registered in Canada. These trawlers were not built here and what what will be done with them? They are to be found on the Atlantic and the Pacific. Will they be confiscated? The government has already accepted them and given them Canadian registry. If the amendment were adopted what would happen? This subsection fixes the licenses for future vessels and it is for the department to decide then whether such vessels shall be of Canadian build and register. But under existing circumstances it would be ridiculous to accept the amendment as introduced by the junior member for Halifax because it would affect a number of ships built in Great

Britain and other countries, operating both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, and registered in Canada. I submit, therefore, that we ought to accept the section as passed by the special committee almost unanimously.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): As a member of the committee which passed this amendment, I might tell my hon. friend from Digby that the committee was not unanimous.

Mr. SHORT: I did not say it was unanimous; I said about three members voted against it, out of a membership of thirty.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): If more members of the committee were better acquainted with conditions on the Nova Scotia coast there would have been more than three votes against that recommendation. I did not intend to speak at any great length in connection with this matter but I notice that the minister has changed his attitude very recently and that the look on his face now is not the look which was there before we adjourned at noon; he has discovered that he has a recruit from Nova Scotia. The position of my hon. friend from Digby is well known to me and to every fisherman in the maritime provinces, and when my hon. friend the minister smiles and applauds him in this house when he takes a certain stand, I feel that any member who supports him is a friend of the capitalists and not a friend of the fisherman of the maritime provinces.

The amendment which has been moved has to do with a great deal more than merely the building of ships in the maritime provinces; it means a great deal more than giving work to our shipbuilders who are to-day out of work. It means to every fisherman in the maritime provinces an opportunity to live, and I make my appeal on behalf of those people. If these ships were built in the maritime provinces to-day we would have no trouble with the ten beam trawlers operating on our coast; we would give the 16,000 fishermen of the maritime provinces an opportunity to live, and we would probably throw 249 men out of work, which would mean that some of the corporations in the maritime provinces would not be able to pay dividends.

Since we can get no other legislation put through this house it is my intention to support this amendment in order that we may curtail to some extent beam trawling in the maritime provinces. If the amendment is adopted, incorporating the words "Canadian built" only one of the trawlers now operating on the Nova Scotia coast will be allowed to continue at work, and for that reason I support the amendment now before the committee.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is quite right when he says the amendment has to do with something other than just the question of building ships in Canada. I do not think the Fisheries Act is so much concerned with the question of the construction of ships as it is with the interests of the fishermen, and I am afraid my hon. friend from Halifax who lays particular emphasis on the fact that we should have Canadian built ships has perhaps missed the real purpose of the legislation now before the committee. I am just as much in sympathy with the idea of building ships in Canada as is my hon. friend from Halifax, but I am not sure that my hon. friend should select fishing vessels as being the only ships which should be required to be built in Canada.

Mr. QUINN: I mentioned others.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has selected the Fisheries Act as the place to insert this particular provision, but I say that this bill relates to fisheries rather than to shipbuilding. At present I am anxious for legislation which will assist the fisheries. Shipbuilding can be dealt with in connection with general legislation respecting the industries of this country, and that might be done instead of picking out the fishing industry alone as the one which will have these restrictions imposed upon it.

Mr. QUINN: I simply suggested that a start must be made somewhere.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not oppose the idea of having these vessels built in Canada but I want to point out to my hon. friend that, under section 5c, it could be a matter of regulation to provide that vessels which were entitled to a license under this act should be required to be built in Canada. I want to remind the committee that we are facing a problem which is at least eighteen years old; it has existed ever since the first trawler was introduced in Nova Scotia, I think in 1910 or 1911. To-day we have on the table of this house the first bit of legislation to be introduced to limit the operation of trawling out of the ports of Nova Scotia, and in that respect I think hon. members should feel that we have made a substantial advance.

In that connection I want to point out that there was a fisheries commission which travelled through the maritime provinces taking evidence, and that commission received a great many different suggestions with regard to the trawler. These suggestions were gone into very carefully, and a majority of the commission brought in a report favouring the abolition of steam trawlers, as they put it

until the demand for fish became such as to necessitate the use of these means for production. As I have understood since, and I think my information is correct, their idea was that if only the domestic market was to be served, then it was questionable whether or not steam trawlers were necessary, while on the other hand a different situation might arise regarding outside markets. The chairman of the commission, in a minority report, recomended that trawlers should be limited to those of Canadian registry and Canadian ownership. A very serious complaint was made before the commission that firms were permitted to go to Great Britain to charter trawlers for a comparatively small amount and bring them over here as Canadian vessels to engage in the fishing industry, so the chairman proposed that trawlers should be of Canadian registry and ownership.

I would also like to remind the committee of something which I think probably has been lost sight of in connection with the discussion and the report. The chairman of the commission pointed out that in his opinion the number of trawlers in use should not exceed the number which would produce from time to time the market requirements in excess of the production of fish from boats and vessels; in other words, he recommended that the trawler production of fish should be auxiliary to the production by boats and vessels and, in addition, the minority report contained a recommendation that some international body be created to regulate fishing by trawler.

Those are the recommendations which were before this house, and the minister introduced a bill which went further than the minority report but not as far as the majority report. The bill which was introduced, which was bill No. 26, required that any trawling vessel operating out of Canadian ports should be of Canadian ownership and registry and, where it was owned by a company, that the majority of shares should be bona fide owned by Canadians. That was not recommended by either the majority or the minority reports of the commission; that meant a very sweeping change in connection with trawlers, and I submit that it made a very substantial limitation as to the number of trawlers which might operate.

That bill went before the special committee, to which representations were made and I want hon. members to realize that everyone is not of one mind in connection with this matter; everyone is trying to find the best solution in the interest of shore fishermen. The representations which were made to the committee took different aspects; one recommendation, which had been made before the fisheries commission, was that over and above the present trawlers, future trawlers should be Canadian built. That recommendation recognized the situation which has been mentioned already, that a certain number of trawlers were operating out of Canadian ports which were not Canadian built, and it was intended that regulations should be made so that over and above those trawlers, the remainder should be Canadian built. Another recommendation was the one which I mentioned a minute ago, namely, that trawlers shall be Canadian owned and registered and furthermore that if they are owned by companies, the majority of the shares in the company shall be owned bona fide by Canadians. Another suggestion before the committee was that the number of trawlers which could operate from Canadian ports was to be limited for this year to the number which operated last year; a very drastic limitation. That last suggestion was made by the subcommittee but it was very strenuously opposed by a number of those interested in the province of Nova Scotia, who felt that if such a limitation were put on a monopoly would be created in favour of those who already had trawlers and against those who might want to operate trawlers in the future. As a result of those representations, the main committee changed the recommendation of the subcommittee and brought down a provision recommending that regulations should be made by the governor in council for the limiting of the number of trawlers and for the regulating of the issue of licenses to trawlers; in other words making it absolutely impossible for a trawling vessel to leave Canadian ports without a license from the minister, and putting in the hands of the governor in council the power to make regulations as to the conditions under which these licenses would issue. Further than that, and it is in the bill, it was provided that trawlers should not operate within twelve miles of the shore. The committee recognized what is set out in the report of the royal commission at page 97, which puts it in this way:

> It must not be forgotten that the shore fishermen are proprietors of the inshore sea, proprietors not in virtue of actual possession, but in having made it their own from the earliest days of Canadian coast settlement or colonization.

The provision is in the bill that trawling vessels shall not operate within twelve miles of the shore, leaving that area to the inshore fishermen.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the minister think that the foreign trawlers can be controlled in that way?

Mr. RALSTON: It is made an offence for a man to land his catch at a Canadian port when he has made that catch within the twelve-mile limit.

Mr. BENNETT: Has the minister given any thought to the effect upon international relations with respect to the outstanding conventions as to the use of sea ports?

Mr. RALSTON: Foreign trawlers are limited in this way: a duty of one cent per pound is imposed on fish which is landed by them. It all comes down to the question of limiting and regulating what we know as Canadian trawlers. That is the recommendation of the committee, and that recommendation has been embodied in the bill. This is not the last word in connection with trawlers; it is the first. It is an endeavour to meet a very difficult situation, a situation which is fraught with all sorts of troubles. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), who I know has a very sympathetic interest with those engaged in the fishing industry in Nova Scotia, was sincerely puzzled in connection with the matter of trawlers. He saw that there were difficulties in connection with any of the remedies which have been suggested, and most of them have been suggested by representatives of the fishermen. He saw that there would be great difficulty in carrying them out, but at the same time a sincere and honest attempt has been made to making it possible to get together those who were interested in this industry and have them place before the minister the representations which they had to make with regard to a practical way of limiting these trawling vessels. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the bill is a sensible one. It is very difficult for the house or the committee to arrive at a solution of a problem which has proven practically insoluble for the last eighteen or twenty years, but I think a fair opportunity has been provided to everyone concerned to present his views. If there is any formula which can be suggested whereby the limitation or regulation of these vessels can be effected, an opportunity is given to those who have that formula to present it to the minister. I believe that those who are members of the committee, and I believe that the members of this house feel that after all, if it ever should come to be a question between the trawlers and the inshore fishermen, the inshore fishermen should have the advantage and be the ones for whom we should legislate. That has been the spirit in which members of the committee approached this question. It is far more important for us to have prosperous villages along our shores, to see happy and contented people, rather than to pile up profits for corporations, and it was in that spirit that this legislation was brought down.

The hon. member for Bow River very honestly and fairly and candidly said that he was doubtful as to whether or not it was possible to do away entirely with the trawler but he thought that there should be some method whereby they could be limited and regulated. The limitation is provided for in this bill, keeping them outside the twelve-mile area. The power is given to the governor in council to make regulations under which licenses will be issued, and suggestions have been offered which can be followed as the principles upon which such limitations or regulations can be laid down. Those recommendations have been made by the committee of the house, and have been adopted by the Minister of Fisheries, and I believe they are a distinct step in advance.

Mr. IRVINE: How many cruisers will be employed in policing the twelve-mile limit?

Mr. RALSTON: If the hon. member will read the act he will see that a penalty is provided for landing fish which has been caught within the twelve-mile limit, and the burden of proof in connection with the catch is upon the trawler. In other words, a man may be required to make an affidavit that the catch was taken outside the twelve-mile limit.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): This is also a discrimination against the Canadian trawler, because the foreign trawler can operate up to within three miles of the shore.

Mr. RALSTON: Does the hon. member say that he is against the twelve-mile limit?

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I am not against it.

Mr. RALSTON: I would like the hon. member to take some definite position in regard to it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I am not in favour of the beam trawlers. I differ from my hon. friend in that respect; he is in favour of a certain growth—

Mr. RALSTON: I am in favour of this act as being the first step in connection with the regulation of trawlers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The foreign trawler can operate up to within three miles of the shore.

Mr. RALSTON: Is the hon. member for or against the twelve-mile limit?

Mr. BENNETT: That is not answering the question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): That has nothing to do with my question. I am in favour of the total abolition of the trawler, but under this act the Canadian vessel has to fish outside the twelve-mile limit, while the foreign vessel can fish up to three miles.

Mr. RALSTON: All I can say is that the Canadian or the foreign trawler is prohibited from landing its catch, if it has been made within the twelve-mile limit.

Mr. SHORT: No trawler fishes within twelve miles of shore. They all fish away off the coast.

Mr. RALSTON: While I am dealing with the matter of fisheries, may I say a word to my hon. friend with regard to cooperation? When he speaks about there being no effort toward cooperation with the fishermen, I think he knows there are between eighty and a hundred fishermen's federations and the government has been and is taking steps toward assisting in connection with the cooperative movement among the fishermen all over Nova Scotia. I agree thoroughly with my hon. friend in regard to the desire to see that cooperation is encouraged among the fishermen of Nova Scotia and that the fisherman is made sure of a substantial market and bargaining power.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The minister stated that we have between eighty and a hundred cooperative societies in Nova Scotia.

Mr. RALSTON: I said fishermen's federations.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Yes. Could the minister say where they are located?

Mr. RALSTON: I could not give my hon. friend the list. They could be given very easily if my hon. friend wants them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I am acquainted with the majority of the fishermen's federations in Nova Scotia and I do not think there are more than twenty.

Mr. RALSTON: That is simply a statement of fact which can easily be verified. The third matter which has been brought up

[Mr. Ralston.]

is one in which I am intensely interested and one which has to do very seriously with the question of trawling. It is the endeavour to bring about an international conference with regard to not the regulation of trawlers coming into a particular port but the regulation of foreign trawlers which, of course, have a right to fish on the banks regardless of any regulation we may make, so that for the benefit of all concerned, the fish supply may not be depleted. That is receiving and will receive the attention of the department in connection with future measures which may be considered.

Mr. QUINN: The Minister of National Defence has stated that this bill is the first step in the regulating the trawlers. I ask him whether it is in conformity with the recommendations of the fisheries commission. I submit that it is not. When I moved my amendment, I had in mind the conservation of Canadian trade, Canadian work for Canadian workmen. That is the argument I adduced in my previous remarks. This bill does not conform with the report brought down by the royal commission on fisheries. The Minister of National Defence wonders why I should bring up under this particular item an argument in favour of Canadian-built ships. This is one opportunity that I have and on every opportunity that presents itself I will urge that Canadian ships for Canadian trade should be built in Canadian shipyards by Canadian workmen. In the last two or three years we have awarded contracts for five ships for the West Indies service. Notwithstanding the opposition that might be raised to my ideas, I submit that these ships could be built in Canadian shipyards, I will confess at an enhanced price, but what would have been the result? We would have been giving work to Canadian workmen, and that is the policy the party on this side of the house been advocating all along. Even if we pay a little increase in price, we should give these contracts to our Canadian shipyards and our own men.

At the present time we have two destroyers being built in England shipyards for the Canadian navy which is under the department of my hon. friend, the Minister of National Defence. In these times of peace when we have no expectation of going and no desire to go to war, we do not need shell-proof destroyers, and therefore an opportunity should be given to Canadian shipyards to build these destroyers for the Canadian navy, even though this might cost us a little more. The only argument against it is that the cost is a little higher; but with the extravagant ideas of the

government which holds the reins of power to-day, a few hundred thousand dollars here or there would not make much difference. Therefore, when they are in that extravagant mood, why not give the advantage to our Canadian workmen by permitting them to build these ships and thus keep our workmen on this side of the line instead of having them go to the United States through lack of opportunity in this country.

I have a deep interest in all Canadian fishermen, but particularly have I at heart the interests of the fishermen of the maritime provinces. Therefore I say: Every opportunity should be granted to these men to carry on the industry in which they are born and brought up, the conditions of which were so well demonstrated by the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton and the hon. member for Bow River this morning. They are such that it is not necessary to point out to the Department of Fisheries that something must be done to alleviate conditions among the fishermen, particularly in the maritime provinces. I would repeat what I said the other day when I was criticizing the present incumbent of the office of Deputy Minister of Fisheries, namely, that if he would devote his time to the industry and to the people who participate in it, he would make to the government a report which would bring about better results. The whole responsibility for the present condition is upon this government and if they do not bring in legislation that will produce better results and conditions among the fishermen of the maritime provinces, they will have to pay the price.

Mr. SHORT: The statements made by the hon. junior member for Halifax and the hon. member for Richmond-West Cape Breton would lead the committee to believe that the firms which are operating trawlers are not in sympathy with the shore fishermen. They would also lead the committee to believe that because I am not in sympathy with the amendment moved by the hon. junior member for Halifax, I am not a friend of the shore fishermen. I want to tell both of those hon. gentlemen that I am a friend of, and have perhaps done more for, the shore fishermen than either of my two hon. friends has done. The firms that are operating trawlers out of Nova Scotia have done more for the shore fishermen than any of the other firms that are carrying on the fish business there, because they have created throughout the country a market for their fish. They have spent thousands and thousands of dollars advertising fish throughout Canada and have found new markets for fish where the small concerns were unable to do so. They would not be operating trawlers out of Nova Scotia ports to-day if they were able to get a regular supply from the shore fishermen. As everyone knows, there are seasons of the year when the shore fishermen do not operate. We do not have any fish on the shore during the winter months, and that is when there is the greatest demand for fish throughout the country. The maritime provinces had no fresh fish market until we were able to give the cities of the upper provinces a regular supply of fish every week. Previous to that they were supplied from the United States, from Portland, Boston and Gloucester. Fish used to come in from those ports all the year round, but in 1910 we started to establish a fresh fish market in the cities in the upper provinces by giving them a regular supply the year round, and that trade is increasing year by year.

The concerns that are operating the steam trawlers would not be operating one of them if they could get a sufficient quantity of fish from the boat fishermen because it is a well-known fact that the fish landed by the boat fishermen are of a better quality than that landed by the trawlers, but during the winter months it is impossible to get a regular supply of fish from the boat fishermen along our shores in Nova Scotia, and we have to use modern methods in order to ensure a regular supply. The report of the royal commission shows that the operators of steam trawlers purchase over fifty per cent of their shipments from the boat fishermen. These trawlers do not operate out of Canso during the summer season at all. It is only in the fall and winter when the weather is bad and the supply is not equal to the demand that they are obliged to use modern methods just as they do in the United States and other countries. I repeat, if the supply of fish could be guaranteed by the shore fishermen, there would be no trawlers operating at all. My hon. friend from Richmond-West Cape Breton talks of the big dividends paid by these corporations. The large fishing corporations of Nova Scotia have made no money in the last four or five years. Like other concerns they did make some money during the war, but since 1921 they have made no money and several that I know of have not paid a dividend for four years. So the big interests that my hon. friend talks about are not making the money that he thinks they are. Their

sympathies are entirely with the shore fishermen, and they would not be operating these expensive trawlers if they could get sufficient supplies from the shore fishermen. I see no reason why this amendment should receive consideration from this committee at all.

Mr. THOMPSON: I know nothing about trawlers on the Atlantic coast or their operation, but I am in favour of this amendment because I am in favour of its principle, that all vessels operating in Canadian waters should as far as possible be built in Canadian shipyards by Canadian workmen out of Canadian materials. I think when the order for the vessels for the West Indies trade was given to outside shipyards a great mistake was made. Even if it had cost a little more, I think the work should be done in our own country.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: The Minister of National Defence has stated that whenever the question comes up as between the shore fishermen and the steam trawlers he would take his stand behind the shore fishermen. I wish to congratulate him on that statement. It is exactly the stand I take. I am not going to say that the steam trawlers should be completely abolished. That is a very difficult question, and I can appreciate the position of the Minister of National Defence when he was speaking in the house on this matter, but we had a commission appointed by this government, which cost this country $100,000, to investigate this and many other matters that were referred to it in its terms of reference. This report is signed by the majority of that commission, by Doctor Cyrus MacMillan and his colleagues, exclusive of the chairman, who sent in a minority report. At the bottom of page 98 of that report I find the following very startling statement made by these commissioners, and I take it for granted that these men were competent to deal with the various matters referred to them by the government. If they were not competent to deal with them, they ought not to have been appointed. They say:

> We believe that one of the remedies for the present situation is the total prohibition of steam-trawlers from operating from Canadian ports, landing their catch in Canadian ports, or obtaining in Canadian ports coal or supplies. And we recommend that such legislation be enacted as to make such prohibition effective on and after June 1, 1929.

Then I turn to page 97 of the report, where they say:

> The problem seems to be largely one of choice between the steam trawler and the shore fisherman.

[Mr. Short.]

I read that for the information and edification of my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence in the light of his statement, that he was prepared to stand behind the shore fishermen, if it became a question between them and the steam trawlers. The commissioners say plainly:

> The problem seems to be one of choice between the steam trawler and the shore fishermen. One or the other must remain, and one or the other must go.

There is the finding of commissioners appointed by this government—one or the other must remain and one or the other must go. It seems to me that the commissioners put it up pretty plainly to the Minister of National Defence and myself and all others who should take a stand as representatives of the people on this question. That is a very serious statement by the commissioners, and in view of the statement of the Minister of National Defence I would ask if he has given it due consideration. Evidently the minister does not believe that that statement is true or this legislation would not have been brought in. If he does believe it is true, then the only stand that the Minister of National Defence and I and others can take is to stand four-square behind the shore fishermen because human values are the values that must be considered in this matter. If, as these commissioners say, one or the other must go, for my part it would seem that the government should indemnify the owners of these steam trawlers for any losses they may incur as a result of the passing of these trawlers. And if the continuation of these steam trawlers in Nova Scotia is to be permitted, and if their continuation means that the shore fishermen must go, I say that it is the duty of this government to protect the shore fishermen, for human life is more valuable than any steam trawler or any other machine that the mind of man can invent. If the statement of the majority of the commissioners is correct, the steam trawler should go, and not the shore fishermen, and it "should not stand upon the order of its going."

Mr. MALCOLM: Is the conclusion of the commissioners correct, in the opinion of my hon. friend?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: What conclusion?

Mr. MALCOLM: The conclusion that one or the other must go.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: That is not a matter for me to decide; it is up to the government which appointed this commission.

Mr. MALCOLM: Not at all.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: The government have that recommendation from their own commission, a commission of their own creation, and it reports back to the government in terms unequivocal that one or the other must go. That commission reports back to them directly in unequivocal terms that one or the other must go. I say to my hon. friend with his ingratiating smile that he cannot put the onus on me. He must put it on the government of which he is a member, and he must bear his part of the responsibility.

Mr. MALCOLM: Apparently my hon. friend is not willing to assist in the matter at all.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: The government have the power, and consequently are responsible.

Mr. BROWN: As a private member who does not know anything about this subject, I should like to ask the hon. member for Inverness—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: After I have concluded my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to answer any questions my hon. friend from Lisgar may wish to ask. My hon. friend the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said he also was interested in legislation for the fishermen. Well now, here we have the report that has been in the hands of the government for over a year, the report of its own commission, a commission which made in all about seventy recommendations. This government kept that report in their possession for over a year, and then in the dying days of the session they bring in a bill to keep steam trawlers from operating within twelve miles of the coast of Nova Scotia, when as a matter of fact they were always precluded from operating within that distance.

That commission also recommended long-term loans to the fishermen to enable them to purchase boats and equipment in order satisfactorily to prosecute their calling and to supply the amount of fish that my hon. friend from Digby said the corporations wanted, so that the steam trawler might automatically abolish itself. According to the evidence taken by the commission, the fishermen of Nova Scotia to-day are not able to equip themselves properly to carry on that important calling. As a result they have to abandon it and the commission found a pathetic condition of affairs in the fishing districts of the province. My hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland), who also visited the province, found a similar condition of affairs. He found that children were not being sent to school because the returns from the fishermen's work were not sufficient to enable them properly to feed and clothe their children. The commission also found that not only were those conditions deplorable, not only were the men not getting a fair return from their hazardous toil, but that hundreds of them were compelled to leave our fishing villages, and the commission saw houses boarded up and villages depopulated.

One of the cures for this calamitous state of affairs would be the introduction of legislation to provide long-term loans to the fishermen of Nova Scotia. Since my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence says he is interested in legislation to assist the fishermen, it may be proper to ask him why that was not done since the government had the whole session in which to do it.

There is no doubt whatever that the fishermen need to cooperate. They should be taught cooperation, because cooperation requires a great deal of study. But I hope the government will not follow the practice of sending down political heelers to organize the fishermen. I believe the organizers should be appointed by the fishermen themselves and paid by the government.

The situation revealed in the report of the fisheries commission is a serious one for Canada. It will be remembered that when confederation was in the offing the great leaders of public opinion at that time, Macdonald, Cartier, Brown, Galt, Tupper, all stressed the importance of the maritime element in confederation. They said that Canada could not be formed unless it had a "maritime element." Well, a "maritime element" does not consist merely of harbours and ports of call. It has to do with the hardy men who carry on maritime pursuits, and if we allow their livelihood to be placed in jeopardy, whether by the steam trawler or any other factor, then the government that is in control of the situation is remiss in its duty when it does not come to the assistance of these people, who have played such an honourable part in our history and who are so important in our national development.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend began his speech very frankly and very candidly by saying that he himself was not wholly in favour of the abolition of trawlers. If he knows anything about the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia at the present time, he must be aware that the fishermen are not advocating the total abolition of the trawlers. He

knows that the fisheries committee has not recommended their total abolition, but has realized that regulation is necessary. He knows that such a good friend of the fishermen of Nova Scotia as the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) who spoke this morning, does not advocate the total abolition of the trawlers. My hon. friend has endeavoured to play on words, but as yet he has made no declaration of his own in regard to this very important matter.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Oh yes.

Mr. RALSTON: He says the responsibility is on the government. Well, the government is taking the responsibility of bringing down this legislation. My hon. friend speaks of this bill being brought down in the "dying hours" of the session. It was first introduced on February 14, 1929. I was not a member of that committee, but my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Macdonald) was, and he knows what occurred in the committee. The committee's recommendation is being dealt with by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries within a week after it was submitted to the house. So my hon. friend can find no fault with the government for delay in the matter. This talk about the dying hours of the session is simply an endeavour to draw a red herring across the trail, and to give him an opportunity for making a speech —something that my hon. friend can do very cleverly indeed—to give the fishermen the idea that he is in sympathy with them—

Mr. MACDOUGALL: My hon. friend does not seriously wish to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. RALSTON: —but failing absolutely to make any concrete or practical suggestion for helping in the solution of a problem which, as I say, has baffled our people for the last seventeen or eighteen years. This legislation is an endeavour to arrive at a solution of the problem. It will enable the people interested to make representations, and afford the minister an opportunity to weigh those representations and to lay down some principle which will be of benefit to the industry. And when I speak of the "industry" I do not mean the trawlers, I do not mean the companies, I do not mean the corporations; I mean the men and women who day by day are engaged in earning their livelihood in this occupation.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): I think, Mr. Chairman, this question should be considered very calmly and coolly. There is no question of doubt that the problems surrounding the fishing industry of Nova Scotia are of a very acute character. But how any person in these modern times could conceive of abolishing absolutely the trawler—the instrument that has made the Nova Scotia fishing industry broaden out in the Dominion—is more than I can understand. It would be like the western country abandoning the gang plough in favour of the one furrow plough, or our textile manufacturers reverting to the spinning-wheel. It is regrettable that certain fishing districts in Nova Scotia are to some extent suffering on account of the operations of the steam trawler, but if the steam trawler were completely abolished the province generally would suffer. Take the coal industry, for instance, approximately $100,000 worth of coal is sold to steam trawlers annually, and that coal is mined in Nova Scotia and these trawlers are also provisioned in Nova Scotia. Therefore I think we should approach the discussion of this question not provincially or parochially but on the basis of a broad national question. Our fishing industry as it is now being developed finds an expanding market all over the Dominion.

It has been said that the fishing corporations are making excessive profits. I am told they are not. An hon. member of this house, thoroughly conversant with the fishing industry and also following that business, claims that they have not made anything like excessive profits in the past four or five years. This question should be considered and debated in a calm, sensible way in the light of modern science and advancement in all our industrial pursuits, including fishing. The steam trawlers do not operate within twelve miles of the coastline of Nova Scotia.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the good of the bill?

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): I am merely discussing the question of the steam trawler, which seems to be the paramount issue before the house at the present moment. The hon. member for Bow River stated this morning that the steam trawler had disastrous effects on the fishing industry off the Orkneys in the old country. The royal commission appointed by this government to investigate and study the fisheries in the maritime provinces held, both in the minority and in the majority report, that the operations of the steam trawler have not had a disastrous effect on the fishing industry of the maritime provinces.

I do not think we should have any desire to cripple an industry which is developing and making considerable headway in Canada. We have had sufficient evidences of coopera-

tion with regard to the marketing of our products; I need refer only to the Maritime Provinces Association in the city of Toronto and another one in the city of Montreal, both endeavouring to assist us in the marketing of maritime products in central Canada. If, therefore, we should make any move which would cripple an industry of such importance and with such far-reaching ramifications as the fishing industry, it would simply be tying the hands of those who are willing to assist us, who have been assisting us, and who in the future will give us more in the way of assistance than we can do for ourselves so far as finding outside markets for maritime provinces products including fish.

Mr. J. ETIENNE DUSSAULT (Levis) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn), I wish to give the reason for the vote I am about to cast. The hon. member moved an amendment to Bill No. 26, an amendment which bears on the Fisheries Act, that a clause be inserted in the act so as to provide that licenses be refused to owners of vessels unless such vessels are built in Canada, and the reason given by the hon. member for Halifax in support of this amendment was that he wants the workers interested in the building of vessels to be employed. In my opinion, the hon. member for Halifax could have found a more appropriate circumstance to help these workers. He told us a short while ago that we could in Canada, as well as anywhere else, build vessels as sound and as cheap as those built by English firms. This is not so. On every occasion that the Canadian government requested our ship-builders and those of English firms to submit tenders, Canadian firms had to ask 30 per cent more than the English firms, and the contracts which, under these circumstances, were awarded to Canadian builders, brought ruin upon them. Last year, the Dominion government had to build two ice breakers, only Canadian firms were asked to tender. What was the outcome? Both contracts were awarded to firms in the Maritime provinces, and I can safely assure beforehand the hon. member for Halifax that these two contracts will hinder instead of fostering the development of ship-building industry in Canada. The Minister of Marine should not be obliged after having asked for tenders, to award the contract to the lowest tenderer. Certain owners of ship-building yards are so anxious to find work for their men that they put in tenders even at ruinous prices. It would be better to have the cost of the vessel, on which tenders are sought estimated and refuse to award the contract should the tender submitted be below the estimates of the department's engineers. The question may be asked why the Canadian ship-builders cannot compete with those of Europe. This is easily explained. First, the workmen's wages must be taken into consideration. All know that wages paid in Canada to workers in ship-yards are at least double those paid in Europe. We have no blast furnaces or rolling-mills in Canada to produce steel plates which are needed in ship-building. These steel plates are imported from England. The freight on these plates must be taken into account. Moreover, the English and European ship-building yards have been established for nearly a century and have always been given the preference on orders from governments or large ship-building firms, they therefore have been able to expand more than our Canadian ship-building yards.

There are in my riding ship-buiding yards operated by the Davie Ship-building Company. The latter were requested, during the war, by the government, to erect a special plant in order to build vessels. This plant has cost more than six million dollars. During war activities work was plentiful, but since then it has often lacked. It has been rumoured that the Davie Ship-building Company, as then organized, made large losses on their ship-building contracts during the war. Ever since then, this company has worked mostly for the Canada Steamship Company who are the owners.

During the war the price paid to ship-builders was $140 per ton, and even at that price Canadian firms could hardly balance their budget. To-day the price has dropped to $60 per ton. How can we therefore hope that this Canadian industry, whose development has been so costly, can, to-day, compete with that of Europe which has developed gradually and was assisted both by contracts and bonuses from various governments. Simply by giving to this industry the assistance needed and paying a fair price for its work. With that end in view the hon. members of this house must impress upon the Minister of Marine the advisability of awarding contracts only to those whose tenders show reasonable profits. It is not by fostering competition such as it exists among Canadian builders that we shall find a remedy to our ills.

Take, for instance, a shipbuilding yard whose workers are out of work; you request its owner to tender for the building of a vessel and at the same time you make the same request to the owner of a shipbuilding yard in full activity, immediately you give rise to

competition which will force the former to tender at a price which will allow him to carry on but to carry on miserably. I cannot see any other reason that can explain the ridiculous low prices which the Minister of Marine has received in tenders for the building of the two ice-breakers in question. Can the minister be blamed for accepting those tenders? Evidently not. Had the minister acted otherwise the opposition would not have let slip the opportunity of blaming him for taking the public's money to make a gift of it to a company. For instance, the minister would have been blamed for having made a gift of $250,000 to the Davie Shipbuilding Company if he had awarded to this company the contract for the building of the first ice-breaker, instead of awarding it to the Halifax Shipbuilding Company. It would have been said that the government in acting thus had no other aim but making themselves safe in the Levis riding. Yet our workmen were more in need of work than those of Halifax. And I feel certain that the passing of the estimates of the Marine department would have been delayed for weeks, as it recently happened, for smaller items, when the estimates of the Postmaster General came up. For these reasons, I cannot vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax.

I have but a few comments to add in connection with the contracts awarded to European shipbuilders for the building of two cruisers. The hon. member for Halifax is wrong in blaming the government for not having these two cruisers built in this country. And this is the reason: The Canadian shipbuilders already own machinery which has been very costly to them. Now, to build cruisers, special equipment is necessary, and the ordinary machinery at the disposal of our ship yards is not sufficient for this work. The plates used in the building of cruisers are made of steel in which enters an alloy of chrome and nickel, an alloy so hard as to resist boring, cutting, heating and bending with the machinery at present in use in our ship yards. All our shipbuilders would have been forced to order beforehand entirely new machinery which would have been only used again about ten years hence when the government would have had to replace the cruisers that are being built at present.

To utilize with profit such equipment, it would be necessary for Canada to decide to build a navy. I feel sure that it is not the intention of the hon. member for Halifax to advise the government to take such a step. I entirely agree with the minister for not having asked our shipbuilders to make a further outlay of $1,000,000 or more so as to purchase and erect machinery which would have been utilized exclusively in the building of these two cruisers, the cost of which will not amount to $1,000,000.

If my hon. friend sincerely wishes to help the workmen of our shipbuilding yards, I think it would be better for him to withdraw his amendment and await a more favourable opportunity. I shall then be very pleased to vote with him in favour of any measure which will facilitate the minister in carrying out the promise which he has just made to the house, that is fostering in all possible way the industry of ship-building in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: I have just one brief observation to make. The Minister of National Defence suggested that the government was taking a stand on this question, and that the question was very simple. The royal commission on fisheries decided by a majority of four to one against steam trawling, but the government decides in favour of it. What lead is that to the House of Commons with respect to commissions? Either the commission was composed of men who knew their business better than anyone else or it was a commission which should not have been appointed; it was either a commission of experts or it was not; the experts knew their business or they did not. If they knew their business, then four of them have recommended, in the language of the report, as follows:

> We believe that one of the remedies for the present situation is the total prohibition of steam-trawlers from operating from Canadian ports, landing their catch in Canadian ports, or obtaining in Canadian ports coal or supplies. And we recommended that such legislation be enacted as to make such prohibition effective on and after June 1st, 1929.

That commission cost this country $100,000, and that recommendation is made by four of the five commissioners. What lead is it to the House of Commons when the government comes along and says these four men do not know their business but that Mr. Justice Maclean, who is not a fisherman at present, says we must have the trawlers?

That is the real question before this committee. The government tried to divest itself of responsibility by appointing a royal commission. The Minister of Finance said the other day that this country is sick of being governed by commissions, although a few days previously he appointed a commission to deal

with the salaries of technical men in Canada. The Minister of National Defence, confronted with the Duncan report, succeeds in having the government of the day appoint a commission on fisheries composed of five members, of which Mr. Justice Maclean was chairman, with four other members who were said to be gentlemen of wide experience, highly qualified by political and other associations to deal with this problem. Those four gentlemen were Cyrus Macmillan, H.R.L. Bill, Joseph Mombourquette and J. G. Robichaud. I am not in a position to place my knowledge against theirs and I ask my hon .friend from Lisgar, who asked a question a moment ago, whether he does not think that those four gentlemen, who were selected by the government which he supports, know more about this matter than we know.

What can I say to my constituents with respect to this matter; what can I say to the public of this country, when four gentlemen named by the government and selected, as I say, because of their wide knowledge, one of them being a college professor, say that steam trawlers should be abolished, while on the other hand a judge of the exchequer court says that action should not be taken? What is this committee to do? The majority is four to one, but now the Minister of National Defence, representing the province of Nova Scotia in the cabinet, says, "I am for Judge Maclean; I agree with him." I leave it to the members of the committee and the country whether or not they think that is giving a lead to public opinion in Canada.

Now I desire to ask the minister one other question. Is it not true that we have renewed the licenses of American fishing boats and that we allow them to enter our Canadian ports to coal, victual, outfit, and land their fish, by an order in council passed within the last three months? I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if that is not so?

Mr. CARDIN: Not on the Atlantic.

Mr. BENNETT: Only on the Pacific? There has been no renewal of the modus vivendi with respect to American fishing boats out of Gloucester?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Then it is clear that they cannot land their catch on the Atlantic?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Nor ice their ships?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Nor obtain supplies of any kind?

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Formerly that was the case, but now that only applies to the Pacific?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: The fisheries on the Atlantic being pretty well cleaned up, now we are to continue this practice until they are wholly cleaned up on the Pacific. In other words, the halibut are to be entirely annihilated, as they have been partially annihilated already, and now that the great fisheries of the Atlantic are becoming exhausted we are to have the same principle applied to the Pacific.

When my hon. friend from Richmond-West Cape Breton and my hon. friend from Inverness are asked as to the position, all they can say, all I can say and all any other Canadian can say is that the government saw fit to select a commission of five members to consider this question, four of whom recommended a certain course of action. The fifth commissioner recommended another action, and the government has taken the opinion of the one commissioner in preference to that of the four. Now what are we to do? The government and the minister will tell us what we must do now. I do submit that this is but an evidence of what you get when you have a condition of this kind in a country like Canada; the sacrifice of principle for the purpose of maintaining power by groups scattered throughout the country. When the groups had been brought together a commission was appointed, and then when the commission made its report, the government did not accept it; the government said that one commissioner was right and the other four were wrong. The hon. minister says that this is but the beginning; it is but the beginning, but it is the beginning of the end of this government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. leader of the opposition is very optimistic.

Mr. CARDIN: I am not ready to take too seriously the observations made by the hon. leader of the opposition. I do not think that anyone has ever contended in this house or in the country that every report made by a commission must be implemented in its entirety by legislation. These reports are merely recommendations which must be studied and looked into by the government

and by the officials of the department. I cannot bring to mind any particular instances, but when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and my friend the leader of the opposition was supporting that government, there were many reports made by commissions, which reports were not adopted in their entirety by the government of the day. I will admit that that is no justification, but it proves that the principle which has been advocated by the hon. leader of the opposition is not possible of application to every case. These commissions are bodies of investigation, that is all, and when my hon. friend says that the minister and the government have chosen between four commissioners and one commissioner, that is not exactly the case. This legislation is the recommendations of a committee of this house. The committee on marine and fisheries dealt with the report of the Atlantic fisheries commission; they dealt with the question of trawlers, and the bill embodies the conclusions arrived at by that committee. The government is merely following the recommendations of the majority of a committee of this house.

Mr. GEARY: The note on page 2 which indicates the purpose of section 7 reads as follows:

This section is necessary to carry out a recommendation of the committee.

As I understand it, the recommendation was to the effect that steam trawlers should be abolished.

Mr. CARDIN: The word "committee" refers to the committee on marine and fisheries.

Mr. GEARY: As I understand it, the committee recommended that all ships should be owned either by Canadians or by corporations the majority of whose shareholders were Canadians.

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. GEARY: Some committee made that recommendation.

Mr. CARDIN: No.

Mr. GEARY: Then I am quite in error.

Mr. CARDIN: The clause in the bill expresses the conclusions of the committee on marine and fisheries.

Mr. GEARY: The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) referred to some report having been before the committee—

[Mr. Cardin.]

Mr. CARDIN: The minister was referring to the report of the Atlantic fisheries commission.

Mr. GEARY: —that all these ships should be owned by Canadians.

Mr. CARDIN: That referred to a bill which was first introduced in the house but which has been amended by the committee on marine asd fisheries.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Chairman the remarks of the Minister of National Defence would tend to give the impression that I was opposed to the beam trawler, when the words of my amendment were not meant to convey that impression. To a certain extent I am in favour of the beam trawler, but the amendment which is now before the committee proposes certain limitations. The hon. leader of the opposition has pointed out that a commission was appointed for the purpose of investigating the condition of the fisheries in the maritime provinces. That commission consisted of three gentlemen who were actively engaged in the fishing industry, a college professor, and a judge of the exchequer court. The three gentlemen who were actively engaged in the fishing industry—

Mr. SHORT: And who were divided in their opinions before they heard the evidence.

Mr. QUINN: —along with the college professor, made a certain finding, but the fifth member of the commission, who occupies an independent position, presented a minority report. That royal commission made a report to this government and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that report should have been implemented by this government. But what did they do? Bill No. 26 is brought in, and that bill is discussed by the fisheries committee and a report presented to the house. We have the matter in three successive stages: a royal commission, consisting of supporters or friends of the government; the fisheries committee, which consists of a majority of representatives of the government; and then this committee of the house, which has a majority on the other side. I am not opposed to the beam trawlers because I believe that they are necessary to the fishing industry, but I am primarily in favour of the shore fisherman. He is entitled to every consideration from this government or any other government; he is entitled to every assistance in the way of protection of the industry by which he earns his livelihood. If the beam trawler is allowed to operate then I say that it should be the product of Canadian shipyards and be built by Canadian workmen.

It may take a little time to bring that result about, but in the interim the question as to whether or not the shore fishermen can produce sufficient fish to satisfy the Canadian market can be settled. If they cannot, then there is a justification for the beam trawler, and if the beam trawler is necessary, then it should be the product of Canadian shipyards and of Canadian workmen. The whole responsibility lies upon this government as to whether or not they satisfy the fishermen. If they do not make a success of that, it is their responsibility.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a misapprehension in the mind of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Geary), and evidently there must be a misapprehension upon the record. The government appointed a commission and that commission brought in two reports, a majority and a minority report. The government did not evade any responsibility, but took the responsibility of drafting Bill No. 26, which provides that all trawling vessels should be Canadian owned and of Canadian register and, in the case of companies that a majority of shares should be bona fide Canadian owned. Because of the fact that there had been a majority and a minority report, and that there was a difference of opinion, the government felt that it was only fair to the members of the house to submit that bill to the fisheries committee. Let me remind the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) that it is not so many years ago since he was standing up in the house and saying, "We will not have any commission, the real commission is the members of this house, elected by the people of this country." The government, having received from the commission a report which was not unanimous but which showed a difference of opinion, referred the matter to a subcommittee of the members of the house, of I think, twenty-six. That subcommittee, as I told the committee a few minutes ago, proposed to pass Bill No. 26, but to limit it for this year to the number of trawlers now operating. Then, when protests were received from those who were interested and who felt that this would create a monopoly among trawl owners who now had trawlers, the result was that when the amendment was considered by the committee itself, the committee struck out that provision and made the recommendation which is now before us and which is embodied in Bill No. 26. I think the course of the government has been fair, has been to assume and not to evade responsibility, and it has introduced a bill in accordance with the recommendation of the committee. My hon. friend says that there is a majority of government members on the committee. That is quite true; but my hon. friend, if he is a member of the committee, knows that not more than three out of the whole twenty-six voted against the recommendation that was embodied in the bill. Therefore it must have been approved pretty generally on the other side. In fact, this afternoon the support of the bill has not by any means been confined to one side of the house.

Mr. QUINN: It is non-political.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend does not seem to be trying to make it so. He says that it may take a little time to have these vessels Canadian built. I would point out to him that we have to be practical in connection with these matters. If it is going to take a little time, is it not the best course to pursue to give the governor in council power to make regulations, to lay down principles under which licenses may be granted and to consider the very proposal my hon. friend is making, as to whether or not a limitation of time cannot be imposed—my hon. friend does not suggest how long—after which period trawling vessels should be Canadian built? As I said a little while ago, the proposition was made before the fisheries committee that over and above the trawlers now operated, new trawlers should be Canadian built. There cannot be any better method to pursue than to afford an opportunity for the inclusion in the regulations of such a principle if it is considered practical, and if it is not practical, then as my hon. friend says, in the interim—and that is the word he used—the question whether or not this principle should obtain can be further investigated.

I do not agree with some of the hon. members who have spoken on the other side. They have said that trawlers are absolutely necessary; they lay that down as a basic principle. My opinion is that trawlers are necessary only if they are required to supply the excess demand after the shore fishermen have brought in their supply. That question may have to be and may be considered by the minister in connection with the granting of licenses. If my hon. friend from Halifax is looking at the matter from the practical point of view, this is the best way to bring about the possibility of putting into effect any such suggestion as he has made.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not think that to place in the hands of the minister the power of determining the number of licenses he shall issue, is going contrary to the modern ten-

dency? The Chief Justice of England has recently declared in very strong terms against bureaucracy, the bureaucracy that consists in orders in council being passed and government by order in council. Here we have a discretion given to a political minister—and all ministers are political; I am not referring to this minister more than others—a political appointeee, to determine who shall have a license and who shall not. Is that quite right? I think the minister will see where that leads—the pressure of his friends, the opposition of his opponents, and in the end the minister is placed in a position where his efforts will be destroyed. One has only to pick up the daily press to see what happens to men who fearlessly enforce the law; they lost their positions. I put it to the minister whether or not it is a fair thing, in view of what his colleague has said, namely, that this is an experiment, to place the success or failure of that effort in the hands of a minister who necessarily must exercise his power in favour of his political friends and against his political opponents, being in that respect like all other ministers as regards a matter of this kind? The effect of the pressure will be that this experiment, so-called, will be nothing more or less than political effort. Those of us who know the capacity of the Minister of National Defence in dealing with patronage in Nova Scotia know what the inevitable result will be.

Mr. CARDIN: I fully realize the difficult position in which the minister may be placed later on by the adoption of this legislation; but somebody has to decide; somebody has to be given the responsibility of deciding a matter of this kind. I think it is for the government to assume the responsibility when they are placed in a position to exercise their judgment. I can assure my hon. friend that the regulations which are provided by that section governing the issuances of licenses to the trawlers, are not going to be drafted without giving the proper consideration and without looking beforehand for advice from all parties concerned in the fishing business. I do not propose to recommend to the governor in council any regulations without having first obtained the advice of and given full opportunity to all those who are interested in the business of fishing to express their views as to the form of these regulations and as regards the power that the minister is given, according to that section, of issuing or refusing licenses. So far as I and the government are concerned, we are not looking towards increasing the number of licenses to trawlers; we are rather looking towards a reduction in the number of those licenses. But we thought it would be an injustice, unfair, practically to confiscate the trawlers which have so far been operating. Unless very grave circumstances arise or reasons are given, no further licenses are going to be issued for trawlers. I quite realize this is going to be a hard job, but may I say to my hon. friend with the short experience I have had in that department and in that branch of the service, with the very limited knowledge I may have of that business and the limited knowledge that previous ministers may have had with regard to these technical matters, it is no small affair to administer the fisheries of this country. As my hon. friend has mentioned, representations of all sorts are coming to the minister on every question which is put to him. We have the representations of the dealers on one side and the fishermen on the other, and we have to give consideration to the general good of both enterprises and to protect with greater care the interest of the fishermen. This is not a small job and it is not going to be a small job for the minister, but for the short period of time I shall be in that position, I am going to take the chance and I can assure my hon. friend that nobody need be afraid of political interference or of any injustice resulting from the influence of one party or another.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has seen fit to throw out an insinuation which I think was hardly worthy of him.

Mr. BENNETT: I intended to make it a plain statement, not an insinuation at all

Mr. RALSTON: I would welcome an opportunity for discussing the matter of patronage in Nova Scotia and, indeed, elsewhere in Canada, a little nearer home to my hon. friend than Nova Scotia. If I had followed the example of his political friends in Nova Scotia, there might be some reason for complaint. But I endeavoured to deal with these matters on the broad basis of the best interests of the country. If my hon. friend has any particular instance in mind, he is quite at liberty to bring it up. I am not going to weary the committee this afternoon, but during the last two or three years there have occurred in connection with political patronage on the part of the provincial administration, friends of my hon. friends, certain matters which might well afford an excuse for my friends to feel, as indeed they do feel and have so expressed themselves very often, that I do not deal with these matters as aggressively as they would like.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no Civil Service Act there.

Mr. RALSTON: There is no Civil Service Act there, my hon. friend says. That is the excuse that is given; there is no Civil Service Act there. My hon. friend mentioned the other day men who had a contract with the government, and who would be entitled to be paid for life even though they had their contract ended at the age of seventy-five years, but there were men in Nova Scotia who had the same sort of contract with the government and were appointed to hold office during good behaviour, who suddenly found that an act had been passed by the present provincial government changing their tenure to holding office during pleasure, and they were immediately dismissed without cause or investigation. That is the sort of thing we have had in Nova Scotia, and that is the sort of thing I have had to meet in connection with the administration of public affairs there. I want to tell my hon. friend that I would be perfectly happy if he would bring up any case he desires with regard to the administration of patronage or of public business in that province, where he thinks there has been political interference.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Garrison's case will be here presently.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall be very happy now to deal with his case. All I know of it is what I have seen in the newspapers.

Mr. BENNETT: Then my hon. friend is much belied because Mr. Garrison said that there was a telegram sent by the minister.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend picks up anything that happens to be told him and retails it from his prominent place in this house as being the truth. That is an absolute mis-statement. My hon. friend does not know it, but he ought to take a litttle more care to investigate before he makes such statements because he occupies a position of considerable responsibility in this house and in this country, and it is not befitting his office or befitting himself to make these statements without at least some attempt at investigation.

So far as this bill is concerned, my hon. friend may be assured that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have all my best endeavours and cooperation in seeing to it that no political considerations enter into it whatever, but that when licenses are granted, they shall be granted on some fixed principle which applies to everybody and has regard to the best interests of the industry and of the men and women who are engaged in it.

Mr. BENNETT: I say that there is nothing too small for the minister to interfere with in Nova Scotia. I say that deliberately, and if you want evidence of it we had it this session when at the public accounts committee he as a minister of the crown sat in that committee and watched its proceedings to protect MacMillan. We have further evidence—this is not the time and place, but the evidence will be brought forward before this house prorogues—in connection with the case of MacMillan, who is the political henchman of the Minister of National Defence, and is well known so to be. The minister's assumption of virtue in matters political is belied by the record, and I say that the people of Nova Scotia know it and they understand it and that is the reason he usually sits for one constituency for one term only and no more.

With respect to this particular matter, a large measure of power, life or death with respect to property is vested in the minister. The minister says what is perfectly true, that political pressure is exercised with respect to these matters. We have had evidence of it in this house within the last two weeks. In the one case when a minister was asked by one of his employees for an investigation, he referred it to his colleague whose signature had dispossessed that man of his position. Naturally, every government must play the game in that way. A minister must support his colleague, and when his colleague takes responsibility, he in turn must support his colleague's view, and that was what was done when the situation arose as it did the other day, and the man failed to obtain an investigation because the minister affected said no.

When the Lord Chief Justice of England was directing attention the other day to these bureaucracies, he pointed out that legislation in parliament in recent years has taken the form of skeleton acts, leaving to the governor or king in council or to a department great powers, and that that was disastrous to democracy and the effect of it was ruinous. Political pressure is invoked, and the result is that a man to save his property must agree to support the administration of the day. That is what happens, and you see men who are Conservative to-day suddenly voting Liberal to-morrow and vice versa, because the government of the day makes it impossible for them to continue to support a party that is opposed to the government if they want to get what they desire and require. It is not a case at all of this one particular instance, for this is but one of many, and

when I point out the fact it is merely something that every man may see for himself if he studies conditions in this country, Regulations are passed, and these regulations permit the very thing that in my judgment must be stopped if we are going to preserve the democratic principles of the institutions that we are living under. To say that a man must support a government or he will not get what he wants is but a manifestation of a principle which is very, very destructive to our institutions.

Then there is patronage. The Minister of National Defence says that patronage in Nova Scotia arises because of the fact that there is a government in power in that province that does not support this government; that the provincial government exercises patronage against this government's supporters, and he is therefore pressed to do it as against Conservatives in the federal field. I pointed out that there is no Civil Service Act in that province. The minister says there is a provision in the Civil Service Act that if a man engages in political activities he loses his position. That provision is in the act, but the minister does not for a moment think that there is any difference in political parties with respect to this question of patronage. The pressure is the same whether it is a Conservative or a Liberal government. But what we are endeavouring to do is to remove the possibility of that pressure being exercised, and I say that it is improper for such a wide power to be left to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister of National Defence, from Nova Scotia, says that he will do what he can, but when his friends insist on a certain thing being done, you will have exactly the situation that we have had many evidences of. Remember, we are not dealing with generalities. We had a great commission that sat here, and we saw the very great pressure that was exercised—members of parliament, ministers, pressure of that kind—and it will continue so long as you afford the means. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is only human, and when he is told that John Smith is out actively working against him and wants a trawler's license, he will see that he does not get that license because the Minister of National Revenue says that he must not have that license and carry on propaganda against the government as he is doing.

Mr. EULER: Not the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not referring to him because he has nothing to do with trawlers. I should have said the Minister of National Defence. That is but human nature. When a general election is on, governments are seeking support from all quarters. It is only human for them to do what they can to secure support from every quarter they can, and all this country's history, royal commissions and otherwise, whether you go back to the early days of 1878 or come down to 1926, show that the evidence is all the same. I admit that public opinion is not very active about it. In support of that all you have to do is to take the report of the customs committee of this house, which was adopted by this house by a majority of ten, and which placed condemnation upon the Prime Minister by name. But what was the result? It did not affect the people—not in the least, although this house by a majority of ten had adopted that report. It may well be that what we are doing is putting public opinion to sleep by opiates and other means—drugging them with large estimates, with favouritism in the distribution of public moneys, by making ports here and harbours there, by dredging rivers, by rebates on salt and coal, buying aviation field sites, and matters of that kind. But there always comes a day of reckoning. It may not come in my day.

It is unfair to ask a minister who is human, who is anxious to get support for his party, who is one of the most active and successful securers of support, if I may use that word, of any minister in this house or of any that have been here for a generation—he secures the support of friends and they tie themselves to him with bands of steel—it is unfair, I say, to ask him to put himself in that position. I am against such bureaucracy and against the exercise of these powers, which have done great injury to Canada and to other countries. It is no good to point out what our friends did or did not do. We make no progress in that way; it does not get us anywhere. If that had been the guide by which governments were to determine their action there would never have been a change from the rotten boroughs of England; there would have been no electoral reform, no passing of bills for the amelioration of the condition of individuals. But we are trying to go forward, and we cannot go forward if we put that power in the hands of a minister under these conditions, with his political friends clamouring for the exercise of power.

With respect to the instance mentioned, the Minister of National Defence says that he is entirely guiltless, that Garrison had no authority for making the statement he did. I accept his word with respect to it. He says that I should make inquiries. All I know is this. Mr. Garrison occupies a very important

place with respect to the Liberal party in the city of Halifax, and on the occasion referred to the evidence indicates that he went to the customs authorities, accompanied by the representative of the Minister of Labour, a fair wage officer. He then made the statement to which I have referred, that he, the man charged, had received a telegram that morning from Colonel Ralston by which he was being recalled. That is as far as I know. The minister says, "You should make further investigation." Well, I made reasonable investigation. One cannot investigate anything more fully than can the government, and if the minister says he sent no telegram, I accept his word.

Mr. RALSTON: Why not ask the man?

Mr. BENNETT: He was asked, and he said a telegram had been sent.

Mr. RALSTON: The man?

Mr. BENNETT: No, Garrison.

Mr. RALSTON: Why not ask the man whom Garrison was addressing to ascertain whether he got the telegram?

Mr. BENNETT: The same record shows that he says he did not.

Mr. RALSTON: Then why does my hon. friend suggest that I did send a telegram when the man to whom it is alleged to have been sent says he did not receive it?

Mr. BENNETT: No. The suggestion is that the minister is exercising his power of patronage in Nova Scotia, as every minister has to do, and that one of his henchmen in Nova Scotia, Mr. Garrison, is so sure of his position that he makes those statements.

Mr. RALSTON: Why did not my hon. friend inquire and find out if they are true?

Mr. BENNETT: Because Garrison is relying on such enormous power that he is in a position to say the minister will do this if he has not done it.

Mr. RALSTON: It is purely imagination.

Mr. BENNETT: On his part, not on mine at all. There is MacMillan's record. Why does the minister spend his time in the public accounts committee?

Mr. RALSTON: I can tell my hon. friend if he will give me an opportunity.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well.

Mr. RALSTON: In the public accounts committee there were no less than three privy councillors representing the opposition. The only two members of the government who were on the committee were the Solicitor General and the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was engaged in the agriculture committee, and the Solicitor General was away. As the only privy councillor available I was asked to represent the government. Why did three privy councillors on the other side take such an active part in the investigation?

Mr. BENNETT: They were allotted to the committee when it was struck. They had nothing to do with that, I understand.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not finding any fault with them, but I say surely the government might be allowed to have one privy councillor present.

Mr. BENNETT: The government have a majority at all times.

Mr. RALSTON: I am talking of members of the government.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought my hon. friend meant the government. Who were the two or three privy councillors on this side?

Mr. RALSTON: The hon. member for Fort William, the hon. member for East Toronto and the late hon. member for Frontenac-Addington.

Mr. BENNETT: The latter was there part of the time; he was not there during the concluding discussions. The record indicates what the purpose and intention of the government was in respect to it. Why should the government desire in any way to impede the investigation of MacMillan's accounts?

Mr. McMILLAN: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Are we dealing with the fisheries bill, or are we throwing slurs against each other across the floor of the house?

Mr. BENNETT: I wish to assure my hon. friend that the MacMillan I referred to was not the hon. gentleman for South Huron.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): A large American fish corporation has taken over two or three Nova Scotia fish corporations. If that corporation has not sufficient trawlers for its Canadian needs, is it the intention of the government under this legislation to grant it a license for American trawlers? To-day that concern is in a position to bring over the trawlers that it owns on the American side.

Mr. CARDIN: No, it is not our intention to issue licenses for the purpose.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): It can be done very easily under this legislation.

Mr. SHORT: It could not be done; they would have to be of Canadian registry.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): It all depends on the minister. There is nothing in the legislation to prevent it.

An hon. MEMBER: Subsection 2.

Amendment negatived on division.

Section agreed to.

Section 8 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 81, to amend the criminal code.

Mr. BENNETT: Explain.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend asks me to explain the bill. I would have thought this would be rather unnecessary, because it is absolutely similar to the bill which has passed this house three or four times only to meet an unfortunate fate in another place. This house is committed to the bill after having adopted it, as I have said, three or four times.

There is perhaps much misapprehension as to the effect of the bill. It is far from having the effect of wiping out the crime of sedition from the criminal code. Its purpose is to replace the law as it was prior to the session of 1919. The crime of sedition existed then and will still be in the criminal code after this bill has become law. Under the present section 132 of the criminal code the crime of sedition is divided into seditious words, which are words expressive of a seditious intention; seditious libel, which is a libel expressive of a seditious intention; and, thirdly, seditious conspiracy, which is an agreement between two or more persons to carry into execution a seditious intention. As the house will observe, the seditious intention plays an important part in the crime of sedition, whether this crime consist in words, writing or conspiracy. The crime of sedition under the British law is a crime under the common law, and it has never been found advisable to define exactly what circumstances and what facts constitute sedition; this has been left to the courts, judges and juries. There was a disposition in the English draft bill to fix a definition, but it was found better not to do so; and here in Canada our criminal code, as originally drawn and introduced into parliament, contained a clause defining a seditious intention. But after much debate in the Canadian parliament it was deemed advisable not to try to have a restrictive definition but to leave the offence of sedition as it was under the common law. And of course the meaning is very general. As has been stated, sedition embraces everything, whether by word, deed or writing, which is calculated to disturb the tranquility of the state. It was so general in its meaning, as first introduced, that parliament found it advisable to place in the code a section safeguarding freedom of speech. That section, which appeared in the criminal code until 1919, and which we are asking now to reinstate, is rather the most important part of this bill. Section 133 of the criminal code as it was in force before 1919, and which section 2 of this bill is intended to reinstate, reads:

No one shall be deemed to have a seditious intention only because he intends in good faith,—

"(a) to show that His Majesty has been misled or mistaken in his measures; or,

(b) to point out errors or defects in the government or constitution of the United Kingdom, or of any part of it, or of Canada or any province thereof, or in either house of parliament of the United Kingdom or of Canada, or in any legislature, or in the administration of justice; or to excite His Majesty's subjects to attempt to procure, by lawful means, the alteration of any matter in the state; or,

(c) to point out, in order to their removal, matters which are producing or have a tendency to produce feelings of hatred and ill-will between different classes of His Majesty's subjects."

I freely confess that I am at a loss to understand why this section was repealed in 1919. Surely nothing therein described could be an offence; the citizens of a country have the right to criticize measures of the government, and to try to show to the people of that country that the sovereign has been misled by his officers, or something to that effect. This safeguard we wish to reinstate in our criminal code.

The second purpose is to repeal the sections which are now consolidated in section 98 of the present criminal code and which were enacted at the same session in 1919, purporting to define certain acts, words or publications as being seditious. As I stated before, these are absolutely unnecessary because the offence of sedition as it exists under the common law, and as it is already in the criminal code, embraces all the things which might have been mentioned in that section. It did not improve the law; far from it. On the other hand, it has been strongly resented and found objectionable by a large section of the citizens

of Canada. As a matter of fact, since I have been a member of the government it has been my privilege to attend every delegation which has met the government each year from the Trades and Labour Council, from the railroad brotherhoods and from other labour organizations, who have all represented to the government their strong resentment of this change in the criminal code. Indeed, they have called attention to the fact that the word "force" as used in that section has been interpreted by certain gentlemen as being applicable to a sympathetic strike. It has been argued that a sympathetic strike constitutes a kind of force, and organized labour, rightly or wrongly, believe that that section as it stands may be used as a means of putting obstacles in their way and denying them the right to strike when they deem it wise to do so. It has been represented to us that organized labour at times cannot find halls for their meetings because the owners are afraid that by renting the hall to such labour associations they may come under the provisions of this section. I may remark that it is rather extraordinary to give to the commissioner of mounted police, who after all is a police officer, the right without warrant to authorize his men to go and take hold of property, either real or personal, on mere suspicion. This, it seems to me, is an extraordinary provision which one cannot find in the code of any other country. I repeat that the law as it was, and as we want to reinstate it, is sufficiently strong to punish the crime of sedition in whatever manner it may be committed.

There is another misapprehension I would like to correct; far from this being done at the instance of or to please the communists, I may say that if I thought this amendment would have the effect of helping them I certainly would not be fathering this bill, but this change is requested not by the disorderly elements in the country but by organized labour, by the men who have been helpful in maintaining peace and order in our industrial relations, and that is why I am introducing the amendment.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I have only one observation to make. The legislation in question has been on the statute books of this country for ten years, and during that time no prosecution has been entered under it. Therefore it has adversely affected no interest, nor has it done harm to any person. We are now asked to repeal it because, in my judgment, there has been a great misapprehension on the part of organized labour as to what it really meant. In essence it is merely an effort to preserve the life of the state by making more definite and clear the conditions under which men may carry on propaganda of whatever kind they may desire to spread. There is no limitation or restriction placed upon legitimate propaganda; there is no restriction upon those who desire to criticize our institutions or to support by peaceful means any change in the conditions under which they live, but the section was drawn for the purpose of meeting a condition which was very real, not only in this country but in others, a condition which we hope has disappeared but which may recur. The essential subsection is as follows:

> Any association, organization, society or corporation, whose professed purpose or one of whose purposes is to bring about any governmental, industrial or economic change within Canada, by use of force, violence or physical injury to person or property, or by threats of such injury, or which teaches, advocates, advises or defends the use of force, violence, terrorism, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, in order to accomplish such change, or for any other purpose, or which shall by any means prosecute or pursue such purpose or professed purpose, or shall so teach, advocate, advise or defend, shall be an unlawful association.

Then follow subsections dealing with other phases of the same matter. It will be observed, therefore, that there is no limitation placed upon peaceful associations, upon propaganda, or upon any effort within reasonable limits to bring about needed changes in the body politic, but it does aim to prevent these unlawful associations from disseminating the doctrine of force in connection with our changes in our constitution or institutions, and I say it is helpful to have upon the statute books of this country laws which will protect us from that form of propaganda.

As ten years have passed without any charges being brought under this section it may be taken that the deterrent effect has prevented such propaganda. I recall reading in the newspapers during the last few years reports of gentlemen making speeches and saying, "Of course, we do not advocate that these changes should be brought about by physical force." I have no doubt that the reason for those statements was this section of the criminal code, and to that extent it has been useful; it has prevented the extremist from carrying on the operations which he might have carried on, and no injustice has been worked to any person. So it cannot be said that it has curbed reasonable criticism, lessened freedom of speech or in any sense deprived peaceful citizens of any rights which they should enjoy with regard to the carrying on of any reasonable propaganda having for

its purpose the persuasion of other people to think as they think. For that reason I say this is not the time when there should be a change of this kind, especially in view of conditions which have been brought to our attention since this house met, conditions which we know and which the minister knows from reports made to him from time to time are not wholly absent from this Dominion but which we hope will become less as the days go by and men realize that no good purpose is to be served by an effort to subvert the laws of the state or reach their ends by other than peaceful means.

If I thought any good purpose could be served by repealing this section of the act I would support this action, but since no harm has been done by this section, no good will be done by its repeal. No useful end will be served by making it possible for those so disposed to carry on their propaganda in a more reckless manner, with less hesitation in the expression of their ideas as to the means necessary to attain their ends.

That is the only observation I have to make with respect to this legislation. If there were any limitation as to the power of expression by the humblest citizen of this Dominion as to the desirability of effecting changes in any industrial activity or in the government of the day, certainly I would not support any such limitation, but as this section aims to prevent the application of force to attain that end, it serves a useful purpose as a deterrent, and it should not be repealed.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Unlawful associations.

Mr. CAHAN: With regard to this bill I might say that I personally made an intensive study of the common law as it stood in 1918. I was then associated with the Department of Justice, and we found it impossible to secure convictions under the law as it then stood against those who were actively advocating the use of force to overturn the existing governmental institutions of this country. If this section is repealed I say with considerable confidence that those who desire to advocate force, violence or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, in order to bring about any governmental, industrial or economic changes, within Canada, will have a great deal more freedom to do so. Those who advocate force, violence or physical injury for the purpose of bringing about governmental or constitutional reforms in this country should be amenable to the criminal law of Canada, because they are really the people who become responsible for the use of force for such purposes, by advocating it and inciting others to commit acts of violence for that purpose. Personally I am against the complete repeal of the present section 98, although possibly it might well be modified in some particulars.

While I am on my feet I might refer to section 133a. I do not see any objection to adding this section to the present criminal law of the country. I think we are all agreed that the matters dealt with in these several clauses should not be deemed to indicate a seditious intent, but personally I think that a complete repeal of section 98 is not in the best interests of this Dominion. I have no animosity or feeling of hostility to the labour movement in any way, shape or form, but if we are to preserve in times of crisis the institutions of this country, it must be made a crime to advocate the overthrow of those institutions by force in a democratic country such as this where complete liberty of moral suasion is permitted and upheld.

Mr. WARD: Has there been, at any time during Canada's history, an attempt on the part of any organization to overthrow any constituted form of government?

Mr. CAHAN: For a short time I was associated with the Department of Justice with the nominal title of director of public safety, and I came in touch with scores of such cases. If the records of the department have been preserved it will be seen that there were many such cases.

Mr. WARD. What kind of government were they trying to overthrow?

Mr. CAHAN: They were trying to overthrow the form of government which we have in Canada to-day, no doubt about it.

Mr. WARD: Civic, provincial or federal?

Mr. CAHAN: Civic, provincial and federal. There came to my attention evidence of foreign funds which had been supplied to a very considerable extent during the last years of the war; foreign agents and aliens, who were resident outside of this country, governmental and otherwise, were sending funds into this country to establish printing presses from one end of the country to the other, for the issuance of propaganda inciting to force, and in saying that I speak from personal knowledge. There were very few prosecutions during that time, but I communicated with some of the leaders of those movements and asked

them to come to Ottawa, and I told them in a most emphatic manner that unless they desisted from those methods they would have to be met with more severe enactments than were then upon the statute books of the country. Those who were propagating that incitation to violence were men who had come to this country from foreign countries provided with foreign funds to be used for such purposes.

Mr. WARD: Has the hon. member ever seen any evidence of success on the part of those so-called foreign organizations?

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Seditious words, punishment.

Mr. BENNETT: In many cases it is within the discretion of a judge to impose a very severe penalty and it has been found that that option serves a very useful purpose, and I cannot understand why a reduction has been made from twenty years to two years.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is for the purpose of making the law as it was in 1919; two years was the penalty at that time.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INDEMNITY OF MEMBERS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been asked by several members when they could receive their indemnity. I have given the necessary instructions to the accountant and hon. members may begin to-morrow to draw their indemnity cheques.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—FISH TRAPS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA WATERS

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss a matter of some importance to British Columbia as a whole and of very great importance particularly to a number of people in that province. It is a matter that I intended to bring up on the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin), and I have sat here patiently, or with such measure of patience as one can command at this season of the year, for three whole days from eleven o'clock in the morning to eleven o'clock at night, for the appropriate item to be brought up. But there has been so much delay and so many interruptions that I may not be here when it comes up. Of course the matter can be discussed in committee when and if we do reach that stage eventually. I understand, speaking at this particular juncture, that I am entitled to speak for more than forty minutes and this would be my opportunity to get back at the advocates of the forty-minute rule and speak for a couple of days. But I want the support of the house generally and of the government and I understand this course would not meet with the approval of hon. members. Therefore, if I can get the attention of the house for thirty or forty minutes, I think I can confine my remarks to that time.

The matter to which I wish to refer concerns fish trap licenses for salmon in British Columbia. Some months ago the government appointed a commission to ascertain whether it would be in the public interest to allow the use of salmon traps in the northern part of British Columbia adjacent to the boundary line between British Columbia and Alaska. The commissioner has reported and I have his report under my hand. To put the matter briefly, he recommends the use of fish traps. I want to give a number of reasons why the report of that commissioner should not be accepted.

The essential objection is that the use of fish traps will eliminate the working fishermen of British Columbia. Last year 14,000 fishing licenses were issued in that province. It is well known that a man does not live to himself alone; it has been calculated that a working miner, between his own dependents and those who make their living out of his wages, supports seven or eight persons. If, therefore, those 14,000 license holders were put out of business, something like 100,000 people would be involved. I do not suggest that that would be the immediate result if the trap licenses were granted in this particular area to-day or this year; because probably there would be only fifteen or twenty traps and it might not affect more than a couple of thousand or twenty-five hundred men. But as surely as day follows dark, if the principle is once granted there it must inevitably be accepted elsewhere in British Columbia and this will lead to the ultimate elimination of those fishermen and of those dependents upon them.

I should like to begin a little back in the history of this matter. Between 1919 and 1925 there were no traps in this area, that is the northern British Columbia area, No. 2. Early in 1925 rumours got around that traps were going to be allowed once more in that area, and the then member for the district—that is, Skeena, Mr. Stork—came to Ottawa and secured from the government a promise that no traps would be allowed in that area. Later in 1925, along about May, a fish company began to build a trap. I may explain that the name of that fish company was The New England Fish Company, a very powerful United States concern, having quarters in Seattle, Boston and, I think, New York. It is purely a United States concern. It operates in British Columbia, of course under an appropriate Canadian subsidiary with a nice Canadian name. When I use the words "this company" referring to the company, I do not confine myself entirely to them. While they are the primary movers; while they are the men who built the traps in 1925 and who are to-day asking for the renewal of their license to use them, there is not the slightest doubt—indeed, it was brought out in evidence before the commissioner—that if they got the traps, the other cannery owners would be compelled to do the same thing. Therefore it is really the canning industry that is asking for the traps as well as this particular company. But on this occasion, namely, along about May, 1925, this fish company began to build a trap; they demanded a license, and they were refused in consequence of the arrangement arrived at between the government and Mr. Stork some months before. It was then found that Mr. Johnston, the then Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, had given those people a letter some months before informing them that they could get all the traps they wanted. That letter, apparently, was not known of at the time, but later on the company of course produced it. The situation was then that they had invested a great deal of money in this trap and they had this letter from a recognized official of the government saying that they would get the license. The government was compelled to yield, on that occasion, stating that they would get a license for 1925, but it was given on the distinct condition that that year would end the license; that they would get no more after the year 1925. That brings us up to the end of 1925.

In 1926 the company, like everybody else in similar circumstances, came back again wanting the license renewed and talked about vested interests and so forth. They were refused flatly and definitely by the then Liberal government, practically the same as the government of to-day. So we have on record at that time a definite stand taken by the Liberal government of the day that they would grant no more trap licenses in that area. That occurred along about May 1926. In July, 1926, the Conservative party came into power and they promptly granted the licenses. Then the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, leader of the Conservative party, went out on a campaign, and when he reached Prince Rupert he found the local feeling so acute—the situation was explained to him just as I am trying to explain it now—that he immediately gave instructions cancelling the licenses and on the 18th August they were cancelled. That was a much more drastic step for him to take than the one that had previously been taken by the Liberal party when they were in power, because the Liberals merely said: You must not go on and build the trap; but in the case of the Conservatives they cancelled the license in the very middle of the season, after the trap had been completed, equipped and was actually in operation. I well remember the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen holding a big meeting in my district at a place called Royston and announcing this cancellation, and the gratification with which our fishermen received the news that this shadow that had been over us for so many years would now be removed. So we have the position that both political parties were absolutely pledged and had taken action in fulfilment of that pledge, against fish traps in British Columbia.

After the election The New England Fish Company comes along and demands a renewal of their license for the next year. There are rumours that the company possesses a letter written by the Hon. Mr. Patenaude, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the Conservative government, to the effect that if they would keep quiet during the election their licenses would be restored after the election. Until I see it I prefer not to believe that there is such a letter. It would be a reflection on the sincerity of the then minister, and until it is produced I would much prefer to have grave doubts as to its ever having been written. But suppose the worst, that it was written. That in no way binds the present government. They could in no way be a party to it, and they had definitely committed themselves to the policy of no traps in that area.

I now come to the commission granted by the government. I am candid to say that I think the government made an error in granting that commission. They should have taken

the position that the matter was closed and that in view of past circumstances, it could not be reopened. However, they granted the commission. The next mistake they made I think was in granting a commission of one man. A good deal of local feeling prevails there, and it certainly would have been much better in a case of this kind to have three men, one of whom, if not two, should have been totally removed from that district and with no possible affiliations or pre-formed opinions on the matter. However, I am glad to say that the commissioner was a man of repute, and I have no doubt that he did his best in the limited time he gave to it.

I wish to explain briefly the question of fish traps and what fish traps mean. It is admitted by everybody that they are the most destructive weapon by which you can destroy fish. The cannery men say that they are the most effective; that is true. The fishermen and government officials say that they are the most destructive, and that is equally true. Very few of the members of this house know what a fish trap or a gill net is, and it would take too long to go into detail, but I can give an illustration that must come home to nearly everybody here. Very few members, I suppose, have not at some time gone out duck or deer shooting. There is the same relation between a fish trap and a gill net as there is between a machine gun and an ordinary shot gun or rifle.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The illustration is hardly a good one.

Mr. NEILL: It is absolutely correct.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): My hon. friend would have a lot of trouble shooting ducks with a machine gun. If he used a machine gun shot gun, it might be all right.

Mr. NEILL: There is a pump gun which operates the same way as a machine gun. As long as you keep your finger on the trigger it fires, and its use has been forbidden in British Columbia.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am afraid my hon. friend is not thinking of the ordinary pump gun but of the automatic gun, which is prohibited by law. There was an automatic shot gun produced, but its use was prohibited.

Mr. NEILL: Possibly "automatic" is the word that I should have used instead of pump gun, but the principle is the same. If you go out shooting and use an automatic instead of an ordinary gun you can imagine the slaughter, anyone who was seeking to kill, regardless of consequences so far as game preservation is concerned, would readily say that it was the best weapon he could have because it is the most destructive. We know what would inevitably happen in a very short time if it were used by many people.

It may be said, and it has been said, that they have traps in Alaska. So they have, in large numbers; and what has been the result? The almost total annihilation of the salmon industry. The conditions were such that a commissioner, Mr. O'Malley, a very capable administrator, was appointed with wide powers to do exactly what he liked. He was an autocrat. All he was required to do was to restore the fisheries of Alaska to some semblance of their old state. The first thing that he did was to turn his attention to traps. The cannery men saw it coming, and they got together and presented a nice little plan to him by which they would voluntarily cut down their traps. There was some dispute among them as to just which traps should be cut down, and the commissioner said, "I can settle this quite easily. I will cut them all out," and in that particular year he cut them practically all out in one particular district. I have not the details, but in southeastern Alaska, the worst district in regard to being over-fished, he cut out I think over 100 traps, and he is going to do away with more next year. According to the Pacific Fisherman, an American publication, he is going to extend that principle to four other areas, which are the remaining areas in which trap fishing is permitted. He intends to cut out ninety-five in that area and reduce the size of the traps, and in another area he is going to cut out seventeen. He is going in very heavily for the reduction of traps, in some areas cutting them out almost entirely and in others reducing them extensively, because of the destructive, almost annihilative effects of trap fishing.

In British Columbia we do not need any more destructive weapons to take our fish; we have too many already. The catch is getting bigger every year, not by the increase of fish, but by more intensive fishing, and we certainly do not want to increase our weapons for fishing; on the contrary we find it necessary to restrict them.

The purse seine is very little better in its destructive operations than the trap, but still it is not quite so bad, and we have formed a large number of areas—last year eighteen were added—in which no person may use a purse seine, the waters being reserved entirely for gill net fishing and trolling, which give the fish a much better chance to get away. In addition to that, we have a regularly weekly close season of forty-eight hours. We

have a further system of restriction which is known as the progressive weekly close season. The chief inspector sizes up a certain area and says from his experience, "I think the number of gill nets that that area could properly stand with a proper escapement of fish would be, say, fifty gill nets, or so many seines." He says, "If fifty gill nets are put in that area the weekly close season will be forty-eight hours, but if fifty-five are put in the weekly close season will be sixty hours." He goes on in that progression, so that if one hundred gill nets are put in, the weekly close season would be seventy-two hours or more, and he is prepared to carry on that progression until, a certain number of gill nets being used there would be only one day's fishing a week, which would be entirely unprofitable to those doing it. That is what we are doing now without any fish traps. We certainly do not need to add to our already overstocked weapons of fishing what is admittedly the most destructive method known to the human mind for catching fish.

To give you an idea of what people there think about this matter, let me read a wire that I have received from the chairman of a meeting that was held at Prince Rupert:

Be it resolved that we the citizens of Prince Rupert assembled in public meeting and representing all occupations and walks of life are strongly opposing permission being granted to operate any salmon fish traps anywhere in the northern British Columbia salmon fishing district No. 2 on the ground that salmon traps, if permitted to operate will endanger livelihood of large portion of British Columbia's population. Letter follows.

In addition to that, I have a petition here that I am presenting to the minister privately because, not being correctly worded, it cannot be presented formally to the house. It reads as follows:

To the Minister of Fisheries
of the government of
The Hon. Mackenzie King,
Ottawa, Canada.

We, the undersigned citizens of British Columbia, do hereby petition your department to prohibit all fish traps in British Columbia and also prohibit all seining of salmon between Chatham Point light and Victoria, British Columbia, taking in all waters in the gulf of Georgia and inlets leading into same.

The object being to put a stop to the wholesale destruction of young salmon by these methods of fishing. All of the adult salmon can be taken by gill nets and spoons without the slaughtering of the immature.

The above mentioned area is a natural feeding ground for all species of young salmon for the first period of their lives.

Hon. members will notice that it goes even further than asking for the abolition of traps alone. That is signed by something like eleven hundred people. The man who sends it to me says he is forwarding by a future mail two or three more petitions much more fully signed.

Now we come to the report—such as it is. I want to say that if the government paid more than a dollar and six bits for the report then the people of Canada are stung to the extent it exceeds that sum; it is not worth any more than that. It consists of twenty pages. I have not time to deal with it all; I do not need to. I will deal with the recommendations. I will quote two or three of them and show how those recommendations not only contradict each other, but contradict other portions of the report. A great deal of the report consists of commonplaces, which to people familiar with the fishing industry and the conditions there might almost be termed platitudes. It does show that at least the commissioner has failed to grasp the real genesis of the situation out there. He makes five recommendations. There is really only one; the rest of them are reasons for that recommendation or padding. This is the first one:

That traps for the catching of salmon to a limited number be permitted or allowed in the following described area:—

Then he gives the area by its geographical description, which I need not repeat. It will be noticed he says, "that traps for the catching of salmon to a limited number be permitted —'.' That is, not the traps are to be limited; oh no; but "traps for the catching of salmon to a limited number".

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How under heaven could they limit the number of fish caught in the traps?

Mr. NEILL: There is a close season, but any limitation would have to be applied to all kinds of gear, and that will work a hardship to others engaged in the industry, as I shall point out later on. It is a wide word, "limited."

Now, the commissioner gives reasons. And I want to be fair. I am not trying to make out a case in the absence of the author of this document, so I am going to quote all his reasons. He says:

Canadian traps in the area above referred to will not appreciably curtail fishing by other gear.

Let me deal with that. I say most emphatically it will and it must curtail fishing by other gear. There are two ways by which curtailment will be brought about. First, nearly all these seines are either owned directly by the cannery, which operates a

paid crew, or financed by the cannery, which equips the fishermen on a percentage basis. No cannery is going to put seines into the water or finance fishermen if it can get traps, because traps are cheaper and more convenient for the cannery; just as it is obvious that a man out to make a killing among ducks or deer regardless of consequences would not use an ordinary gun if he were allowed an automatic. I would refer to the evidence in which a man came forward and said he had gone to some cannery and asked for a boat and net. That is the usual practice, the cannery supplying the boat and net on a percentage basis. But the manager refused the man's request, stating they did not care about gill netters now as they had traps. He gave this as an instance of the viewpoint of the companies—and a very natural one indeed. Why should they bother about outfitting men with gill nets and purse seines when they can have a number of traps? That shows it would curtail the employment of these other fishermen, because they would not themselves be able to buy gill nets or purse seines, and no company would be anxious to give them the necessary financial backing. The second reason why it would curtail the other gear is this. We are now restricting the areas. We are searching about to restrict the number of fish now being taken. We are cutting down the fishing sometimes to four days a week. Two years ago it was necessary in the middle of the fishing season to put on a close season of two weeks. The canneries and the fishermen were in the midst of their operations, they had to cease work and leave all their equipment idle. This involved a disastrous expense. It was found necessary two years ago—and I believe it was justified—to put on that close season. So you see, as I have said before, we are restricting them all we can, and now on top of that over-fished water—too much gear in the water—it is proposed to throw in unlimited traps. This is the most destructive method known. It will discourage the use of gill nets and purse seines, and the inevitable result must be more close seasons, because there will be too many fish taken and the fish inspector will come along and say, "We must put on an extra twenty-four or forty-eight hour a week close season." This would involve hardships, especially to the working fishermen, because an idle trap affects only four men, but if the fisherman has to be idle three or four days a week he cannot make a living fishing the other one or two days. It came out in the evidence that on an average the traps employ four men. I calculate that one trap would replace twenty or twenty-five fishermen. But that does not mean there would be only twenty-five fishermen out of a job because, as I said before, he has his wife and family dependent on him, and he has other men incidentally depending on his wages. It is calculated that seven people are dependent on one fisherman; that would be something like 150 people would be out of employment for every trap that was operated; for you must remember, Mr. Speaker, that a trap does not have its hair cut, it does not buy clothes, it does not go to the movies; it simply stays there and does not cost anything when idle. But these other fishermen give other people work, all the inhabitants of the little towns depend for their living on the money earned by those fishermen.

To show that this is not only my opinion but the opinion of the commissioner, may I turn to page 17. This is not something I am twisting out of the document; these are his exact words:

> The fishermen were able to convince me that traps would reduce the number of fish they would catch, and an elimination to some extent of the number of men engaged in the fishing business. This Mr. Hagar concedes—

He is the manager of the company.

> —the number so eliminated would naturally depend on the number of traps put in the water.

Naturally so. And he is going to allow unlimited traps; so the number of men thrown out of employment would be unlimited. After reading that statement, surely it is a joke for him to say that it will not appreciably curtail the number of gear now in the water.

Now we come again to his defence—I desire to be polite. He says:

> Canadian traps. . . will result in catching a share of the salmon now being caught by American traps and which otherwise would be lost to Canada.

I call particular attention to those words, "otherwise lost to Canada." That, Mr. Speaker, is begging the whole question, because I may explain the cannery men's argument is that these would-be traps are placed on the border line between British Columbia and Alaska. In that particular place Alaska, we might say for the purpose of comparison, lies north of British Columbia. The cannery men contend that the fish go from the south to the north, and if we do not put in these

traps, then the fish will go on into American waters and be caught with American traps. This, so to speak, is the "last chance" at them.

Now, the commissioner appears to have swallowed that argument, stock, lock and barrel. His acceptance is based entirely on a bald assertion by a cannery man that that is so. But the fishermen come along and say the opposite. They say that the fish are going south and that therefore Canadian traps would take fish which would otherwise go, not into American traps, but into the Skeena and other rivers in British Columbia to be caught by gill nets and trollers. Those are the two points of difference. The cannery men say that the fish go north while the fishermen contend that they go south, and the commissioner throws his whole weight into the argument of the cannery men.

Mr. SPENCER: But surely the facts are known as to which way they go.

Mr. NEILL: They are to some extent, and I will explain that in a moment. But as between the two, what little is known is emphatically on the side of the argument that the fish go south. Here is a report on Pacific salmon migration by Professor H. Charles Williams, D.Sc., F.R.S.E., a technical and highly educated man, who is not going to throw his weight one way or the other but undertakes to record the facts as he sees them. He tagged 659 fish, and I may explain to those who are not familiar with it just what this means. They take the salmon when newly caught and put a clip into its tail or one of its fins and then turn it loose, and when it is ultimately caught valuable information is obtained as to where it has been in the meantime and where it is going. This is a new method only recently adopted. Now according to this report only 135 of the 659 were recaptured that season, and of that number 80 per cent were caught in British Columbia waters and 20 per cent in American waters. He actually gives us a map showing the course run by every fish from the time it was first tagged until it was finally caught. One was caught 100 miles south inside of twenty-four hours; in other words, it was travelling at an average of 100 miles a day. As I say, 80 per cent were taken the second time in British Columbia waters. This man's report ought to be good because it is a definite, unbiased and scientific statement, and he asserts that 80 per cent were taken in the waters of British Columbia, proving, so far as our knowledge goes, that the fish were going south. Therefore this theory of putting in last chance traps is entirely unsound, and the argument that the fish would "otherwise be lost" is not based on the facts.

The third reason the commissioner gives is this:

> The Department of Fisheries with traps in this area will be in a better position to carry on a more intensive system of tagging, and for the next few years study the run of fish from Wales island and Dogfish, that is, whether and to what extent they are making for Canadian and United States waters.

You will note that he says it will enable them to go in for more intensive tagging. He is proposing to put in traps—perhaps twenty—at a cost of $150,000 in order to catch a few fish to be tagged—a few hundred or a thousand fish which could be caught just as well with seine or troll. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we want roast chicken we do not burn down the hen house and its contents. Is there any need of investing $150,000 to establish a destructive method of fishing in order to catch a few fish to be tagged when experience shows that they can be captured just as well by seine or trollers? It is done off the west coast of Vancouver island; I have seen them do it with the troll and they have been quite successful. They did not need to use any traps. Further, it is stated, we shall be enabled to decide to what extent the fish are making for Canadian or for American waters. In that sentence is to be found proof of what I have said, namely, that the commissioner, with all due respect to him, has failed to grasp the situation as it exists. He is going to allow traps to be used for an unlimited period and in unlimited numbers for the purpose of taking fish by a very destructive method in order that some of them may be tagged to determine whether traps should be allowed or not. Do you grasp that? Traps, with their iniquitous capture of these fish, are to be allowed in order to determine by means of tagging the fish whether the traps should be allowed or not. The last time I heard reasoning of that sort was at a country fair and by a quack doctor selling patent medicines. Would it not be better to continue the existing system of tagging with a view to demonstrating whether the traps should be allowed or not?

Now we come to the other recommendations. No. 2 is, that applications for licenses should be open to all. Well, applications for licenses have been open to all for the last twelve years. That policy was adopted by the Conservatives in 1918 and has been continued ever since; it is known as the open door policy. So that when he recommends that applications be open to all he is merely re-

peating a commonplace. Mind you, it is not a question of putting in two or three traps; the New England Fish Company would be content with three. But every other cannery man in that vicinity would also demand fish traps; and as a matter of fact they say plainly that if one gets them they will all get them.

The third recommendation is that licenses be granted only for a specified time until the results of the tagging operations have become known. Note that: a specified time. But what is a specified time? He does not say. It may be a year or a decade or fifty years. However, he recommends that the licenses be granted only for a specified time until the results of the tagging operations are known. He gives the show away in that sentence, because he admits he does not know whether the traps should be there or not. But he says, in effect: "In the meantime, let them operate with this destructive method until we find out by the tagging operations whether the traps should be allowed or not." Is that not putting the cart before the horse? Why not let the fish traps wait until the present system proves conclusively whether or not the suggestion is correct that the fish are going south?

The fourth recommendation is that no license granted in any sense creates a vested interest in the owner for any period longer than is mentioned in the license. If that is not a platitude I have never heard one. If I rent a house for ten years I know that the house does not belong to me at the end of that period; but there is no need for anybody to tell me that.

The fifth and last recommendation is that the opening of areas specified in recommendation No. 1 is in no sense to be regarded as a precedent to be cited or acted upon in respect to any other areas or territories in this or any other fishing district in British Columbia. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would point this out: You cannot establish a precedent and then by a wave of the hand say it is not a precedent. If I commit murder and formally announce that the deed is not to be regarded as murder, I cannot get away with it; the corpse is there, justice is demanded, and the law will step in and brush aside my sophistry. A precedent once established is there for all to point at, and it will be pointed to. A week or two ago I used an illustration which perhaps I might now repeat. Was it not said by the Conservative party, and properly, that their legislation in 1918, in regard to the good roads grant was not to be considered a precedent? Yet every member who spoke on the subject a few months ago sooner or later cited that very precedent. I will tell you why the commissioner makes this statement. He wants to conciliate public sentiment and allay alarm, because the people are afraid that this principle, once established in the north, will spread to the south. And it is for that very reason that I take so keen an interest in the matter. This particular district is away beyond my own, but our people are terribly afraid of this thing called a precedent; because once it is established that it is right to have traps up there, the next thing will be to have them in the southern waters in the district I represent.

Now it may be said that I am unjustifiably suspicious, that I am an alarmist, that I am pleading a special cause and for that reason making the strongest case I can. Not at all. I have evidence here to show that it will be only a matter of a very short time, if traps are granted in the north, before the precedent will be cited in the south. And here is the evidence to show that before that policy is actually adopted traps in the south are being recommended. I quote from a newspaper report of the evidence:

> Mr. Hagar not only advocated the establishment of fish traps in northern waters, but also throughout the province.

There is the handwriting on the wall. Before ever traps are granted in the north, he says, "You have given them in the north and we must have them in the south as well." Am I not justified in asking, if they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?

Now, sir, it is up to the government. Some hon. gentlemen may ask why the government should not accept the report of the commission. Possibly that should be done in most cases, but not in the case of a wabbly, stillborn report like this, which contradicts itself in its own recommendations and in other ways. This afternoon one of the members from the maritime provinces was criticizing the government, and when a member of the government challenged him to define his policy in regard to the question under discussion the hon. member replied that he would not do so, that the responsibility must rest with the government. That was a politician's answer, of course, because it left him free to find fault with whatever action the government took. I am not afraid to take the responsibility or the blame for anything I advocate; I have the courage of my convictions. Of course it would pay me better in a political way to let the government go ahead, and do wrong, because then I could yell "crook and scandal" during the election campaign, but where would my district be

left? I would rather see the government do the right thing now even if they get credit for it instead of myself.

Here is the question: As I have said, there are 14,000 working fishermen licensed this year; with their families and those indirectly depending upon them, including the farmers—because they do not eat fish exclusively; they must have eggs and butter and milk—and the town people who are also dependent upon the earnings of these fishermen, we might take it that 100,000 people would be affected. We want these people, Mr. Speaker; we have them now and we want to keep them because they are a sturdy, desirable class of citizens. Are we going to wipe them out and leave our shores barren except for a few fish traps placed at strategic points in order to swell the coffers of an alien corporation? I think I can safely say that I represent the views of every fisherman in British Columbia; they are a unit in their opposition to these fish traps. Practically all the people of northern British Columbia in the neighbourhood of Prince Rupert, irrespective of politics or occupation, are of the same opinion in this matter, and judging from the petition I have presented and from others which I could produce, there are a great many people in the southern part of British Columbia also opposed to these fish traps.

Now I have practically finished; the decision is up to the government. I beg and implore them—yes, I even warn them—to put people before pocket, men before money, in this case and let the decision be made on that principle.

I do not want to be melodramatic; I do not want to use sensational language, but I am trying to find words which will impress upon the government the seriousness of this situation. I am sorry if I am unable to emphasize sufficiently the importance of the matter, but I believe, and more than that I hope, that a curse will rest upon this government, certainly politically, if they take away the livelihood of these people in order to produce a few quicker and fatter dividends for an alien corporation, because that is practically what it amounts to, no matter how it may be wrapped up and regardless of how it may be explained or camouflaged. I might almost paraphrase the American orator—William Jennings Bryan, and say: We must not, we shall not and we dare not crucify our British Columbia fishermen on a cross of increased dividends.

Mr. J. C. BRADY (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that this question has come up so prematurely, because it is a complex matter fraught with very great interest to thousands of fishermen on the Pacific coast. The commission which sat in Prince Rupert and Vancouver some weeks ago to consider the question of the advisability of allowing traps to be installed along the international waters in the northern part of district No. 2, was composed of one gentleman, Judge Ellis. I found it very difficult to get information with regard to the origin of this commission, as to who appointed it, who authorized it and so on. As far as I can gather, Mr. Speaker, it was done by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin), who was anxious to settle once and for all the question of the advisability of permitting traps in these waters.

I have before me a letter which was handed to me by the hon. member for New Westminster, (Mr. McQuarrie), who is not here, with the request that I read it in the house. This letter refers to fish traps, and is as follows:

New Westminster, B.C., May 18/29.

Mr. W. G. McQuarrie, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

I have been instructed to call your attention to the recent action of the Department of Marine and Fisheries with respect to salmon traps and to ask you to support the fishermen in their opposition to the same. Following are the facts as the fighermen know them:

Late in 1927, in October or November, a delegation of salmon canners and fishermen held two meetings with Hon. P. J. A. Cardin and asked that a royal commission be appointed to investigate the salmon fishing industry in British Columbia with a view to recommending remedial action of some sort. This was opposed by W. A. Found, and the commission was not granted. After departure from Ottawa of fishermen delegates canners put forward set of requests of their own, unknown to the fishermen. The man who arranged the two meetings of the joint committee with Mr. Cardin was an attorney of Vancouver named J. E. Ellis, evidently retained by the canners, as the fishermen did not retain him.

Recently, without fishermen having the remotest idea that such a thing had been applied for, announcement was made in Vancouver that Judge Ellis was named as a royal commission to investigate and determine whether it would be in the "public interest" to allow the establishment of salmon traps in Canadian waters adjacent to the Alaskan boundary. In the "public interest" and "adjacent" were two terms that stuck in the craws of the Prince Rupert men, where the first meetings were held. Naturally, fishermen opposed traps and canners favoured them. At the Vancouver meeting Mr. Ellis, when questioned who asked for the appointment of himself as a commission, said he did not know, he merely received word by wire from Ottawa to make the investigation and report thereon. However, A. L. Hager, president Canadian Fishing Company, was not so reticent or ignorant, and stated his company probably was responsible for the appointment of a com-

mission to see if his firm would not be allowed to operate traps at Wales island which they purchased some years ago from M. Desbrisay and were stopped from operating them. Therefore it appears to the fishermen that the Department of Marine and Fisheries has, under guise of a general investigation, appointed a commission for the specific purpose of giving the Canadian Fishing Company right to operate certain traps, and so that will not appear too raw to the proletariat, etc., a few more trap sites will be given to other concerns, and then the general scramble will be on again.

Wm. E. Maiden,
Secretary, B.C.F.P.A.

Then he asks that the hon. member for New Westminster support the fishermen in their contention that traps should not be installed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members were privileged to read the report of Judge Ellis together with the evidence given by the various witnesses; if hon. members could understand the attitude of the representatives of the two opposing sides, the one against and the other advocating traps, together with the summing up by Judge Ellis and his recommendation in favour of the installation of fish traps along the international boundary, I have no hesitation in saying after reading the report that no one unprejudiced could possibly claim that all the convincing evidence produced at the meetings of that commission held in Prince Rupert was given by the representatives of the fish traps.

I have taken from the report a few of the reasons which were advanced as to why the traps should be installed. I am very sorry that I had not more time at my disposal to go through this report thoroughly, because we are not dealing with a local issue. I wish to impress that upon the house; the question of fish traps in Canadian waters is not a local issue, it is outside the realm of any local condition; it is international in its scope and demands a broad international mind to deal with it in order that justice may be done to both sides arguing this question. Here are some of the reasons given by the advocates of fish traps in support of their claim that traps should be installed in these northern waters.

The first reason given was that the traps represent the modern trend in fishing. In American waters to-day the trap is the one and only, up-to-date, scientific machine for catching salmon with very little difficulty. It is quite true that it is the modern trend in fishing.

The second argument offered was that a better grade of fish was caught. That is true likewise. The fish get into the traps of their own accord, and they are in perfect condition when caught.

The third argument was that traps would enable us better to compete with the United States. On what ground would we be competing with them? For the annihilation of the fish. Through their up-to-date system of traps the United States have undoubtedly seriously menaced the salmon fisheries of the Pacific coast, and one has only to go down to the Fraser river and into Puget sound to realize the truth of that statement. Or he can go up to the southeastern Alaskan waters and find that Mr. O'Malley, the director of fisheries for the United States, has reduced the traps for the year 1929, in the very area we are speaking of, by the number of sixty. On what grounds? Because of the fact that the escapement of salmon is not sufficient and the catches have depreciated.

The fourth argument offered was that the largest amount of fish caught in foreign countries was caught by means of traps. In the short time at my disposal, I could not find any further arguments.

Let me take the argument which was advanced by the fishermen—and I think these men are entitled to the courtesy of a fair hearing because we are considering something greater than the mere scientific, expeditious method of capturing fish. The fishermen argued that many of them would be put out of employment. They proved that statement, and Judge Ellis admitted that the fishermen had proved their case. In his report Judge Ellis said that the fishermen had convinced him that the traps would reduce the number of fish they would catch and eliminate to some extent the number of men engaged in the fishing business, and the canners admitted that that was true and that the number eliminated would depend upon the number of traps which were put into the water.

I find that there is no right or power vested in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to grant say three or four licenses at Wales island or Pearse channel and to refuse licenses to others in the same area. He cannot grant to some and refuse to others. What will be the result? According to the canners themselves the result will be that by the installation of traps they will be able to obtain a higher grade of fish and sell at a higher price. Can anyone argue that other canners in the same area will stand idly by and allow two or three of their number to reap the reward; that they will be content to take the lower grade of fish which they say are caught by the gill netters, the trollers and seiners? That is absolutely ridiculous. These traps will not only throw two or three hundred fishermen out of employment, but a living will be taken away from their wives and children.

In this large district No. 2, there are 1,421 fishermen engaged in the industry, with three hundred more trawlers. These men buy their supplies from the various merchants in Prince Rupert and they contribute a large sum of money annually to the upbuilding of that town. They have a capital of $1,500,000 invested in boats. All these matters should be considered, but, to my mind, the main one was not mentioned in the report.

I approach the discussion of this question with as open a mind as any man could have in order to investigate a question concerning which I was some time ago not fully informed. I agree that the trap is a scientific instrument for the catching of fish. It is deadly in its power; it is placed in the very path of the fish as they go to spawn and there is no hope of escape. The gill netter, the troller and the seiner must follow the tide hither and thither, and the fish have a sporting chance of escape as they go to the spawning grounds. The Americans are decimating and depleting their own waters, and it ill becomes us to put into operation a system so deadly in its effects and so dire in its results, one which destroys God's food to the people who for all times and for all ages have depended upon the food of the sea. It may seem sentimental for me to speak like this, but I have only to take you back, Mr. Speaker, to the days of Christ himself, when He, the representative of the poor, having no money with which to pay tribute to Caesar, ordered that a fish be caught, and in its mouth was found the coin that paid the tribute to the Roman emperor. This question is not one that we, as a people capable of understanding, can treat with light disdain and at the same time be true to the great heritage which is ours. Therefore I honestly believe that in putting those traps into those waters, we are doing something which will deprive future generations of the food that God Almighty Himself placed in the waters, believing that those fish would be the food of the common people for all time.

I do not see that the report of Judge Ellis, as I have read it, is based upon convincing arguments. Therefore, without delaying the house further, I ask that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries consider carefully the arguments advanced on both sides. He has found all the citizens of Prince Rupert opposed to those traps; the city council passed strong resolutions against them. Nine different associations of salmon trollers and fishers have asked him not to put those traps into effect. I know the minister believes that if he had those traps there, he would be better able to tag the fish and to follow their migration to the waters in order to ascertain whether they go into Alaskan or British Columbia waters. But that is a minor question in the presence of a major one, which is this: I am here this evening endeavouring to represent to parliament the views of the people of British Columbia as a whole, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be well advised, before putting into operation the recommendations of this commission, to ponder its report more carefully and at greater length, so that at least we may be assured that no injustice will be done to the people in No. 2 district and that there will be no depletion of the fish supply which is so valuable to the people of those parts of British Columbia.

Mr. A. D. McRAE (Vancouver North): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the house for a few moments while I refer to this subject. I regret that it comes up at this time, as in committee it might have been disposed of with a few questions to which, no doubt, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin) would have been able to supply the answers. The traps in question are a subject of long standing, going back, I think, as far as three or four years. I find in the file a copy of a letter dated September 10, 1926, from the department to the company concerned, in which the department promised an investigation with a view of ascertaining what damage, if any, was done, and what obligation there might be on the part of the government on account of promises made, which the company interested claimed they had acted upon. In going through the file I find there does not appear to be any other correspondence of record until this royal commission comes up. In this regard I think a fair criticism of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is the fact that so much of their business is carried on apparently by personal negotiation and so little of it is a matter of record that it is very difficult for anyone to follow the proceedings in continuity. It is not necessary for me to point out to the house that in international negotiations in the past this failure to put our understandings on record has led, I believe, to some repudiations which were not pleasant. I am sure that in our negotiations here as well as with our neighbours to the south, the department will keep out of trouble, and the members of the house will be able to follow the proceedings with a great deal more clarity if they are all properly on record and not left to verbal understanding.

It would appear that in the early stages of this trap controversy on our northern boundary, the claim for damages was presumably made and the investigation then promised

apparently had that in view. This matter would have been much better dealt with had that now been the issue and had the government seen fit to order an investigation on the basis of whether we were responsible financially or morally in connection with the establishment of these traps some three of four years ago, instead of bringing up the old question of the establishment of traps.

It is unnecessary for me to go over this question again. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Brady) have dealt with it at length, and there is little I can add except to say that I thoroughly concur with them in their presentation of the situation.

A great deal of trouble would have been saved had the matter been dealt with on the basis of compensation. I cannot think there is any politics mixed up in this at all, because it certainly would be very bad politics. I notice, however, in going through the file, that a letter was sent to Mr. Olaf Hanson on March 27 last advising him that a commission was appointed, but apparently he never replied; at least there is nothing on the file to show that he did.

Mr. BENNETT: Who is he?

Mr. McRAE: He of course is the candidate for the Liberal party at the next election.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In Prince Rupert.

Mr. McRAE: The opponent of the hon. member for Skeena in the next election. I can only say that if Olaf did not reply, it goes to show not only his great inexperience but that he has a great deal to learn in the political game, because even to a blind man it should be apparent that this would be ruinous to the chances of any candidate. I hope in the committee, in order to square Olaf, to show that he has ordinary sagacity in matters of this kind, the hon. minister will be able to produce a letter from him telling the minister not to go ahead with this commission under any circumstances because to do so will mean the return of Jim Brady.

This problem as it manifests itself in the north is right on the border line between British Columbia and Alaska, and the situation is almost identical with that of Fraser river. I suggest to the minister that when he is redrafting the Fraser river sockeye treaty for next session, he include the Naas problem, because it is an international water. The satisfactory adjustment depends entirely upon our coming to an agreement with the United States, and I do not hesitate to say, as I said in committee the other day, that unless something is done in connection with the Naas River, it will soon be as barren of fish as the Sahara. There will be no fish in it at all and nothing to trouble about. That would be a most regrettable condition, and I think that the proper way to deal with this matter is in an international way.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I was not going to refer to the question of traps except to endorse the position taken by the two hon. members who have spoken. I do, however, want to take exception to one or two of the findings of the royal commission in the hope that in view of our united opposition the recommendation to establish traps will not be adopted. I see that the minister himself has a pretty fair idea of traps because, if my memory serves me aright, in speaking a few days ago of the haddock traps he said that they required few men. That is true of traps whether they be on the Pacific or the Atlantic coast. The report of Commissioner Ellis would indicate that there are now some 11,000 fishermen engaged in fishing on our coast. Last year, 1927-28, the total number of licenses granted to all kinds of people, red, white and yellow, was 14,819, and that, I would have hon. members understand, is for a very much depleted industry. If our fishing industry on the Pacific coast was built up to what the people of this country have a right to expect, there would be about 50,000 licenses issued a year, and that industry alone, built up on that basis of individual licenses as now issued, keeping away from traps, would support a population as great as that of Prince Edward Island. That is what is in the future, and I agree with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) that it would be nothing short of a crime if we started in now to undo these prospects.

I had in mind, until it has now got so late in the session that I presume new ideas will not be tolerated, to suggest when the estimates for the Indian department came up for consideration the opening up of dozens of Indian reserves in the mouths of our rivers in small lots of ten or fifteen acres—it is the best land in the country—for settlement by white fishermen, and then they would have their homes on the ground. On many of these Indian reserves there is nobody living to-day, and I think the time has come when we should build up communities of white fishermen where they can rear their families, and thus establish in British Columbia a race of fishermen such as they have to-day in the maritimes. We have not got that to-day, but we are on the way to building it up, and I hope that in a few years when our industry gets on the

road to prosperity again we shall be able to take all these surplus fishermen in the maritimes out to the Pacific coast.

I have referred to only one or two things, Mr. Speaker, in the findings of Commissioner Judge Ellis. I think generally we would all disagree with his findings. So far as economic fishing is concerned, traps are undoubtedly the modern method, but so far as the wealth of the nation is concerned I submit that the practice of fishing which will support a great healthy white population in our country is the method that we want to employ, and we would certainly be taking a very retrograde step if we should now establish the precedent of putting in even one trap. I entirely disagree with the statement of the commissioner who says that this would not be a precedent, because once you have established one trap, you have let the bars down, and then look out for the results.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I have only a few words to say in reply. From the observations made by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this matter, I can readily understand that there is a very strong opposition to the issuing of licenses for traps in the northern waters of British Columbia.

As has been stated, this is not a new question. It has been in the mind of the public for many, many years; in fact, licenses have been issued as far back as 1916. In that year two licenses were issued; in 1917, 5; in 1918, 6; in 1919, 7, and in 1920, 6. The department has received complaint against the issuing of these licenses, and the officers have been looking into that question with some care. I think, however, it would be unfair to conclude that the present government is the only one responsible for these traps. Indeed, in that respect, the record of the Liberal government can be compared favourably with that of previous administrations. Licenses were issued in 1925 on the understanding that the company should not be too sure that they would be renewed in 1926; in fact the licenses were not renewed in 1926 until after this government went out of power. After we went out of power, on July 23, 1926, licenses were issued to that company, the Canadian Fishing Company, by the then government, but on account of representations made on the 4th of August, 1926, a report was asked for, and the result was that on August 16, 1926, less than a month after the licenses had been issued on July 23, they were cancelled by the present government.

As hon. gentlemen have pointed out, it is a complex and difficult question. The department felt that we should not renew the licenses and the matter has been under consideration in the meantime. After receiving representations from the fishermen and from the company concerned, it was considered advisable to have an investigation made by an independent organization, and it was thought that a judge would be sufficiently independent to take the evidence which might be given on both sides of the issue and carry on that investigation. I confess that, this report having come to the department at the end of the session when we were very busy, it has not been given by the officers of the department or by myself, owing to lack of time, a detailed study. I can only say at present that no one should conclude that because the commissioner recommends the licensing of a certain number of these traps it is the intention of the department and myself to follow his recommendation. I once more submit that a department or a minister is not bound to follow the recommendation of any commissioner who may have been appointed in order to provide the minister with better information and fuller detail on the question under consideration. In that case as in any others, the reasons given by the commissioner and his conclusions will be weighed in the light of experience, and I can assure the house that the interests of the fishermen will not be prejudiced, and nobody need be alarmed lest the matter be decided without proper consideration being given to the recommendations.

My hon. friend from North Vancouver (Mr. McRae) referred to the fact that the documents which I showed him were not very complete. As a matter of fact they are all we have. I know the matter has been discussed verbally with people from British Columbia by the officers of the department and myself. I should not like the impression to prevail that our files are not properly kept. They are kept in good order, and documents which should be on those files are to be found there. In fact the letter written by the Hon. Mr. Patenaude—he was Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a short while—in which he promised an investigation was not on the departmental files. It is on there today because that promise was used as an argument by the company asking that licenses be issued in their favour. When we asked

them whether the promise was in writing they sent us a copy of the letter. This explains its presence on the file.

My hon. friend referred to the letter which was addressed to Mr. Hanson advising him that a commission had been appointed. He said that if Mr. Hanson was a good politician, qualified to be a candidate for any party, he should have expressed his views against that procedure. I have no letter from Mr. Hanson, but my hon. friend will not object to my declaring that I know Mr. Hanson's views through a verbal message which was brought to me, and I may say that they are as strong as those of my hon. friends from North Vancouver, Skeena and Comox-Alberni.

Mr. McRAE: May I say that evidently Mr. Hanson is a lot more careful than we gave him credit for, and is too good a politician.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not write.

Mr. McRAE: No, he did not write.

Mr. CARDIN: I do not think there is anything further I can add. I repeat that hon. gentleman need not be alarmed. I can assure my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni that his observations will not fail to be considered, as will also the very strong support which is given to him by the hon. members for Skeena and North Vancouver.

Mr. McRAE: As the minister has given a clean bill of health to his present candidate in Skeena, would he kindly give the gist of the verbal understanding with Mr. Hanson.

Mr. CARDIN: I was requested by this gentleman, as I have been by many others, not to issue those licenses, whatever might be the conclusions of the investigator.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

The CHAIRMAN: Vote 308, page 68 of the estimates, national revenue, $14,014,663.

Mr. BENNETT: What is this item for?

The CHAIRMAN: It was under discussion the other day.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister say whether or not he has received a report from Mr. Knox with respect to conditions in Halifax?

Mr. EULER: I received a report from Mr. Hunter. I received some correspondence, possibly it might be called a report, from Mr. Knox. In fact this morning I had a call from him with regard to conditions in Halifax.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the difficulty there?

Mr. EULER: I might give a very brief review of the situation, because I understand my hon. friend desires to bring it up.

Some time ago word came to the preventive branch of the department that there were certain abuses existing in the city of Halifax with regard to the local preventive service. In the ordinary routine of the office the acting chief despatched Mr. Hunter and Mr. Knox, the investigating officer, to Halifax to ascertain the situation.

Mr. BENNETT: Who is Mr. Hunter?

Mr. EULER: The chief clerk in the preventive office here. They made certain investigations. During the course of their stay in Halifax a certain man named Garrison—whose name I heard mentioned this afternoon by the hon. leader of the opposition—entered the office.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely the minister must have heard his name before?

Mr. EULER: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BENNETT: It was in the paper a week ago.

Mr. EULER: I am referring to the assault.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. EULER: I am afraid my hon. friend was not following me.

Mr. BENNETT: I was.

Mr. EULER: I am describing what took place after these officers went to Halifax.

Mr. BENNETT: But I thought the minister said he heard the name Garrison for the first time this afternoon.

Mr. EULER: No. If my hon. friend finds any discrepancies in what I am about to say I hope he will correct me.

During the course of their stay in Halifax a man named Garrison came to the office to interview Mr. Knox. Mr. Hunter was there at the time; an interview did take place between Mr. Knox and Mr. Garrison. What really happened there I am not sure, there are conflicting reports, but as a matter of fact there was an assault. Whether Mr. Knox or Garrison was the aggressor I do not know, but in any case Mr. Knox was charged in the courts with assault, and was called upon to put up a bond of $5,000 for his appearance at the trial.

Mr. BENNETT: Is it a civil or a criminal proceeding?

Mr. EULER: I am not enough of a lawyer to say, but he was called upon to put up a bond of $5,000. He requested that the department put up the bond. Mr. Knox is regarded as a good investigating officer, and I desired that the investigation should proceed. So, rightly or wrongly, I decided that the department might well supply the bond.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. EULER: That was done. Before the bond was issued, on his own responsibility Mr. Knox engaged counsel to assist him. I felt, however, that if an officer of the department took the law into his own hands and administered very severe physical punishment to someone else, he was going beyond what he had any right to do as an officer of the crown. For that reason I issued instructions that the department was not to be held responsible for the legal fees of the lawyer whom he had retained. From the reports the situation appeared to me to be rather bad, and in order that the investigation should be conducted on the highest ground and that everyone should have confidence in those making that investigation, I instructed the assistant commissioner of customs, Mr. Blair, and Mr. Lennie, who I think is known to most members of the house, to proceed to Halifax to institute the inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT: When?

Mr. EULER: They are there now. We did not displace either Mr. Knox or Mr. Hunter. Mr. Knox was asked to remain there, although he had requested to be sent to Toronto, intimating that undue political influence had been used in Halifax. I do not know what sort of pressure had been brought to bear upon him, but there may have been some. Certainly, however, it was not recognized in the department. Both Mr. Knox and Mr. Hunter were asked to remain. Mr. Knox—I presume this was the reason—when he found that the two officials whom I have mentioned had been sent to Halifax to make a thorough investigation into conditions that looked rather bad to me, sent in his resignation, which was promptly accepted.

Mr. Knox came to me this morning, stating that he wished to see me with regard to conditions in the port of Halifax. He found fault, I think, with the fact that the department declined to pay his lawyer's expenses for his own personal defence. He said he had not been backed up by the department or by someone in the department. I requested him to give instances to show where he had not been supported, because there had been no interference on the part of the department with either him or Mr. Hunter. He declined to give me any instances but stated that he would take them to my hon. friend, who would bring them up in the house. That is the story so far as I know.

Mr. BENNETT: The question at the moment is: Was there political influence? That is No. 1. The second question is: Who asked for the investigation in Halifax? I do not propose to discuss the question whether the port of Halifax is or is not in proper shape, because that would be prejudging the matter; but I asked the minister whether Knox had made a report in writing—and I should have added, with respect to conditions in the port of Halifax. As a matter of fact, I did not have time to speak to Knox, beyond having a few words with him, because I had to be in the chamber.

Mr. EULER: I will answer the first question first. My hon. friend inquires whether there was political influence. I have answered that already: So far as the department was concerned, there was absolutely none.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that, but from other sources?

Mr. EULER: Nor from other sources. I can very well guess the inference which is supposed to be drawn by the house, because I heard the debate this afternoon. So far as the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) who represents one of the constituencies in Nova Scotia is concerned, I may say that no influence of any sort was exerted nor was any attempt made to exert influence with myself with respect to Knox.

Mr. BENNETT: Was an effort made to withdraw Knox from the investigation?

Mr. EULER: Never to me, and I do not know that any such effort was made so far as anyone else is concerned.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister say that none was made to any of his colleagues?

Mr. EULER: I have no knowledge of what may have happened with my colleagues.

Mr. BENNETT: Knox gave evidence before the customs commission, and although I hardly know the man except for the fact that when I saw him this morning I recognized him as a witness in that inquiry, it appeared there that he was regarded as a valuable investigator and was certainly well thought of in that sense by everyone. From Ontario, where his duties usually lie, he was taken to Halifax, and I know only what the papers and the minister say, because I had not time

to go into the matter. That is why I asked the question. The minister indicates that trouble arose because a man called Garrison, who is known to be a very active and offensive political supporter of the government in Halifax, went to the custom house. My understanding is that Mr. Hunter, who was there, retired and the two men had an interview. This man Garrison was accompanied by a man named Martin. Is that correct?

Mr. EULER: I understand so.

Mr. BENNETT: And he was a government official in the Department of Labour. Is that so? He was a fair wage officer in the Department of Labour in Halifax?

Mr. EULER: When Garrison went to interview Knox he took with him Martin, who is in the employ of the Labour department.

Mr. BENNETT: What for?

Mr. EULER: As a witness.

Mr. BENNETT: What for?

Mr. EULER: I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT: A political heeler says he took a government employee with him when he went to have this interview, and the minister says the man went as a witness—what for? As a plant?

Mr. EULER: No.

Mr. BENNETT: What was he a witness for? The minister says this man states that the other was taken as a witness. What was he a witness for?

Mr. EULER: That is the statement made by Knox.

Mr. BENNETT: No, the minister did not say that; he said it was the statement made by Martin. He was taken as a witness.

Mr. EULER: There is a statement here by Martin but I am sorry it is difficult to find it. My recollection, however, is that Martin wrote a report in which he stated that while he was in the long room of the custom house in Halifax, Garrison came and asked him to accompany him, which he did. He said: "I don't know what it was all about"—I am speaking from memory—"and in fact after the fracas I was sorry I went."

Mr. BENNETT: Someone used the words, "as a witness." The minister has used those words; I did not use them. The man went there as a witness; as a witness to what?

Mr. EULER: I gather that he went as a witness on the request of Mr. Garrison; it could not be for anyone else, because Garrison asked him to go.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly.

Mr. EULER: As a witness to what took place, I suppose. Mr. Garrison went to make certain accusations against Knox, which he did make, which Knox denied, and as a result of which denial the words followed leading to the assault. I presume that when a man goes on such business with the purpose possibly of making an assault or of having a difference with someone else it is not at all difficult to understand that he might desire to have a witness there.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Did they have boxing gloves?

Mr. BENNETT: In view of what the minister says, and of which I was not aware, and the matter being now investigated, it would be premature for me to discuss it further at the moment. But I venture this statement, that the minister should support his officer. When an officer in the discharge of his duty is assaulted on public property, whether or not he provoked the assault is a matter to be determined; but no person for a moment thinks that such a man should be abandoned. He has been sued, I judge civilly, because he would not give bond for $5,000 for a trial in October unless the proceedings were civil. Of course, it may be a criminal case; I do not know, and perhaps the minister can tell us. It may be a case of damages or it may be criminal. What counsel did he employ? That probably would largely explain the matter.

Mr. EULER: A man named Jones, I understand. My hon. friend is a lawyer and knows more about these technicalities than I do, but the words are, "It is ordered that the defendant be arrested and imprisoned until final judgment." I suppose that indicates a criminal action?

Mr. BENNETT: No, that is a civil action.

Mr. EULER: In any case, a bond of $5,000 was required.

Mr. BENNETT: I think in the old provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick they still have what we call a capias procedure and probably this man was arrested under capias, because if he was directed to remain in gaol until judgment was given it would indicate a civil and not a criminal action.

Mr. EULER: Just a word with regard to the statement made by the leader of the opposition that the department should stand behind the man. I think we did that. I do not desire to go into this question at any length, but as a matter of fact there have been numerous complaints for many years in regard to Mr. Knox. In fact, until to-day I did not know that the assistant deputy minister of excise had reported that Mr. Knox should not be employed by the department at all. I had many complaints, but I also knew it was the impression of the committee and perhaps of the house in 1926 that Mr. Knox was a good officer.

Mr. BENNETT: A good investigator.

Mr. EULER: Exactly; all the reports say he is a good investigator, but there are reports which perhaps do not speak quite so highly of him in other respects. I kept him in the department, one reason being that we might be criticized if we let him go in view of the information he furnished in 1926, which was detrimental to the then government, as most people will admit. I was unwilling to have the accusation made that I was discriminating against the man for that reason.

Mr. BENNETT: That does the minister credit.

Mr. EULER: I also agreed after an explanation was given as to the assault which had taken place, that the department should furnish the bond of $5,000. However, I did not think that any officer should take the law in his own hands. Mr. Knox is a pretty big man and need not be very much afraid of a physical encounter with anyone, and I understand that his opponent was not very big. Mr. Knox may have had provocation; I understand he was the subject of an epithet which is regarded by most people as being fighting language. But if an officer of the crown takes the law into his own hands it is not the duty of the department to stand behind him as far as his legal expenses are concerned; it then becomes his personal affair. At any rate, rightly or wrongly that was my position and I am within the judgment of the committee as to the wisdom of my action.

Mr. BENNETT: Who was the lawyer employed by Knox?

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend probably knows the name of the firm; one of the members of the firm is Mr. McInnes.

Mr. BENNETT: I think he was a president of the Conservative association for a good many years.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. EULER: Perhaps that does not make it any worse. The firm name is McInnes, Lovett and MacDonald. I might also say that the acting chief of the preventive service inferred that the services of a solicitor should be paid for by the department, at the time I gave instructions that the bond should be given. I instructed him to the contrary, but whatever expense had been incurred up to that time so far as solicitors were concerned is being borne by the department.

Mr. BENNETT: Did Knox make a report in writing?

Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: To the department?

Mr. EULER: He made his report to the acting chief of the preventive service. It is rather a lengthy report; does my hon. friend wish to hear it or shall I show it to him?

Mr. BENNETT: Does it touch the port of Halifax, the investigation?

Mr. EULER: No, it is with regard to the fracas with Garrison. Since the investigation is going on perhaps it would be as well not to read it.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the report should be read; I agree with the minister, however, that we should not discuss the question of the investigation of the port.

Mr. EULER: I am not sure that there are not some incidental references to the port. The report is rather lengthy, but if the committee desires to hear it I will read it. It is written from Halifax and addressed to Mr. Jenkins, acting chief of the customs preventive service, under date of May 20.

About 1.10 p.m. to-day I was called to the phone by Mr. G. E. M. Hunter, acting divisional chief, Halifax, and answered same. The party on the other end of the telephone asked if I was Mr. Knox to which I replied yes. He then said "Are you going to be in the office for a while?" I said "Yes for probably half an hour". He gave no name or any intimation of what he desired to see me about. Ten minutes later two gentlemen arrived in the preventive service office and as I was sitting in the inner office, which is occupied by Mr. Hunter and myself during this investigation, I heard one of the gentlemen ask for Mr. Hunter and myself whom I later learned was a Mr. Garrison. These two gentlemen were shown into the office and the taller of the two, whom I later learned was Mr. Garrison, asked who was the boss to which Mr. Hunter replied he was. Mr. Garrison then replied "Well I don't want to see you" and Mr. Hunter replied "Is it on official business in connection with the preventive service of the customs?" He said "yes". Then Mr. Hunter said "Well I want to know all about it." Mr. Garrison said "You think so".

I might tell my hon. friend and the committee there are words written in here in ink; I do not know whether or not Mr. Knox wrote them and I am not sure whether I should read them. They are not initialed and probably they are the words my hon. friend would like to hear.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know; the minister has the report. I would like to have it read, and the minister says it is written partly in handwriting.

Mr. EULER: Yes, and the acting chief of the preventive service thinks it is not in the handwriting of Mr. Knox.

Mr. BENNETT: Read it under those circumstances.

Mr. EULER: Very well:

Colonel Ralston will talk to you.

Those are the words written in ink. Then the report proceeds:

"You are not the boss around here" and Mr. Hunter replied he was and would insist on being present at any interview where matters of the preventive service of the customs were being discussed. Mr. Garrison then sat down and addressed Mr. Hunter that he did not come to see him but to see myself and that he wanted a private interview with me. Mr. Hunter then retired after Mr. Garrison had informed the both of us that the gentleman who accompanied him be brought as a witness and was the representative of the Minister of Labour at Ottawa, namely Mr. Peter Heenan. At this stage Mr. Hunter retired to the other office closing the door, leaving me in the room alone with these two gentlemen.

Immediately after the door was closed Mr. Garrison addressed me as follows, "You got a telegram from Colonel Ralston this morning, did you not" to which I replied "Not to my knowledge." He insisted I had and I again informed him that I had received neither telegram nor letter from any individual whatever this morning. He then stated that I was lying and that I was through with my investigation here and I knew it. I informed him it was the first intimation I had from anyone that I was through my investigation here and would continue my investigation until I received such word that my investigation was through. He then replied, "Is that so?" "Colonel Ralston" he says, "will see that you are taken away from here." I replied, "if that happened I could not help it but that until I got some official notice from our own department I intended to continue on. He then replied, "You were to see my brother last week," to which I replied, "Not that I know of."

That is a peculiar reply; I think if he had been there he would have been aware of it.

He then challenged me that I was lying and that he knew I was up to see his brother before he died. I replied that I never had been to see his brother subsequent to meeting him on board the boat "Guardian" in the dockyard over a week ago and that was the only time that I ever seen his brother or had the privilege of meeting him and then only for a few minutes when we were trying out the engine on the boat "Guardian" and that I had no discussion with his brother whatever except informing him, when he complained about the oil in the motor heating up, that it would not matter much a little heating in a new boat. He replied I was a liar and that he had witnesses to prove that I was to see his brother in a new blue Ford automobile the day before his death. I replied no he must have been mistaken and asked him whom the parties were that said I was to see his brother at his home. He replied that a neighbour of his had seen me and the blue Ford car. This I informed him was impossible because I never knew where his brother lives nor was I at any time in a blue Ford car to see him. Again he insisted that I was lying so I informed him and the other gentleman that was with him that if they had any evidence or any witnesses to prove that I was to see his brother at his home at any time that I would like to know. Mr. Garrison insisted he had and would see that Colonel Ralston was informed.

I then addressed myself to Mr. Garrison and Mr. Martin, whom he introduced as the Hon. Mr. Heenan's representative and told them both in these words, "Gentlemen, if you have come to see me or interview me on any business whatsoever I want to make it clear that I know nothing of what Mr. Garrison has been saying and as he had insisted in that I was Lying I would have to request you gentlemen to leave the office." That I was not going to be accused of lies and untruths to my face. Garrison replied he would not leave the office and I replied that I would see he did and immediately arose from the chair and opened the door to show both gentlemen out. On opening the door I requested both gentlemen to leave the office immediately or if not I would have them put out. Garrison replied I was not big enough so I opened the outside door which leads into the corridor and requested him especially to get out or I would show him whether or not I was big enough to put him out. He challenged me in a threatening attitude so I took him by the shoulder and pushed him outside the door. When I did so he said, "You would, eh" and crouched down in a boxing manner as if to make an underhand or foul blow at me when I prepared myself for an onslaught which I anticipated was coming. Just in a moment he made a flash at me as if to strike me but I sidestepped him and he missed and I then caught him with my right hand under the eye. He was at this time inside the door of the office. The blow struck by myself staggered him and left him in a dazed condition after which I took hold of him and shoved him out in the corridor. His condition was weak at this moment and he fell down so I simply rolled him out in the corridor and could see that he was bleeding a little but not serious.

I then closed the door on him and left him in the corridor and later spoke to Mr. Martin who allowed himself to be introduced without speaking a word as the Hon. Mr. Heenan's representative. I must say in fairness to Mr. Martin that he in no way took part in any conversation which I had privately or otherwise except after I had put Garrison out in the corridor. The only time Mr. Martin opened his mouth was when I struck Garrison when he said, "I am a witness to that." After having shut Mr. Garrison out in the corridor Mr. Martin seemed very much surprised and informed Mr. Hunter and myself that he was at a loss

to understand what it was all about and informed us that he had met Mr. Garrison by accident in the long room of the customs house just previous to coming up to see myself and Mr. Hunter and that he was approached by Mr. Garrison to accompany him and to be a witness to what he was going to say to me and my replies to him. He then said that if he had known what it was going to be he certainly would not have been there and was very sorry that he had been misled by Garrison on this occasion.

I cannot understand by and through whom Mr. Garrison would have come to interview me to-day because I have had nothing to do whatever directly or indirectly with his deceased brother. I simply met him casually at a trial run of the boat Guardian with Mr. Hunter over a week ago at the dockyard and had no cenversation with him whatever any more than what I have previously referred to, that is that he did not need to worry about the oil tank on the engine of the boat Guardian warming up that as I understood all new boats or new engines will do this and that it was nothing for him to be afraid of. This I am prepared to swear to before any tribunal and hence my misunderstanding not having any knowledge why Mr. Garrison this afternoon came to see me whatsoever. Never have I at any time had occasion to go and see his brother prior or subsequent to the trial run of the boat Guardian and I defy anyone to state that I have been to see him.

The whole question of our unfortunate interview this afternoon was brought about by Mr Garrison himself. His attitude and his threatening language brought the trouble on himself and when he tried to maim me I was forced to defend myself and will do so on any other such occasion should it arise. I have nothing to be sorry for in striking Mr. Garrison, if I had not done so I might have been wearing the beautiful black eye that he has to-day and, Sir, he will long remember his interview with me and the force which terminated that interview.

It is not a question at all of anyone losing his head. It was simply a case of self defence of which I will always seize the opportunity to defend especially when it is against my own person. From the results of this interview between Mr. Hunter, myself, Mr. Garrison and Mr. Martin I can only conclude that Mr. Garrison came here with the idea that I had been to see his brother and interrogated him thereby causing his sudden death. This, Sir, I will say with all emphasis is an infernal lie to which I have not been a party nor, so far as I am aware, Mr. Hunter either.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. A. Knox.

Mr. BENNETT: I suppose he has not made any report as to the investigation at the port?

Mr. EULER: No; as a matter of fact I do not think there has been any investigation with regard to the port; I think the investigation was held with regard to the preventive officers. There were some charges made against the officers at that port in correspondence which came to the department.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. BENNETT: The investigation is now being carried on?

Mr. EULER: That investigation is being carried on. The papers of which I spoke are in the hands of Mr. Blair and Mr. Lennie, who have gone down to make the investigation. Inspector Graham is there also.

Mr. RALSTON: I just want to repeat what I said this afternoon, that the use of my name in connection with the incident which has just been cited was entirely unauthorized and without any foundation. I never had any communication with Mr. Garrison, either directly or indirectly, or with anyone for him, nor did I have any communication, either directly or indirectly, with Mr. Knox. I can only assume that Mr. Garrison referred to me, or thought that he would make his complaint to me on account of my being the minister from the province, but there was no authority at all for bringing my name into this matter.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister says no such reference was made, in fact.

Mr. RALSTON: Knox says that Garrison referred to me in that conversation. I cannot say whether or not he did this, but I am saying that there was no foundation for his doing so.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister says no reference was made to the hon. Minister of National Defence by Garrison or anyone on his behalf in connection with the investigation carried on by Knox.

Mr. RALSTON: None whatever.

Mr. EULER: I think I might just repeat that at no time were any representations made to the department that Mr. Knox should be withdrawn from the investigation.

Mr. RALSTON: I understand that Knox said that Garrison referred to me; I do not know whether he did or did not, as I was not there.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. minister says that in fact he was not referred to by Garrison or by anyone on his behalf, or by Knox, and that makes it quite clear.

Mr. EULER: I have no desire to prolong the discussion, but I should like to read a report signed by Mr. Taylor, assistant deputy minister, which goes back as far as May 26, 1925.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the minister think he should read that report in view of the fact that there is a trial pending?

Mr. EULER: This refers to Mr. Knox and has absolutely nothing to do with the assault.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a civil action for damages pending.

Mr. EULER: I read Mr. Knox's statement.

Mr. BENNETT: A statement made by the deputy minister in 1925 might be prejudicial in connection with the trial for damages.

Mr. EULER: Does my hon. friend think it would be fair to read a portion of a report which has just reached me through Mr. Hunter?

Mr. BENNETT: The minister must use his own discretion with respect to that; the minister has had a servant of the crown withdrawn.

Mr. EULER: I have no desire to do anything which will cause an injustice. Mr. Knox tendered his resignation; he was not asked to resign. As a matter of fact, we were willing to continue employing him as an investigator in Halifax after the assault took place, although I had serious doubts as to the advisability of doing so because it could not be expected that he would be received with any spirit of good will or even with the respect which should be given to any officer making investigations of that kind.

Mr. BENNETT: Did Mr. Martin represent the Minister of Labour?

Mr. EULER: I do not know, but perhaps we might accept his statement. He said that it was a casual meeting in the long room of the customs house and he went along just to keep Garrison company.

Item agreed to.

To provide for payments to Messrs. Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle and Nash for services in connection with work arising from reports of the special committee and royal commission and in connection with special sales tax investigations, $10,000.

To provide for payment in full to the widow of the late C. E. McDonald, sub-collector of customs and excise at Port Borden, who was accidentally killed while returning home from duty, a compassionate allowance of, $3,000.

To provide for payment in full to the widow of the late T. Ingalls a customs excise officer on the preventive service, who was accidentally killed while on duty, a compassionate allowance of, $3,000.

To provide for payment in full to Henry Mayo, an ex-member of the crew of the customs patrol boat No. 3.—Mr. Mayo received an injury to his eye in the performance of his duty which has left him practically blind, $2,500.

To provide for payment in full to Edwin P. Clark, an ex-member of the crew of the customs cruiser Bayfield.—Mr. Clark received an injury to his back which resulted in subsequent illness, $2,673.

Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and in connection with the Board of Customs—Further amount required, $55,100.—Total, $76,273.

Mr. MANION: I see that a part of this item reads:

Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and in connection with the Board of Customs.

We were discussing here the other day, very briefly, the closing of a number of customs ports in various parts of the country. Would the minister inform the committee as to the saving made by the closing of these ports, and how many of the men engaged at the closed ports were removed from the service so that positions were eliminated?

Mr. EULER: Practically all these ports were very small; in fact the salaries ranged from $200 up. Many of the officers were not receiving more than $200 a year; they were only part time employees. In a really strict sense, many of these so-called ports were not full-fledged ports at all and there was not a great deal of monetary saving in abolishing them. The chief reason for their abolition was in connection with appraisals. It is impossible, in these small places, where men are not qualified, where they have no knowledge of commodities, to get proper appraisals, and that is the real reason for closing a number of the ports. The saving was comparatively small. In most instances where the officers were full-time officers, we transferred them, wherever possible, to some other point where their services could be utilized.

Mr. MANION: Including those receiving $200 or $300 a year, how many of these men had their positions eliminated by the closing of the ports?

Mr. EULER: Perhaps 125.

Mr. MANION: What I am going to speak of now has nothing to do with the Canada Starch Company about which I was asking the minister the other day. A gentleman stated to me on the street—and I merely pass this on and ask the minister to give his version of it—that at most of the ports that have been closed, the entries are being made to-day just as they were before; in other words, that the ports have not really been closed. What is the minister's statement as to that?

Mr. EULER: That is almost altogether untrue. There are only two or three cases of that kind. For instance, Queenston was a part of Niagara. It is handled in that way still; the officer belongs to the Niagara port instead of Queenston being a seperate port.

Mr. MANION: I asked this question to clear the matter up and not with any other desire. I do not know anything about it myself, but the statement was made to me.

Mr. CHAPLIN: As regards the port of Queenston, there would not be any saving of expense in what the minister has done in that regard, would there?

Mr. EULER: The appraisal is done at Niagara Falls.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But Queenston is five or six miles from Niagara Falls and seven or eight miles from Niagara-on-the-Lake. It is a point where vessels land.

Mr. EULER: The officer is there and attends to clearances of vessels.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I ask the minister where there is any saving in connection with officers.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps there is not a great deal of saving, and as a matter of fact it might be that the ports should have been closed entirely. Perhaps that will follow. As I have already intimated, there is not a great deal of financial saving in the closing of these ports. The chief factor in the situation is the matter of appraisals.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems to me to be a matter of convenience as much as anything else. I do not know whether I am on the right item or not, but I should like to ask the minister a question and I have not yet had an opportunity of doing so. I notice from last year's public accounts that the minister has been buying quite a few automobiles in his own city, presumably for the customs service around the country. Some of these machines went as far as British Columbia, some to Quebec, and some to Ontario. How does it come about that his own city is favoured with these purchases?

Mr. EULER: I rather expected that somebody would ask that question. The orders were given entirely on tender, and if my hon. friend desires, I can give him the prices with regard to one particular make of car which, perhaps, I need not specify. One tender price was $1,825; another was $2,225; another was $1,955, and the one that was accepted, which came from a Kitchener firm, was $1,815, by far the lowest tender, for the same make of car.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The same car?

Mr. EULER: Yes, delivered at destination.

Mr. COOTE: What were those cars used for?

Mr. EULER: For patrolling the border, preventive service.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Do I understand the minister to say that he got in Kitchener a price for a car that was equal to the price he could get at Quebec, for instance? One of those cars went to Quebec. Did the minister at the same time ask for tenders in the city of Quebec? It seems strange that a car should be shipped to Quebec from Kitchener. Were tenders for that particular car asked for in the city of Quebec; and similarly, were tenders asked for in British Columbia?

Mr. EULER: Tenders were asked for in the places in which the cars were needed. Surely it should not be to the discredit of even the minister or the town from which he comes if the dealers there were able to underbid other dealers. They are very keen business men in that town, and they know they have to deliver the right kind of goods at the right prices in order to get the business. That does not apply only to motor cars.

Mr. POWER: I should like to make this suggestion to the minister: recently the government decided on a policy somewhat different from that which it followed two years ago with regard to clearances of liquor, a question which has been discussed in the house at some length. It appears that the government has continued in its employ as a solicitor, Mr. Rowell, who is, I am sure, not sympathetic with the government in its praiseworthy and patriotic stand in connection with liquor clearances. I should like to enter into a discussion in committee with the minister in regard to the expense account of Mr. Rowell. I would point out to him that in view of the overwhelming sentiment of this house and of this country it is not the right thing for the minister to have in his employ someone who is not wholeheartedly in sympathy with him on this policy, and I would ask him if he will seriously consider employing other counsel than Mr. Rowell. But first I should like to know what he cost the country.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I think you can get reasonable support for that suggestion over here.

Mr. POWER: That is what I am looking for. I should like to know just how much this country has spent on Mr. Rowell in prosecuting the cases which have arisen out of the customs investigation.

Mr. EULER: I do not quite follow my hon. friend when he says that Mr. Rowell is not in sympathy with the policy of the department. That may apply to clearances of liquor, but Mr. Rowell had nothing whatever to do with that. He was retained to conduct the cases against the breweries and distilleries against which we were proceeding for sales and gallonage taxes. On my recommendation he was employed by the Department of Justice and paid by them, for two reasons. He was employed because he had an absolutely thorough knowledge of the whole situation. He had previously been employed by the Royal Commission on Customs and Excise and knew the business of the breweries and distilleries I think better than any other lawyer in the country. That was one of the reasons we employed him. The other reason was this: he is a first-class lawyer, and while perhaps even I might not agree with Mr. Rowell in everything, he has obtained results, and that after all is what this committee and this parliament desire.

Mr. POWER: I should like to obtain a statement of those results. Can the minister give the committee a statement showing how many cases Mr. Rowell prosecuted, how many he won, and how many he lost?

Mr. EULER: We collected almost $2,500,000, as a direct result of the activities of Mr. Rowell, from the breweries and distilleries.

Mr. POWER: How many cases did he lose?

Mr. EULER: Two, and they are under appeal now.

Mr. POWER: How much did they involve?

Mr. EULER: One, $600,000 and the other about $300,000.

Mr. POWER: He wins about $2,500,000 and loses about $1,000,000. A lot of lawyers can do that.

Mr. EULER: We already have collected about $2,500,000, and I think we will collect the other $900,000 as well.

Mr. POWER: Is the minister speaking from personal sympathy or from legal knowledge? Mr. Rowell has received large fees from this government, and I think we should be able to receive a report on his activities.

Mr. ADSHEAD: How much has he received?

Mr. POWER: I do not know; that is what I want to know, and I think we are entitled to know just how much. I think the minister ought to get that somewhere.

Mr. EULER: I would suggest to my hon. friend that he put that question on the order paper. In any event the cases are conducted by the Department of Justice and not by the Department of National Revenue, and Mr. Rowell's fees are paid by the Department of Justice.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Speaking of the same gentleman, Mr. Rowell, I should like to inquire from the minister if it is true that a certain gentleman wanted to give evidence to this solicitor and that he followed him around to several places? I am referring to Mr. James Cooper, of Windsor, who wanted to give certain evidence to Mr. Rowell, and Mr. Rowell never took his evidence. Does the minister know about that case?

Mr. EULER: I have no knowledge of that whatever.

Mr. CANTLEY: I asked some questions the other evening regarding the port of Pugwash. What was the officer there paid?

Mr. EULER: He was paid $560 per annum.

Mr. CANTLEY: Will the minister be good enough to let me know whether he has a shipping master at that port?

Mr. EULER: I have not that information.

Mr. CANTLEY: I should judge that there is not one there, and in that case I would ask what is to be done when a foreign vessel arrives at that port. Her crew has to be paid off, and before she sails the master has to sign on another crew. That can only be done before a shipping master. Is it a fact that there is no shipping master nearer than Pictou? If that be so, is it not a fact that the master of the ship must take his crew to Pictou and there get them discharged before a shipping master?

Mr. EULER: Only four foreign vessels arrived at that port in the whole year.

Mr. CANTLEY: Suppose there was only one. The point is how can that work be done?

Mr. EULER: The postmaster is a customs officer and can do it.

Mr. CANTLEY: The postmaster is not a shipping master.

Mr. EULER: Even if it were necessary to go to another point, I do not think we would be justified in keeping open that port for the sake of four vessels that depart in a year.

Mr. CANTLEY: I think there have been more than four.

Mr. EULER: No, I have the figures.

Mr. CANTLEY: How many sailing vessels and how many steamers?

Mr. EULER: The statement I have shows that four foreign vessels arrived. I do not know whether they were sailing vessels or steamers.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister gave me a list of seventeen other vessels that were using the port.

Mr. EULER: Those were coasting vessels that departed to the number of seventeen.

Mr. CANTLEY: How can you sign off the crew without going before a shipping master?

Mr. EULER: They do not need clearances at all.

Mr. CANTLEY: Foreign vessels do.

Mr. EULER: Only four foreign vessels departed.

Mr. CANTLEY: Suppose there are four; are you going to compel the masters of those four foreign vessels to take their crews to Pictou, which is the nearest port where there is a shipping master, to have them signed off and have another crew signed on there?

Mr. EULER: I really think it would hardly be justifiable to keep open the port and pay the expenses of an official in order to serve the needs of four vessels. It might result in a little inconvenience and expense to the owners of these four vessels, but it seems to me a very good case has been made out for the abolition of the port by my hon. friend's argument.

Mr. CANTLEY: That is not the only argument.

Mr. EULER: It is not a very strong argument.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. CANTLEY: It is only part of my argument. This port has been open for seventy-five years or more. The minister closes it, and he admits that the whole saving is only four or five hundred dollars a year. To have that port open is some convenience to the people of that district apart from signing on and signing off crews. We talk of encouraging foreign trade, but you are not encouraging foreign trade very much under those conditions.

Mr. EULER: I have just been informed that the crews can be sworn on before a justice of the peace. I am not very familiar with the shipping business or with marine law, but my hon. friend will know whether that is a fair explanation.

Mr. CANTLEY: If that is so, it is something that I never knew before, and I doubt the statement very much.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont): I am in the shipping business and I have sworn on crews before a justice of the peace.

Mr. CANTLEY: Sailors on foreign ships?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont): Yes.

Mr. CANTLEY: I think you had better revise your information. You may do it on the lakes; you do not do it in the maritimes.

Mr. FRASER: In this return the minister submits two orders in council as his authority for paying these premiums, one dated September 9, 1898, and the other May 6, 1907. What sections of the act give authority for these orders in council?

Mr. EULER: I am afraid my hon. friend hardly expects me to answer that question.

Mr. FRASER: I certainly do not; but will the minister get the answer for me?

Mr. EULER: I shall be glad to.

Mr. POWER: To revert again to Mr. Rowell, I do not wish the committee—

Mr. CANTLEY: Hit him again.

Mr. POWER: No. I do not wish the committee to be under the impression for one moment that I have not the highest opinion of Mr. Rowell as a solicitor and as a citizen. But I do object to his being employed by the government; first of all, because I do not think he is in sympathy with its policy; and secondly, because I do not think—

Mr. BENNETT: What is the policy, may I ask?

Mr. POWER: The policy of the government with regard to the clearance of liquor.

Mr. EULER: He has nothing to do with that.

Mr. POWER: He has a lot to do with it. I would not have a man in my employ who did not agree with me all the way.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the trouble with the harbour commission of Quebec.

Mr. POWER: It is a pretty good harbour commission.

Mr. BENNETT: On that principle.

Mr. POWER: The difficulty is that here is a question which is being violently agitated in public, and one of the most important men working for the department is absolutely out of sympathy with the minister.

Mr. EULER: Not at all.

Mr. POWER: On that question he is. Surely you are not going to tell me that Mr. Rowell has changed! If he has I will apologize. As a lawyer he has a perfect right to his personal opinion on almost anything, but on matters connected with the business for which he is employed he should, at any rate ostensibly, support the policy of the minister.

Mr. BENNETT: I think he supports the government.

Mr. KAISER: What is the policy of the government?

Mr. POWER: There is another reason. As I said before, I believe Mr. Rowell to be a very upright, honest man, but personally he has not the sympathy of a large portion of our population. He managed to alienate it some time ago, and he has never been able to get it back. I wish to warn the minister that there is a possibility that if he continues in the good graces of the minister he may, as it is rumoured in the public press, be appointed as the Canadian arbitrator on the I'm Alone case. I want to tell the minister if that is so—

Mr. BENNETT: He will be alone.

Mr. POWER: Yes, he will be alone; and I hope he finds against us because we will deserve it.

Mr. KAISER: Would the hon. member be kind enough to tell us what is this government's policy in regard to clearances?

Mr. POWER: I am sure I don't know.

Mr. QUINN: May we expect any further consideration of the claim of Charles F. Longley in connection with the Admiral Beatty matter? The minister is thoroughly with it as are nearly all hon. members, because it was discussed here last session. Briefly, this is the case. Longley chartered this vessel to a native of France to carry a cargo of liquor from St. Pierre Miquelon to Nassau. Off the Nova Scotia coast she became disabled, sprang a leak, and had to put into Halifax, where some repairs were made. She left again and was only a hundred miles off shore when she had rudder trouble and again had to seek shelter. Because of some five small flasks of liquor being carried ashore on the persons of the crew, the vessel was seized and held under detention for fourteen months until the trial took place before Mr. Justice A. K. Maclean of the Exchequer court. He held:

> I am therefore of the opinion that the seizure of the Admiral Beatty and her cargo has not been justified, and they should be discharged from the custody of the crown and delivered to their owners, and free of any charges or expense incident to the detention.

Longley claimed that his vessel became unseaworthy because of her detention in the port of Shelburne for fourteen months in all kinds of weather. Her sails became rotten, her chains rusty, her deck planks unsound, and her bulwarks were stove in by a storm that took place shortly before she was released. I understand there was a delay of three or four weeks after the vessel was discharged before Mr. Longley could take possession of her because of his financial condition.

I submit in view of the facts of the case, with which the minister is fully familiar, that some compensation should be paid to Mr. Longley because of what is practically the loss of his vessel. Following the decision of Mr. Justice Maclean on August 16, 1927, the vessel was discharged, and Mr. Longley took delivery the following October. But she has been laid up ever since, unfit for any use whatever. As a result of the loss of his vessel Mr. Longley today is practically penniless. He has a claim for damages against the department of which up to the present he has been unable to recover a dollar. The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has mentioned a gentleman who has been employed by this department and treated very generously. According to the last record obtainable he had received over $50,000 for nine months' legal services. If the department can treat a gentleman of the legal profession so generously, the minister ought at least to compensate Mr. Longley for the loss of his vessel.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, this matter was very fully discussed last session, and I am not going into the details again. Perhaps I might give one of the reasons which determined us not to grant the request, and that is that the damage to the vessel was occasioned after notice had been given to the owner to remove it from the dock. He did not do so, a storm came up, and damage resulted. There may have been some other damage, but the judge did not in any sense hold the department responsible. Under all the circumstances I am afraid that while I have a good deal of sympathy for my hon. friend's constituent, I cannot hold out a great deal of hope at the moment that we will change our course of action as decided upon at that time.

Mr. CANTLEY: I was one of those who discussed this matter last session. The minister's statement is only partly correct. The damage resulting to the bulwarks of the vessel I will admit probably occurred as the minister has suggested, but the main damage was occasioned during the long period that she was held by the department without any effort whatever being made to protect her from such damage as must result to any vessel exposed throughout the summer, winter, spring and autumn. The sails were rotted, a lot of the deck planking was damaged, the spars were in bad shape, the standing rigging was practically worn out and the running rigging was gone completely. All that occurred prior to the time when the vessel was supposed to be redelivered to the owner. Surely in these circumstances the minister will not maintain that his department is not responsible or that the unfortunate owner of the vessel is not entitled to some compensation. That is not reasonable, it is not British justice, and I should expect something very much better from the minister, knowing what I do of him, than to offer such a suggestion as he has made to-night.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps my hon. friend forgets that the case was tried in the exchequer court, whose decision freed the department of liability. In the face of that he will realize that it would be pretty difficult for the department to pay money by way of damages when the court had decided that we were not liable. However, I will say this to him. If Mr. Longley decides to appeal from that decision we will certainly not put any barrier in his way, and if the appeal should be successful I should be glad to have him recompensed.

Mr. QUINN: Does the minister realize the position Mr. Longley is in? The man is practically penniless to-day and is not able to make an appeal. He cannot do anything to recover damages. He is not in a position to appeal against the decision of Mr. Justice Maclean. I showed the minister the report of a master mariner and marine surveyor as to the condition of the vessel about the time she was delivered to the owner. He said that the standing rigging was worn out, the running rigging was gone and the whole vessel in exceedingly bad shape. This vessel was held under seizure by the department for fourteen months, and I submit that it should have been taken proper care of while in detention. If the vessel was not delivered to the owner in the same good order and condition, ordinary wear and tear excepted, as she was in prior to her detention, then I claim that the department should recompense this man for the damage sustained. In addition to that, I have affidavits from two other master mariners, sworn to before notaries public in the province of Nova Scotia, all in the same strain. These men declare that the vessel is absolutely unfit for going to sea. I submit that some compensation should be given to Mr. Longley because of the carelessness of the department while the vessel was in their hands.

Item agreed to.

MINES AND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mines Branch

For investigation of mineral resources and deposits; of the mining and metallurgical industries, and of mineral technology; wages, expenses of testing and reasearch laboratories, investigations by Dominion Fuel Board, including salaries and all other expenses, $257,000.

For operation of peat bog at Alfred, Ontario, $25,000.

For publications, English and French, purchase of books, laboratory supplies, instruments, miscellaneous assistance and contingencies, $45,000.

For transportation charges from outlying provinces on ore shipments which may be sent to the ore dressing plant of the Mines branch at Ottawa for testing purposes, under regulations approved by the Minister of Mines, $1,000.

To compensate J. H. Fortune for quarters, fuel, light and water supplied him as resident caretaker of the Mines branch building, Sussex St., vacated because of the necessity of utilizing the caretaker's quarters for storage and laboratory space, $400.

Appropriation not required for 1929-30.—Total, $328,400.

Mr. WHITE (London): Will the minister make a statement with regard to the peat bog at Alfred?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of Mines): We have been operating at Alfred for some years. Last year we completed the machinery and put the plant in operation but did not have a very successful season, there having been so much wet weather. The

quantities depend very largely on the extent of dry weather there is, becauses the peat is air-dried on the ground. We made about six thousand tons last year and have a considerable quantity still on hand.

Mr. WHITE (London): What is the cost per ton?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The estimated cost is $3.50. We have had to buy a considerable amount of machinery and to pay the cost of replacements and adjustments in machinery, and this runs into a good deal of money. We have spent $87,000 on capital account since taking the plant over from Peat Fuels Limited and equipping it. We had an agreement with Peat Fuels Limited whereby, at the expiry of the lease executed, they were to take the plant back at the amount expended by us, and the arrangement included the provision that if the department and Peat Fuels Limited did not agree the matter should be submitted to the exchequer court. We find ourselves in that position to-day: We cannot come to an agreement as to the price they are to pay us and the question is being referred to the exchequer court for adjustment. When it is settled Peat Fuels Limited will come into possession of the plant and resume operations.

Mr. GEARY: Have you produced peat fuel?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes; we have a little more than four thousand tons on hand, having produced six thousand tons last year.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What is the fuel sold for?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is sold at $3.50 but I am not sure whether that includes loading charges.

Mr. ADSHEAD: That is what it costs; but what do you get for it?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is a reasonable cost of production.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I am not asking that; I want to know what you sell it for.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Peat Fuels Limited were the selling agents and I believe they retailed it in Montreal at about $10.

Mr. ADSHEAD: But the department gets nothing back. It costs us $3.50 to produce the fuel, and what do we get back?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We sold outright at $3.50.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What did it cost to produce?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Just about that amount.

Mr. BENNETT: There was a loss, was there not?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the total loss?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That will be difficult to estimate until the courts decide what amount we are entitled to receive from the company.

Mr. CANTLEY: I think up to the beginning of last year we lost about $350,000, because we have been playing with this project for about twenty-one years. Last year the minister got $50,000 from parliament for this purpose and made some arrangement with somebody whom he referrs to as Peat-Fuels Limited, but apparently he got into trouble with them and he can now neither hold on nor let go. And so we are asked for $25,000 more after having spent $350,000 already with absolutely nothing to show for it. Are those not the facts?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Investigations of this character cannot be carried out for nothing, and I think I am safe in making the statement that this plant is capable of turning out a maximum of 20,000 tons in a good year, but to be on the safe side we will say it will average 15,000 tons annually. We have had to make trials and test out the machinery; as a matter of fact we have had to develop new machinery, because so far as I know there is no similar plant operating anywhere. This machinery is designed as a labour saving device for the manufacture of peat fuel. In the villages surrounding that plant there is a very large quantity of hardwood used for domestic fuel, for which use this peat fuel is adapted, and in my opinion every ton of the output of that plant can be sold in the immediate vicinity without shipping a single ton to Montreal. I frankly admit that, like other people who enter into agreements, we sometimes reach the place where we have to ask the courts to make a decision as to the difference between us, and that is the case in this instance.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the real difference?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): To be quite frank, I have never had a definite offer from Peat Fuels Limited as to what they are willing to pay. I have had tentative offers of $40,000, but we have spent $87,000 on capital ac-

count and we think we should recover that amount, or at least the greater part of it. The only thing for me to do was to apply the remedy contained in the agreement and submit the question to the exchequer court for a decision, I may say it is not our intention to operate that plant this year, and we will not require the money which is included in this item.

Mr. BENNETT: Then take it out.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Was the $50,000 voted last year all spent?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I find that we will require $600 for picking up the fuel still on the bog; $3,000 for handling the peat in stock;; $2,000 for harvesting the humus, which is ground peat now used on greens on golf courses, and $5,000 for selling expenses, so apparently I was rather hasty in saying we would not require this money. We will need approximately this sum to finish selling the peat already on hand in order to realize on it.

Mr. CANTLEY: I venture to say that the minister will not get back the amount of money he proposes to spend this year.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, I will get back this money.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister has said something to that effect every year when this matter has been under discussion.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): While we are experimenting with machinery and putting in new machinery, of necessity it will have to be charged to capital account, but this amount is simply to dispose of the material on hand and realize what we can from it.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister and his predecessors have been coming to parliament year after year in connection with this matter. I have here a report issued in 1925 which contains statements as to the amount of peat handled in the previous year, the amount that was to be handled the next year, the type of machinery being replaced by other machinery and so on. The real fact is that we have spent $350,000 or more, as I said, before, and got nowhere. In former years I have dealt with this matter at some length and pointed out that as a commercial proposition, peat fuel is not in the class of fuel that can be dealt with mechanically. There are about 4,000,000 people in Ireland and they consume about 8,000,000 tons of peat; that supply is obtained by peasants spading it out in the spring months, stacking it up to dry and using it during the ensuing eleven or twelve months of the year. It is not a mechanical proposition at all but a domestic one. As the minister knows, the water content of peat is very high. In discussing this question on a former occasion the minister referred to the difficulty of drying peat in this country particularly in the summer months, because of the moisture in the air. Unfortunately that is true; there is much more moisture in the air in warm weather than is the case in cold weather. When the temperature is below zero there is no moisture in the air at all; it is completely dried out, but during the summer months the moisture content is very high and it is much higher on some days than on others. That affects the water absorbed by the peat just as a sponge absorbs water; the combined moisture cannot be abstracted by solar heat or any other kind of heat. I believe the minister is aware of that fact; that is the great difficulty and it is one reason why peat has a very low fuel value.

There are three difficulties in connection with peat; the first is its low thermal value; the second is its bulk and the third is its friability and the difficulty of handling it without reducing it to powder. Why the minister continues to spend large sums of money year after year in the face of all that has been spent and the continued failures in connection with this project is something I am at a loss to understand. Last year, when we appropriated $50,000 for this purpose, I thought we had heard the last of this unfortunate enterprise which has dragged on for more than twenty years.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): These experiments usually result in the discovery of a process that will be beneficial to the community. I only need cite the expenditure of $1,000,000 at Bienfait by the government which we succeeded. Apparently there was no result from that expenditure but to-day, following that experiment, a splendid plant is being established there by British capital for the manufacturing of low grade fuel and the making of briquettes. All I can say for the peat proposition is that I inherited it along with the Bienfait project. My hon. friend is quite correct when he says he has objected to the peat experiments during all these years. However, I repeat that this plant is capable of turning out in the neighbourhood of 15,000 tons annually, and in competition with hard wood—of course it is not being offered in competition with coal—it is a

cheaper fuel for the people of the locality in which this particular bog is situated. We have proved that it cannot be shipped long distances and that it is a fuel which cannot be handled frequently; it must be handled very rapidly from the drying up to the point of consumption. Therefore, I suggest that we must dispose of what we have manufactured already in the immediate vicinity. I may say that a private company is operating at St. Hyacinthe now and we are not assisting them in any way; all I am asking for is an amount to permit of the present fuel being disposed of. We are awaiting the decision of the court as to what amount is to be fixed for Peat Fuels Limited.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am glad the minister has admitted as many facts as he has, because it is a distinct change from the position he took two or there years ago. How much peat is actually on the ground?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): About four thousand tons.

Mr. CANTLEY: How much is the minister asking for to dispose of that?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): $23,000.

Mr. CANTLEY: To sell four thousand tons of peat which is actually upon the ground?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, but my hon. friend will bear in mind that we expect to recover a certain amount. The Ontario government has agreed to put in $10,000, and it is necessary to grade and gravel about two miles of road in order to get to the main highway with our trucks. Owing to weather conditions it was impossible to do that last year; all the peat which was marketed had to be marketed in carload lots in Montreal, and we discovered that that is not a profitable way to handle this commodity. It should sell at about $8 per ton, so my hon. friend will be able to see what amount we expect to recover.

Mr. CANTLEY: If the hon. minister gets $10,000 from the Ontario government he is still spending $12,000 to handle four thousand tons of peat.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We estimate that it will take in the neighbourhood of $7,000 to repair the road. As this road is in the province, we have asked the Ontario government whether or not they will consider the repairs as being part of their contribution to this experiment.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. CANTLEY: That does not improve it very much, because when the small pile of peat is gone the road would be of no value. The minister referred to some experiments carried on in New Brunswick.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, I did not.

Mr. CANTLEY: If not—where?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is a new plant going into operation at St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. CANTLEY: This peat has some value. It is an excellent absorbent and in the powdered form it has a small sale, but the quantity bought and sold for that purpose is comparatively small. From what the minister has said I would judge that he is through with the peat experiment. When the minister was referring last year to an experiment in the west he stated that he had thrown away a million dollars.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I did not say that we had thrown away a million dollars.

Mr. CANTLEY: You said something which was pretty close to that. The minister's words were as follows:

> Notwithstanding the fact that we have spent $1,000,000 of good hard cash of this Dominion on that experiment, which was said to be a failure—

I understand that that experiment has been taken over by another concern and there is some difficulty in connection with that transaction.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): In what way?

Mr. CANTLEY: I understand there has been some misunderstanding with the people who have taken it over.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have nothing to do with them.

Mr. CANTLEY: Under what conditions was the plant taken over?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The coal was being purchased from the Western Dominion Collieries, and a large proportion of the money invested in those collieries was English money. Mr. Sutherland, who was in charge, has since died but the mine is still controlled by the same company. They have decided to erect a plant at Bienfait upon the premises occupied by the original experimental plant, erected by

the Lignite Utilization Board. We are not connected with the matter in any way except that they hope to come under the provisions of the domestic fuels act, while we do not believe that they can come within the provisions of that act.

Mr. CANTLEY: I understand that that plant was erected for the purpose of briquetting brown coal; is that the fact?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is Canadian lignite; I do not know whether you would call it brown coal.

Mr. CANTLEY: Yes, it is the same thing. I do not see any possibility of their coming within the provisions of the coking act because briquetting and coking are two totally different operations and there is no connection between them. There has been a considerable amount of correspondence between the department and these people.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is very difficult for me to see just how they can come under the provisions of the act, but they have a high temperature carbonization plant through which the coal is put before it is briquetted.

Mr. CANTLEY: Their idea is simply to heat the coal to a temperature of four or five hundred degrees in order to make it plastic by liberating some of the oils and tarry substances in the hope that thereby they will then be enabled to briquette it. Whether that will actually work out in practice remains to be seen, but that is beside the question. If those people are prepared to spend their own money in making that experiment, I have no objection, and I do not think the minister will object. I should like to call the attention of the house and of the minister to some of the activities of the mining department. A good many publications were issued—

The CHAIRMAN: It is now eleven o'clock.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the house, I beg leave to present the sixteenth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Tuesday, June 11, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): On the orders of the day yesterday the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) referred to a press report from Great Britain to the effect that the Prime Minister of Great Britain intended meeting the President of the United States to discuss disarmament matters and asked if I had received any information with respect to the matter. I may say to my hon. friend that my information is restricted to the reports which he himself has seen in the papers.

IMPORTATION OF UNITED STATES FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. K. ESLING (West Kootenay): In view of the frequent appeals made to the government last year, may I ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government to restrict the importation at glut prices of surplus United States strawberries and other fruit and farm and poultry produce during the approaching marketing season of the Canadian producer.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government will endeavour to deal with each situation as it arises.

PROPOSED CHIGNECTO CANAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. K. SMITH (Cumberland): I would ask the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Robb) if he would answer the question I asked on Friday last with respect to surveys and investigations into the proposed canal across the isthmus of Chignecto.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): I had quite forgotten that. I have a memorandum upon it in my office, and I will send for it and give it to my hon. friend.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF RUTH ELIZABETH GREENE

Mr. J. A. GLEN (Marquette): With the leave of the house I move:

That pursuant to standing order 111, Bill No. 322 (Letter K8 from the senate) intituled: "An Act for the relief of Ruth Elizabeth Greene",

the preamble of which was reported as not proven by the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills, be placed on the order paper for consideration in committee of the whole at eight o'clock p.m. this day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. GLEN: This bill was remitted to the private bills committee. I had the opportunity of reading the evidence before the bill went to the committee, and I find that there were four witnesses in support of the petition including the petitioner herself, that is the wife, two investigators and one other party—four in all. The petition was undefended. No appearance was made for or on behalf of the respondent. The evidence is perfectly clear that adultery had been committed, and the only objection that could possibly be taken was taken by some that there might have been connivance on the part of the petitioner. I felt then that the evidence was so clear, and so many cases of a like nature had already passed through the private bills committee, that there was no reason that could possibly be adduced by anyone to prevent the passage of that bill. A vote was taken in the committee and the preamble of the bill was not proved, and the bill was thrown out. I am now making this motion in order that the case may be brought to the attention of the house to-night for further consideration. If this action were not taken I feel that an extreme hardship would be placed on one individual, according to the evidence, which is much stronger than in many other cases that I have read, and I therefore ask for the consent of the house to move this motion in order that the bill may be discussed this evening.

Hon. J. D. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, this bill came before the private bills committee of the House of Commons and was discussed there for the best part of an hour. A vote was taken in committee and with the exception of one voice it was unanimously decided to throw this bill out. The principal objection taken to the bill was that the petitioner in this case had been supported by evidence of people who are making a business of trading in divorces. That is the sum total of it. Further, it was established that the petitioner in the case was aware of what was going on—she admits that in her own evidence—and could have prevented what was going on but evidently did not want to. It was quite plain that she was not very particular, and she was conniving with people who are making a business of securing divorces and who have appeared before the divorce committee in quite a few cases. It further developed that the principal witness was a friend of the man who was the respondent, and that he deliberately laid a plot to catch him. There was a plant to secure the evidence for this divorce, and that is the reason why the bill was thrown out. I do not see any reason for bringing it up again and wasting the time of the house upon it any longer.

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale): I hope the house will lose no time on this matter. Early last week this bill came before the private bills committee, and we discussed it for half an hour and then adjourned to allow both the respondent and the petitioner to be represented by counsel.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): On a question of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this matter can only be dealt with by unanimous consent and that as there is not unanimous consent further discussion is unnecessary and not in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is a private bill. I think that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is misinformed.

Mr. BENNETT: This is a motion to bring the bill before the house to-night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No notice is necessary.

Mr. BENNETT: Notice is necessary to discuss it to-night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the motion is quite in order.

Mr. SPENCE: This bill was discussed for an hour in the private bills committee and a vote was taken. The majority objected to the bill being reported to the house and it was thrown out. As the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) has said, the chief witness in this case is a man without a reputation, a man who worked a frame-up on the respondent in this case, hired rooms in the King Edward hotel, provided two women and booze, and they were all drinking together when he telephoned to his accomplice, to a man who has appeared in fifty-three cases of divorce before the House of Commons committee this year. This same witness has been co-respondent in two other cases I am told. This is a man who allows himself to be used as co-respondent and will take part in a frame-

up against a man with whom he is friendly. He swore that he was a traveller and had to have these rooms in the King Edward hotel, but I know that he lives in Toronto and has a wife and family and he ought to be living with them. Then just before my friend the respondent—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPENCE: There is nothing to laugh about. Just before the respondent knew that he had been framed he met this witness at the bank. The latter wanted to cash a cheque and asked the respondent: "Will you identify me?" The bank manager said to the respondent, "The only thing you can do is to endorse the cheque." The witness issued a cheque on a bank in Chicago and later it came back marked "No account." That is the character of the witness whose evidence is being relied upon in this particular case. He had described himself to the respondent as a travelling salesman for a system of advertising with headquarters in Chicago. When the cheque came back as I have described the man was arrested, and in the police court he stated that he was a private detective. So in one case he was a traveller, in the other a private detective. In my opinion we should not grant a divorce on the evidence of such a man.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that your ruling is not a correct one, and I stand by what my leader has said in regard to it. Personally, I do not like divorces, but as a rule when the private bills committee reports in favour of a divorce bill the house passes it. However, in this case that committee has reported that the preamble has not been proven and we should support the committee. Standing order 111, to be found at page 277 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, deals with such a case. In the comment on this rule contained in paragraph 890 I find the following:

Consequently the correct procedure in all analogous cases—

That is, where the committee has reported that the preamble has not been proved:

—is for the house to give the committee instructions which will enable it to consider the whole question again.

The hon. gentleman has moved that this bill be considered by the committee of the whole this evening. The proper motion to make would be that the bill be referred back to the committee on private bills for further consideration. Therefore as it is not on the order paper to-day, I submit with all respect, Mr. Speaker, that the motion is out of order and cannot be proceeded with except by unanimous consent.

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any use my entering into discussion of the merits of this case. I am perfectly satisfied in my own opinion that an injustice has been done to the petitioner in view of the evidence submitted.

Mr. CAHAN: But this is a point of order.

Mr. GLEN: Just a moment. I leave it to anyone on the other side of the house who wishes to review the evidence dispassionately and without prejudice to say whether or not an injustice has been done to the petitioner. But in view of the fact that there has to be unanimous consent, and there is opposition to my motion, with the consent of the house I beg to withdraw the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shall the hon. gentleman have leave to withdraw his motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion withdrawn.

SUPPLY—FISCAL POLICY

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, since the hon. Minister of Finance made his original motion to go into committee of supply much has transpired on this continent that should give this parliament occasion to pause and consider the position of Canada, and I avail myself of the motion that has now been made to discuss the situation as I see it, hoping that we may be able to obtain some indication from the administration as to what it proposes to do to meet a crisis in our economic history.

That it is not seemly to discuss the domestic policies of another country goes without saying, but to that general rule there are two exceptions. The first exception is, that if we have treaty obligations that are affected we are bound to discuss them. The second is, that if the legislation which is in process of being passed, or has been passed, by a friendly nation does directly affect this country, and it has been pointed out during the discussions antecedent to the passing of the legislation that it was so intended, then obviously this parliament should discuss it.

I need hardly point out that with regard to the action of congress we have no treaty obligations to be respected or discussed; but with regard to the second proposition that I have submitted to those of us who have read the speeches of the public men of the United States delivered last fall, not only of those who were candidates for high office but of those who supported them in their political campaign, will recall that in many instances it was declared to be the intention of the Republican party if it came into power to enact such legislation as would have the effect of preventing the importation from Canada into the United States of certain of our products that would enter into competition with their own. Under the circumstances it is therefore quite clear that a discussion of the domestic policies of the great republic becomes important and essential because of the fact that they were intended to, and do in fact, adversely affect the interests of this Dominion.

Having regard to what I have referred to, may I point out that in 1921 when the emergency tariff was enacted by congress it had an immediate adverse effect upon the interests of Canada, and that when the Fordney-McCumber tariff was put into force in 1922 its effects became apparent to every one. The emergency tariff very injuriously affected the interests of this country as a whole, particularly the farming interests, and if hon. members will look at the Commercial Intelligence Journal, published on the 25th of May of this year under the auspices of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, they will find set out exports from Canada to the United States of a number of commodities such as are produced on Canadian farms or manufactured directly from such farm products. The figures given are for the month of April, 1921, 1922, 1928 and 1929, and for seven months ended April for the same years, with the United States tariff rates in force on such dates. It will be observed that during the seven months ending April, 1921, this country sold to the United States cattle, horses, poultry and sheep, fruits, grains, grain products, meats, milk and milk products, seeds, vegetables, and miscellaneous products such as eggs, hay, maple sugar, tallow and wool, valued at $138,845,815. The next year, 1922, exports of the same class of live stock and farm products had fallen to a value of $32,000,000, in 1928 they rose to $39,000,000 and in 1929 they declined in value to $33,000,000, using round figures. It will therefore be observed that the direct result of the Fordney-McCumber tariff and the emergency tariff that preceded it was to decrease the value of our exports of farm products to the United States in a seven-months period by over $100,000,000. That is a tremendous sum of money with respect to live stock and farm products, and the result is directly attributable to changes in tariffs by the United States. These changes will be found set out at page 785 of the journal to which I have referred, and it will be observed there are a large number of free items; in the first column there are the emergency tariff rates on such exports and in another column the Fordney-McCumber tariff as it now stands.

Now the loss of $100,000,000 worth of exports from the farms of this country was reflected in the increased prosperity of the farmers of the United States, who produced the products that had formerly been imported into that country. They were no longer subject to the competition of $100,000,000 of Canadian live stock and farm products, and to that extent they supplied the requirements of their own people which theretofore had been supplied by Canadian ranchers, farmers and artisans. That, I think, is abundantly clear. Need I point out that the Fordney-McCumber tariff also contained a provision whereby the President of the United States was enabled after inquiry to increase the existing tariff rates to any extent not exceeding 50 per cent; and if he found that this was not ample to protect the agricultural and other interests that were affected he had power to fix arbitrarily, after inquiry, the price of imported articles upon which duty should be computed, somewhat similar to the provision we made in our customs tariff, and to which I shall presently refer, in connection with fruit and vegetables and matters of that kind. Under these circumstances, we are confronted with the fact that this government, in power in 1922, as it still is, there having been an interim in which it was not, was called upon to meet a situation which imperilled Canadian trade with respect to agricultural products to the extent of over $100,000,000 per annum. I will not take up the time of the house this morning to review the imports and exports to the United States, but I will point out that during the last six or seven years we have been able by slow degrees to get back somewhat to the condition we were in before this tariff was enacted against us. But the adverse balance of trade between the United States and Canada still continues, and while for the year ended March 31 we bought nearly $900,000,000 worth of goods from the United States, we were able to sell them only $500,000,000; and that $500,000,000 worth of goods was made up largely of three items: First, paper and paper products;

secondly, unmanufactured lumber and lumber products; and, thirdly, minerals and mineral products. These three items made up in a large way what we sold to the United States in our endeavour to pay for the goods purchased from that country and thus to reduce the adverse balance of trade.

Now we ask ourselves at the very threshold of this discussion: What did this government do to meet that situation? What did the government of Canada do in 1922 to meet a situation which destroyed $100,000,000 per annum of the export trade of this country? That would be a pertinent question to ask at any time; it is doubly pertinent at this time for reasons that are apparent to us all. I find that the government of that day, speaking through the Minister of Finance in 1923, after the Fordney-McCumber tariff had been enacted, thus represented their position. The Right Hon. Mr. Fielding said:

I believe I am warranted in saying that to-day there is no class of the Canadian people who do not recognize that it is of the highest desirability that we should have proper trade relations with the United States. The desire of Canada to make a friendly treaty with the United States ought to be well known, and I think it is well known. As to the willingness of Canada to have a measure of reciprocity between the two countries there ought to be no question. A minister of this government went to Washington and informed the government and the congressional leaders of Canada's willingness to enter into negotiations for another reciprocity treaty. They know our willingness in this regard, and I think it is well we should say it again. The position of our government in the matter, therefore, is well known. In 1879 when the national policy, so-called, was framed, there was what was called a standing offer to the United States, and the United States had notice of how Canada would like to deal with them. I want to adopt the principle of that, though not the details of it. I am proposing that we shall put into our tariff laws to-day a declaration of our readiness and our willingness to make an arrangement with the United States whenever they are ready to meet us on fair terms. I propose to put it in this clause:

The governor in council may authorize any minister of the crown to enter into negotiations with any authorized representative of the government of the United States with a view to the making of a commercial agreement between the two countries on terms that may be deemed mutually beneficial. Any agreement so made shall be subject to the approval of the parliament of Canada.

This is a general indication of our willingness to make a commercial treaty with our neighbours. We realize, however, that if this suggestion on our part should meet with favourable consideration, considerable time would have to elapse before an agreement could be made and brought into effect. It would require action by congress. Congress only could deal with the matter in that broad way. Is there not some other way in which the desired end, in part at least, could be reached? Can we do nothing in the meantime? Possibly we can.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Under the present law of the United States there is a privilege granted to the president of the United States to make certain reductions if he likes to do so. He may do that without waiting for congress, and, therefore, we propose to insert this clause, having relation to that particular matter:

If the president of the United States, under authority of the United States' tariff act of 1922, determines to reduce by fifty per cent the duties imposed by such act on the following articles, that is to say:

Cattle, wheat, wheat flour, oats, barley, potatoes, onions, turnips, hay, fish as enumerated in paragraphs 717, 718, 719 and 720 of the said tariff act of 1920, the governor in council may by order in council make such reductions of duties on such articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions on Canadian products imported into the United States.

The previous paragraph makes a standing offer of reciprocity which we know can only be adopted by congress. This paragraph appeals to the president, or intimates to the president, that if he is prepared to exercise the power which the congress has given to him by way of reduction, we are prepared to meet him on similar terms. I do not know that any good will come from it. I think we are doing right to place on record our desire and determination to meet our American friends on fair terms, if they will meet us.

That was the action taken by the government of that day, speaking through the Minister of Finance, in connection with these matters: first, an offer of reciprocity coupled with a provision that a minister might be appointed to go to Washington to negotiate a treaty if that were thought desirable—though so far as I can ascertain from the records no such minister was ever appointed; and, secondly, a provision whereby the government of this country, by order in council, might reduce the duties upon American products named and specified if the United States president did the same with respect to Canadian products. What came of that? Nothing; for let me point out that, far from that appeal having had any effect on the President of the United States, the exact opposite is the fact. It will be observed that under the elastic provisions of the tariff to which I refered a few moments ago, the President of the United States was given large powers which, as I have indicated, he has seen fit to exercise, increasing by proclamation the duties upon Canadian products since the tariff of 1922 was enacted in that country. And the effect of that has been to make it more difficult still for Canadian products to find access to the United States. Perhaps I might mention some of these products in order that they may be recalled to the minds of the members of this house.

When the emergency tariff was enacted in 1921 the duty placed on wheat was 35 cents a bushel; it was reduced in the permanent tariff of 1922 to 30 cents but was later increased by proclamation of the President of the United States, on March 7, 1924, to 42 cents per bushel. Wheat flour was similarly increased to $1.04 per hundred pounds from 78 cents; butter from 8 to 12 cents; iron from 75 cents to $1.12 per ton. And here is this singular item to which I direct the attention of the house, namely, bran shorts and mill feeds, which were subject to a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem when the final tariff measure was passed in 1922, but which the president, by proclamation on March 7, 1924, reduced by one-half, that is to say, 7½ per cent ad valorem. That indicates the settled policy of the United States; they reduced the duty on all those products which they find it necessary to import, either in a wholly raw or partly raw state, or partially processed or partially manufactured, in order that they may be made available for their own use in a completely manufactured state. So bran, shorts and feed are reduced from 15 per cent to 7½ per cent, while wheat is increased from 30 cents to 42 cents per bushel and other farm products and raw materials are similarly dealt with.

I mention this because it illustrates the policy of the administration of the United States during the years from 1922 to 1929. Having thus indicated what the effect of the Fordney-McCumber tariff has been, what this government has done in relation thereto, we ask ourselves if they did anything further to meet the situation, and we must answer yes, they did very much more. Not only did Mr. Fielding place upon record the offer to which I have referred, which offer never has been availed of, but while we in this house during the last few months have been discussing the situation with respect to our own country the new President of the United States, acting upon the report of a tariff board, has seen fit, by proclamation which becomes effective on the 14th day of this very month, to increase the duties upon various articles. This list will be found in the issue of the United States Daily of May 12-13. That proclamation increases the rate on milk from 2½ cents to 3¾ cents per gallon or the maximum executive increase of 50 per cent; it increases the duty on cream from 20 cents to 30 cents per gallon, again the maximum by executive action; the duty on window glass is increased from ⅝ cents to 1½ cents, again the maximum increase. So that, thirty days from the date of the proclamation, that new tariff law comes into force, while we Canadians have been sitting here urged by the leader of this house, the Prime Minister of Canada, not to say anything that might be provocative to the Congress of the United States.

However to continue the inquiry as to what we have done further, we find that we have met the stern rebuffs of our friends to the south by reducing the protection which was afforded to the Canadian people. We did that to such an extent that our representative at the League of Nations stood up and spoke proudly about Canada leading the world in reducing tariffs; we did it to such an extent that the Minister of Justice referred to it proudly a few days ago, and various extremists throughout the world have been lauding Canada as leading the world in reducing tariffs or tolls on imports which in effect has enabled those who do not offer to us facilities to trade in their markets to come in and dispossess our markets from our own people. Is there any doubt with respect to that? I will refer to the observations made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) in 1924, when the greatest reductions were being made. Speaking for the government of the day in reply to Sir Henry Drayton, who was the financial critic of the then opposition, on April 14, 1924, he is reported as follows:

> One could not help but be struck this afternoon, in listening to the address of the ex-finance minister (Sir Henry Drayton) by the fact that he saw very little wrong with the budget as presented on this occasion, but it was interesting to note the desperate way in which the hon. member declared that it was the death knell of protection. One would have thought that we were listening to a funeral oration this afternoon, and I trust that it will be the death knell of protection. I do not mean to suggest for a single moment that we should vote at this time to abolish the tariff in its entirety, but rather that we should do as we have been doing —as to which my hon. friend complained so bitterly—continually amend the tariff where it bears too heavily upon the production of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad to hear that the policy enunciated by the minister in 1924 is, in this year of grace 1929, still the policy of the administration, and that the administration invites the abandonment by the Canadian people of their own markets in favour of our great and powerful neighbour to the south! If there is any doubt in this connection it will be dispelled by the observations that have been addressed to a long-suffering people by the Consumers' League of this country, about which I will have something to say presently, in which they point out,

doubtless on behalf of the administration, since the officers of that league so loyally support the administration, that there has been a continual lowering of the tariff by the administration.

That is how this government met the Fordney-McCumber tariff; that is how the government met the situation which deprived Canadians of $100,000,000 of trade in a single year; that is how this government met a situation which destroyed cattle men in western Canada who theretofore had free access to the markets of the United States and who were deprived of those markets by a duty ranging from a few cents a pound for cattle weighing less than 1,050 pounds to 30 per cent in some instances on horses, cattle, sheep, swine and various other varieties of live stock. I will not take the time of the house to go into the matter in detail, but that is how this government met the situation.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend might mention what they got for their cattle last fall.

Mr. BENNETT: They received a good price in the Chicago markets for their cattle, and they had to pay a high rate to get them there. There are no thanks due this government for that fact.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I say that they received the highest price paid for cattle in western Canada during the last twenty years or more.

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. gentleman will look up the figures he will find that he overstated the case when he said the prices were better than they had been for over twenty years; he stated a fact that is not a fact.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I will be glad if my hon. friend will put me right.

Mr. BENNETT: I have before me the figures from the Department of Trade and Commerce with respect to the last few years only. I know that Mr. Cross's steers brought a higher price in Chicago last year than has been the case in recent years, because of the scarcity of steers in America; the Americans bought the cattle and paid the duty, but what did this government do to help the western cattle men? They received that higher price because of the law of supply and demand and because the American buyers had to come to Canada for the cattle. If it had ended there it would not have been so very bad, but during the last ten or twelve months there have been exported from this country a larger number of dairy cows than ever before in the history of the Dominion. From one county in Nova Scotia alone three thousand cows have disappeared, and since this tariff was introduced into congress several representatives of United States firms have been going about in Ontario buying up milch cows with which to replenish the herds of the New England states, and these men say that now they can succeed in their dairy industry because they will not have competition either from Canada, from New Zealand or from anywhere else.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Are they paying for the cows?

Mr. BENNETT: They are paying for the cows with real money, not with promises such as were made in Weyburn last week by the hon. member. Before that they were paying for the milk and cream which now they are not allowed to do, because after the 14th day of this month there will be in existence a tariff which will prevent milk and cream from entering the United States; that will affect Ontario and Quebec, and other sections of this Dominion. Now, thanks to the action being taken by the congress of the United States, they will have the American market for themselves, and they are buying our cows in order to furnish the milk and cream for that market.

Mr. BROWN: We will keep on raising cows and sell them at a good price.

Mr. BENNETT: We have 101,000 fewer cows in Canada to-day than we had a few years ago, according to the figures supplied by the Department of Trade and Commerce. That is how you are raising cows, and while the United States is raising tariffs—

An hon. MEMBER: We are raising cows.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: We are not raising cows; while they are raising tariffs we are not raising cows.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: It seems to be a great joke to the hon. gentlemen when they consider the fact that we have 101,000 fewer cows this year than we had last; it seems to be a great joke to the hon. gentlemen when they realize that the American tariff on milk and cream has been increased 50 per cent; it seems to be a great joke to them that the Canadian farmers who were dependent upon the markets of New England and New York have been deprived of those markets; it seems to be a great joke to them that cows are

being bought and sent to the New England states; it seems to be a great joke to them that cows are being bought in Ontario and shipped to the United States to supply milk and butter to the American people; but it is not a joke to the people of Canada. It may be a joke to the hon. gentlemen opposite but it is not a joke to our people.

Having thus indicated what the effects have been, we are now confronted with a new measure, a measure which has been introduced into the House of Representatives of the United States and forwarded to the Senate with some amendments for further consideration. Need I point out the effect of that measure? Need I point out what the effect will be upon the farmers of this country? Need I indicate that it means a prohibitive tariff against Canadian wheat, flour, cattle, sheep and potatoes? I hold in my hand the measure as it left the House of Representatives. The first two hundred pages deal with this new tariff legislation. The free list commences at page 211, but it will be seen that it is a list of products which are either raw materials or partly processed goods, or manufactured goods of which the United States has practically a producing monopoly and in which we cannot compete. Our copper, our asbestos, our gypsum —where is the hon. gentleman from Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley)?—are to be taken into the United States free from duties or import tolls and fabricated in order to give employment to a quarter, a half or a million workmen who in turn will be supplied with butter, milk and dairy products by the men who purchased cows in Canada, while the Canadians denuded of their natural resources see their raw materials flowing into the United States to be fabricated by the labour of American citizens. I commend to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) the careful perusal of that tariff measure as indicating the policy of the United States in protecting its own people.

But there was another effect. As I have said, we had a sudden decrease in the value of our goods exported to the United States. I have the detailed figures here but it would hardly be fair to take up the time of the house in repeating them. Not only did it lessen the exports from this country to the United States; not only did it improve the export of goods from the United States into Canada because of the reduction of duties, by this government until our importations from the republic have reached the large figure of $868,000,000—an increase from $515,000,000 in 1922 to $868,000,000, in 1928, or an increase of over $350,000,000—not only have we increased our imports, but we have done more than that. Our men and women, unable to find employment in this country through the operations of the Fordney-McCumber tariff, have been forced to follow our raw and partly fabricated materials to the United States to find jobs in that country which could not be obtained at home. Let us have no misunderstanding about this matter. I have the figures which have been classified by the immigration authorities of the United States of America. In the year ending June 30, 1922, only 46,465 Canadians went to the United States; the next year, as a direct result of that tariff, 115,635 people went to the south from Canada; in 1924, when the full operation of the Fordney-McCumber tariff was apparent, we sent to the United States of America 200,834 Canadians; in 1925 the migration was 102,496; in 1926 it was 91,786; in 1927 it was 81,982; and for the year ending December 31 last the figure was 73,605. Why this steady diminution in numbers during the last few years? Because we had exhausted the available source in the years which had preceded. That is the reason. Do the hon. gentlemen realize the significance of those figures? Do they realize the relation between cause and effect? We have the Fordney-McCumber tariff, the diminution of exports, to the United States, the increase of imports, the lack of employment and the increase in the exportation of men and women from this country to find occupations in another country in fabricating Canadian raw materials, which occupation was denied them at home through the action of this government. Consider the type of men and women who have been forced to leave this country. In 1922 we sent out 1,757 of the professional class; in 1923, 3,100; in 1924, 5,385; and last year the number was 3,884. In skilled labour and skilled artisans we sent out 18,730 last year and 41,345 in 1924. When we consider farm labourers, farmers, labourers, servants and draymen, the same story is told. Most of those who left the country were under the age of forty-five years.

Taking into consideration these figures and their relation to cause and effect, most Canadians hoped that confronted with a new problem affecting our very economic existence, confronted with this new tariff measure, just when we were showing signs of recovery from the Fordney-McCumber tariff, Canada would have had a clear policy outlined by the government of the day. It was thought that the leaders in the political life of the country, the leaders of the government, the leaders of the Liberal party would have indicated some policy with which to meet such a crucial situation as now confronts us. What happened? Our friends to the south merrily pursued their way, the new tariff bill was in

troduced and has gone to the senate and the effect of that bill upon the cattle industry of the west will be that those who ship their cattle to Chicago will find themselves handicapped in some instances to the extent of $20 per head. What has the government done about it? What are they going to do about it?

An hon. MEMBER: What is the senate going to do?

Mr. BENNETT: It will do what it has always done, increase the tariff against us as a competing country.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): What would you do about it?

Mr. BENNETT: When the electors of Saskatchewan get an opportunity once more they will indicate what they will do with respect to dairy products.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That should hold you for a minute.

Mr. BENNETT: They little know the men from the west; it would take more than that to hold the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) for even a half minute.

What has been the effect upon this country? I have indicated the effect upon the imports and the exports of materials, other than human, and upon the man and woman power of Canada. But there is another effect. It has been assumed that we are prosperous because we have such a large purchasing power by reason of our great crops. We have been fallaciously assuming, because we produced and sold $550,000,000 worth of grain and grain products during the last twelve months, between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 worth of forest products, and about $200,000,000 worth of metal and mineral products, that with such great purchasing power we are prosperous, when we are with this money buying from the people of the United States what we should to a large extent be making at home.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): The situation is the other way around; we are buying because we are more prosperous.

Mr. BENNETT: We are buying because we are prosperous and we are prosperous because God has given us a great heritage and great crops. The great crops of western Canada, the great forests that can not be replaced in a generation, the mineral products that can never be replaced, have been turned into money and give us a purchasing power which is reflected in our so-called prosperity. But all that we have done is to sell our birthright in the way of mines, forests and the wealth that nature has given us from our lands, and exported them to give employment to men and women in a foreign country. Is that the kind of prosperity the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) wants? Is that the kind of prosperity he is hankering for, that he thinks will make a nation or a people, a prosperity by which we become hewers of wood and drawers of water for the great people to the south of us, shipping to them our vast wealth in raw materials partly or wholly unfabricated and then buying back the manufactured goods, so that men and women went from Canada to the United States to the number of 200,000 in one year to find employment?

An hon. MEMBER: How many came back?

Mr. BENNETT: I can say to the hon. gentleman that the figures are perfectly clear. The number that came back did not constitute 10 per cent of those who went.

Mr. MORRISSY: That was not the case in New Brunswick, my hon. friend's birthplace.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend's government, not content with dealing with our great neighbours to the south in the manner indicated have also dealt with other nations of the world. They have made trade treaties with France, Italy, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Esthonia and other countries and with Australia and New Zealand. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) used to talk about empire trade in terms that would almost make one weep at his expressions of desire to advance the interests of the empire. With a tremor in his voice he talked about the Australian treaty as a fine gesture of empire unity. But within a few weeks after it had been in force, his government imposed the dumping clause against Australian products and shut out most of the agricultural products of that country. By an order in council on the 25th day of September 1925, a few months after making the treaty, the Minister of Finance put the same treaty into force with New Zealand by order in council. That was only four days after the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said in Woodstock that if the treaty worked an injustice to Canada, he would see to it that it was cancelled. What has happened? In this Dominion during the twelve months ended April of this year, we bought 27,000,000 pounds of butter from New Zealand. While we did that, the United States of America, having increased their duty on butter from two and a half cents to twelve cents a pound, made their people so free from outside competition that all they

bought was 4,600,000 pounds of butter. Do you realize, Sir, there are hon. gentlemen in this house who say that tariffs play no part in agricultural life? There are some of my hon. friends to my left who say that. In the United States of America, in 1920, they bought 37,000,000 pounds of butter to supply the requirements of their own people and at that time the duty was two and a half cents a pound. They raised it to six to eight to twelve cents a pound and in 1928 they supplied all their requirements with the exception of 4,600,000 pounds.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Their people are eating oleomargarine.

Mr. BENNETT: The evidence is that they are eating more butter than they ever did before in their lives. That is what their official reports show.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): They are not eating within ten pounds per capita as much as we are.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so, because there is very little butter consumed in the southern states as compared with what is consumed in the northern part of the United States. Butter fat, as the physiologists tell us, is largely used in northern climes as distinct from southern. The hon. gentleman knows that, and when he talks about oleomargarine, he is endeavouring to draw a red herring across the trail. He cannot becloud the issue in that way, any more than his intervention in Weyburn improved the political situation there.

I have pointed out what has happened in Canada with respect to butter, eggs, poultry. I put this query to my hon. friend: Is it desirable that Canada should become a dependent country with respect to butter, not producing enough for our own requirements? The other day I wrote to the Department of Agriculture of Ontario asking them what the situation was there since the beginning of the year, and they tell me that the total of butter manufactured in February, March and April, 1928, was 10,802,541 pounds, and the number of creameries reporting, 228. This year the quantity manufactured in the same months was nearly 700,000 pounds less or 10,155,818 pounds, and the number of creameries reporting had dropped down to 211, or 17 less than the year before. The great manufacturing creameries of Ontario and other parts of Canada are importing New Zealand butter and this is part of the 27,000,000 pounds the new Zealanders are selling to the people of this country to-day. This is due to the fact that the milk is not available and it was shown here the other evening why that is so. I will not enter into a discussion with respect to this matter.

I have referred to butter, eggs, poultry and other products of that kind; but let us go a step further. Is it desirable that Canada should become a dependent country with respect to meats, importing more and selling less? Is it right that this should happen in regard to fruits; that we should import more and sell less? Is it desirable with respect to machinery about which we have heard so much talk?

Nothing could be worse for a country than that we should not be able to manufacture machinery and thereby become dependent on people who are competing with us in the same activities. I require machinery in western Canada and under existing conditions I have to go to the United States to get it. I have to take my chance against the United States competitor. If he wants machinery, he gets his first and then I get mine. Shall this country develop its resources on that basis or not? The real issue that faces Canada to-day is whether we shall be dependent on other countries, dependent for butter, for farm products, for meats, for fruit, for vegetables, for manufactured goods such as machinery and so forth, upon a foreign people whose supreme object in life is to support their own interests and prosperity regardless of what happens to us? This is not a matter that one can regard with any degree of satisfaction.

I should like to read to my hon. friend from Weyburn what Professor Dean of the Ontario Agricultural college said in a broadcast message the other day. He said:

> Here we have the argument plainly stated. Why did Canada import over 24 million pounds of butter, worth over 8 1/2 million dollars, in 1928, and nearly two million pounds of cheese? The answer is that the Canadian farmer is not accorded the protection in his business which he needs in order to make it profitable. A little over two million cows' milk goes annually into the factories in Canada. We have the land to maintain twice this number of cows for factory purposes. If the full number of cows were kept on Canadian farms there would be no need to import butter and chese for home consumption requirements, and we should maintain our imports at or above the present level. It is an economic question. The Canadian farmer may not know his costs of production so well as he might, but he has a shrewd suspicion that 40 to 45 cents per pound butter in winter does not cover his costs, and he concludes that he cannot compete with cheap grass butter from Australia and New Zealand, which enters Canada practically free of duty. The American farmer demands that his business shall be "protected" similar to that of any other manufacturing business. His slogan is "protection for all or protection for none."

I commend that statement of Professor Dean, of the Ontario Agricultural college to my hon. friend from Weyburn and other mem-

bers of this house. It was broadcast the other day throughout Ontario and indicated at least the considerations that prevailed in inducing him to arrive at conclusions as to what the situation really is.

Now I proceed to deal with the question of trade treaties with other countries. We have a treaty with France and a treaty with Italy, where the farmers of this country sell their wheat and wheat products. What happened? This government made a treaty with those two nations. The treaty with France provides that we shall enjoy the minimum tariff on our exports to that country, but it does not provide that they will not increase their tariff, and so we still have the minimum tariff, while France has increased it three times since the minister made the bargain with them. Only last week I find that the republic of France increased the rate upon wheat to 50 francs for 220 pounds, or about 54 cents a bushel. What are you doing about it, Mr. Minister of Finance? You made the treaty. You cannot complain because we still enjoy the minimum rate. The best tariff rate that the rest of the world gets from France we get. But we have given them favours in our market which we cannot take away from them, while they can take away from us the favours which they have given to us under the treaty.

France increased the duty on wheat first of all from 25 to 35 francs, and increased the duty on flour in the same ratio and then on the 23rd of May of this year increased the duty on wheat from 35 to 50 francs per 220 pounds. Italy increased the duty on wheat from 7½ to 11 gold lire per 100 kilograms or about 220 pounds, and only the other day, on the 25th of May, while we were sitting here, Italy further increased the rate from 11 to 14 gold lire per 220 pounds, or nearly 75 cents a bushel.

Where is the agriculturist of the west? What is he doing with this government? Where is the member for Weyburn? Where is the Minister of Agriculture? What are they doing about it when our market in France is taken from us by increasing the rate on wheat to over 50 cents a bushel and our market in Italy is taken away from us by increasing the rate to nearly 75 cents a bushel, while we say under the treaties: Behold the Canadian market; take it, it is yours; we have fixed the terms on which you can enjoy it and cannot change them without abrogating the treaties. What are you going to do about it, Mr. Minister of Finance?

[Mr. Bennett.]

It is the same with respect to Great Britain. I am indebted to my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Kaiser) for giving the exact facts in connection with the preference afforded to Great Britain. From 1868 to 1898, a period of thirty years, there was no preference with Great Britain. From 1898 to 1928, another period of thirty years, there was a preference. The average duties collected on imports from all countries were as follows:

Average duties p.c. collected on imports from all countries

	Per cent
From 1868 to 1898—on dutiable goods..	25-50
From 1868 to 1898—on dutiable and free	17-16
From 1898 to 1928—dutiable goods.. ..	25-52
From 1898 to 1928—dutiable and free..	15-81
from United Kingdom	
1868 to 1898—dutiable..	23-98
1868 to 1898—dutiable and free..	18-64
1898 to 1928—dutiable..	24-39
1898 to 1928—dutiable and free..	18-49
from United States	
1868 to 1898—dutiable..	22-49
1868 to 1898—dutiable and free..	12-48
1898 to 1928—dutiable..	23-95
1898 to 1928—dutiable and free..	13-35

There are the figures. The so-called British preference negotiated in 1897 and whittled down by the operation of various treaties has now reached the stage where the average duties are more favourable to the United States than they are to the United Kingdom. You may take the figures and make the computation for yourself; any hon. gentleman may do it. I have given the facts of the situation as they confront the Canadian people at this time, not only with respect to the great republic to the south, but with respect to the countries with which we have made treaties, and indicated why the difficulties of trading with these countries are increasing from time to time.

How is the government of the day meeting the situation? You heard this morning the answer given by the Prime Minister: We will meet each situation as it arises. Is that statesmanship? Is that the duty of a statesman? As I read the history of great statesmen whose lives have been devoted to their country, they had prescience and vision and looked into the long future. They saw policies where others saw none and they led their people so that they might be able to meet the emergencies as they arose. What are we doing to meet those emergencies? What are you members from the province of Quebec doing to meet the situation by which your milk and cream will no longer be able to find access to the United States? What are you farmers from the west doing with respect to the increased tariffs on wheat in

France and Italy and the United States? What are you doing about your cattle? What are you doing, my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Sinclair) about your potatoes from Prince Edward Island that used to pay 50 cents per 100 pounds duty and will now pay 75 cents? What are we doing about the cattle industry?

Mr. FORKE: The people will pay more for their beef in the United States.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend says that they will pay more for their beef. This seems to me a very proper time at which to make one observation with respect to that matter, because it is an observation made by Professor Sidgewick, who is one of the greatest authorities sometimes quoted by my hon. friends. Professor Sidgewick, dealing with this situation, used words which I commend to every man who studies the economic situation of this country:

I have now to call attention to an oversight in the ordinary exposition of the benefits of free trade, which is of some importance when the division of the world into separate nations is taken into account, and the interests of a single nation are considered. It is often assumed, expressly or tacitly, that when a class in a given nation can obtain any kind of commodities cheaper through foreign trade, the nation as a whole must be benefited by their so obtaining it. What is overlooked is the possibility that a portion of a nation from which employment is withdrawn by the change cannot be employed within their own country without a loss of utility greater on the whole than the gain from the cheaper foreign supply of the commodities they were producing before the change. I do not think this result is at all a probable one in a country as large and as industrially developed as England. But I think it must be admitted in any theoretical treatment of the subject, that in order to realize the economic advantage obtainable by free trade between two countries, a displacement of labour and capital out of one of the countries may be necessary; so that the aggregate wealth of the persons living in one of the countries may be reduced by the change.

I commend those words of Professor Sidgewick to the Minister of Immigration because I think, coming from such an authority, they will probably have some effect on his mind.

Leaving that for the moment, I again ask what has been the attitude of the government? What are their suggested remedies? I will take them in order. The hon. gentlemen from western Canada who spoke were all very careful to say: You must not interfere with these tariffs of the United States. The Minister of Finance issued a warning, and hardly had the warning escaped him and reached Washington than they began to revise upwards the tariffs originally submitted for consideration. Then came my friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) and he talked internationalism, pure and simple, with respect to tariffs. He talked the old shibboleths of free trade, clothed in modern terms, and about the resolutions of Geneva. Against that I put not only the words of Professor Sidgewick, but the words of Herr Stresemann when he was speaking at the League of Nations in connection with tariffs and allied matters. These words I commend to the Minister of Justice because they express at once the view that I think should be held by every man who is not prepared to sacrifice his love of country for any such shibboleth as internationalism or free trade throughout the world.

I am of the opinion that no nation which belongs to the League of Nations in any way renounces thereby its own national personality. The Divine Architect of the earth has not created mankind as a universal whole. He gave the nations different strains of blood. He gave them as the sanctuary of their soul their mother tongue.

We might say in Canada "their mother tongues." That is the answer to the speech he made, that is the answer to his appeal to the Geneva resolutions. Then the Prime Minister comes in and closes the debate for this nation, you might say; for the moment he assumes to speak for Canada. It is sufficent for the purpose that he has a majority behind him made up of men of diverse views and thought with respect to economic problems; but there is the majority. When he rose and spoke for this young nation what did he say? "Hush! Hush! Don't provoke them over there; they might do something to you; and don't you dare talk about preference with the mother country for you might provoke them worse still and they would become more angry with you than they otherwise might be."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend kindly give his authority for those words? I do not think he will find the word "hush" in anything I said.

Mr. BENNETT: These are his words, which will be found at page 1403 of Hansard for April 9, 1929:

An important measure, we are led to believe, is a measure relating to farm relief. Another measure relates to limited adjustments of the tariff; I think that is the expression which has been officially used. Having that knowledge before us, I ask hon. gentlemen irrespective of party: In the condition of prosperity which Canada is to-day enjoying would it be desirable on the part of the administration to take any action with respect to the tariff in Canada at the present time which could be regarded as provocative by those across the line who may be interested in seeking to raise the tariff in that country? I say that with the knowledge that we have before us at the present time, were we to do what hon. gentlemen opposite by their amendment apparently wish us to do, namely raise the tariff, we would be creating in the

minds of the American people the very sentiment which would cause them to raise their tariff higher perhaps than it was ever their intention to raise it. We do not intend to take any action of that provocative character.

May I say to my hon. friends opposite, in the other corner of the house, that were we to-day to take a step along the lines of increasing the British preference to a greater degree than exists at the present time that step also might be misconstrued, for we know that there are people on the other side of the line who are just as anxious to be trouble-makers as certain people on this side of the line, who are ready to misrepresent matters, and we have to take human nature as it is, and deal with it as it is. So facing the situation before us, we have followed the policy that we shall follow at all times and that we have followed in the past, of dealing with each situation as it arises in the light of the conditions as they exist at the time.

I am sure the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) must cheer lustily that statement, because it represents his view sufficiently—"Unto the day sufficient is the evil thereof." And the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) who has intimated that his stay amongst us may be all too short, doubtless cheers a sentiment of that kind, because it represents so well the policy of the Liberal party at the moment. That policy is, Don't provoke them!

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has not yet found the word "hush," has he?

Mr. BENNETT: He did not use the word "hush" He said it was a Hush! hush! policy. And that is what it is. Can any such policy be anything more than a Hush! hush! policy?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend's policy is a Hash! hash! policy.

Mr. BENNETT: That indicates the cleverness of the right hon. Prime Minister for which he is so famed throughout this country. A "Hash! hash!" policy he says. Well, I submit that it is better to have an affirmative policy of any kind than a negative policy. I say his policy is unfitting to the dignity of this country, and in that regard I ask him to read the Vancouver Sun, and especially I ask him to read the Toronto Globe. The latter paper says that the time has come when the government must consider this question.

Mr. FORKE: Or the Winnipeg platform.

Mr. BENNETT: I should think platforms would be the last thing the Minister of Immigration would ever want to talk about. Anyone who has ever read his utterances from this corner of the house on the tariff policy of the government would be surprised that he does not hang his head in shame to find himself to-day a minister of the crown in the present government. What does he think of the tariff policies of the government to-day? Has the leopard changed his spots?

Mr. FORKE: Will the leader of the opposition state what I have got to be ashamed of?

Mr. BENNETT: His observations made in this house on the government tariff policy.

Mr. FORKE: What were they?

Mr. BENNETT: Well, I can only say—

Mr. FORKE: You can make statements. But come through. You said they were statements to be ashamed of.

Mr. BENNETT: Undoubtedly.

Mr. FORKE: Tell me what I have to be ashamed of.

Mr. BENNETT: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. When one out of power and office makes declarations against the government of the day, declarations that are to be found in Hansard from 1921 to 1928, and then changes his policy and accepts office under the same Prime Minister whose policies he denounced—I say unless he has given some evidence and reasons other than his love of power, he should be ashamed.

Mr. FORKE: Will the leader of the opposition tell me wherein I have changed my policy?

An hon. MEMBER: How did you get there?

Mr. FORKE: All right. Come through with it. Let us have it. I am waiting to hear it.

Mr. BENNETT: I will say this to the hon. gentlemen. I doubt not that he had an inward desire to accomplish those reforms which he championed so loudly from this side of the house, but he has found his surroundings so impossible of improvement and reform that he has abandoned the task, and in a sunnier clime in another place he hopes to find that repose which is denied him here.

The next gentleman who spoke was the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler). He did not speak in this house; he went down to the Women's Liberal club in this city and said:

> The Canadian government will act in the interests of the people as a whole when the time is ripe for action, and though people are assuming that it is going to "turn the other cheek," it is just as logical to assume one course of action as another.

That is the nearest the hon. minister got to any policy or desire to serve this country

at the moment. But the government sent the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Cannon) to Windsor. He, speaking for the administration as all cabinet ministers do, was a little bolder down there. He said:

We face a serious problem with our neighbours. We are not looking for a fight, but we certainly will not run away from it. We will see to it that Canada is amply protected.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh!

Mr. BENNETT: The Solicitor General continues:

—the Liberal government has never shirked its responsibility.—At present they are not as good friends as they might be.—

Despite our embassy in Washington!

Canada must play between these great nations—

That is Great Britain and the United States.

—the part of a liaison because at the Geneva conferences Canada, it may be truly said, represents the American opinion.

"Represents American opinion"; If that is so we shall soon get a low tariff, shall we not? Now let us look at this statement. The hon. gentleman uses the word "fight". After the Kellogg pact, after we have decided to abolish war by asphyxiating gases, the Solicitor General uses the word "fight" down in Windsor; and he uses the word "protection". He says that the government of Canada will "protect" this country. Now there is protection for my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Glen).

Mr. GLEN: Not the kind you have enunciated.

Mr. BENNETT: Then if, by means of some method of television or otherwise, the hon. gentleman has been able to read into these words a meaning we do not suspect, the Solicitor General has deceived the people of Windsor.

Mr. GLEN: You know the answer to that.

Mr. BENNETT: I am only reading the language of the Solicitor General. He says: "We will see to it that Canada is amply protected; the Liberal government has never shirked its responsibility".

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): May I ask the leader of the opposition whether he has quoted all that the Solicitor General said with regard to protection in that instance, or what paper he has been reading from?—because there are different reports.

Mr. BENNETT: I have it from three papers and the despatch is the same in all: "C.P.", Canadian Press; and inasmuch as it was a Canadian Press despatch I thought I would take it rather than any other as a statement of what had taken place.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I know my hon. friend wants to be fair, and I may tell him that the despatch I read indicated that the Solicitor General had proceeded to say that Canada would protect the legitimate interests of all her people. He was not dealing with tariff protection.

Mr. BENNETT: I may say to the hon. member for Melfort, whose return we so heartily welcome—

Mr. McLEAN: He is pleased to be back.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He says he is pleased to come back.

Mr. BENNETT: There are five hundred reasons why he should be. The hon. gentleman has asked a reasonable question and in reply I may inform him that I have been quoting from a Canadian Press despatch. There were several despatches from private correspondents but I selected the Canadian Press despatch which appeared in all the large papers in Canada. I will show it to the hon. member at any time if he cares to see it. A more ample statement of the Solicitor General's observations appeared in one of the Liberal papers, but this is from the Canadian Press.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I was referring to a longer despatch which appeared in many of the papers.

Mr. BENNETT: Now that is the position of the government. Here we have the Minister of Finance making a slight and veiled threat. He says: be careful now, down there; we don't believe in high but low tariffs, but we will trade with people who trade with us. Then the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) gives the assurance that there is no reason to believe that the government will turn the other cheek—they may engage in some other form of entertainment. Then there is the Prime Minister, and later still the Solicitor General—gathering volume as they go until at length we have the use of the words "fight" and "protection". Now that is distinct progress, very considerable progress indeed. What else have we? We have in addition to that the assurance given to the fruit and vegetable growers of Canada last year, when a delegation waited upon the government, that in some way their interests would be protected. In 1922 this provision was incorporated in the statutes of Canada at the instance of a Liberal government.

If at any time it appears to the satisfaction of the governor in council, on a report from

the minister, that natural products of a class or kind produced in Canada are being imported into Canada, either on sale or on consignment, under such conditions as prejudicially or injuriously to affect the interests of Canadian producers, the governor in council may, in any case or class of cases, authorize the minister to value such goods for duty, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, and the value so determined shall be held to be the fair market value thereof.

Last session an endeavour was made to deal with the situation. The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) asked that this provision should be repealed, and a resolution was moved on May 8, 1928, on this side of the house, urging that necessary action should be taken by the government of Canada effectively to control the importation into Canada, either on sale or on consignment, of natural products not grown in this country. Notwithstanding this, the minister has intimated to the interests affected that they cannot be protected this year. But we have another indication of the attitude of the government. There is in this country an organization known as the Consumers' League, of which the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bothwell) is chairman, the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) is secretary, and the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) is one of the distinguished members. These hon. gentlemen have sent out, under frank of this house, ammunition or literature to various parts of Canada. Some of it is quite interesting inasmuch as it undertakes to teach the people of the United States how they should govern their country. I have no doubt the good people to the south of us will be greatly obliged and deeply obligated for the advice thus tendered them from Canada. For example, listen to the following which appears in the pamphlets which these hon. gentlemen have sent out:

> The Consumers' League has recently published an eight page article entitled, "The Principles of Free Trade". This article ought to be in the hands of every student of the problem.

Further:

> A protective tariff is simply a device by which the rich are made richer at the expense of the poor.

I ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to mark that. Then there is this statement:

> The Consumers' League of Canada is in favour of lower tariffs. Its contention is that the burden of the present tariff is greater than the benefits received.

Here, then, we have the Consumers' League, officered by members of parliament and supported by other members, of whom my hon. friend from Weyburn is, as I have said, one of the distinguished members, telling the people of the United States, in face of the present situation, that what we desire in Canada is a lower tariff.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member says "hear, hear." Very well; let us reconcile the views of this group of supporters of the administration. One says: Steady; don't provoke them; don't mention preference, or that will provoke them still further. Are those hon. gentlemen expressing the views held on the other side of the house when they take this stand? Another says: You have no reason to believe that we shall turn the other cheek. Then another says, "We will fight; we will protect Canada." Then come the hon. member for Swift Current, the hon. member for Humboldt and the hon. member for Weyburn, all declaring that what we want is a lower tariff—that is what we need in this country to-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, out of these it is proposed to fuse a party which will save Canada at the present time. But, Sir, not content with saving Canada, they are also bent upon saving our friends to the south of us. I quote again from an article by the Consumers' League entitled "Bunk to the American Farmer":

> Not since those happy halcyon days, when the man with the pea under the shell played cats and dogs with the pocket-book of the yokel at the country fair, has there been anything quite so artful as the save-the-farmer-if-it-costs-ten-cents-apiece plan of the Hoover tariff mandarins at Washington.
>
> "Mandarins", by the way, is an excellent word to describe the gentlemen who work the game. A "mandarin" is a Chinese official entitled to wear a button on his hat. Buttons on the hats of the members at Washington would help the farmers as much as the tariff suggestions of the ways and means committee, now planning at the American capital, new methods of exploitation, new ways of cracking the public crib.

So we have the Consumers' League saving the farmers of the United States, calling their legislation "bunk," and at the same time declaring that we in Canada must have lower tariffs—in order that the Americans may sell more goods in this country. I wonder who subsidizes this league: the Canadian farmers or the American manufacturers? I asked myself that question when I read this statement I have just quoted—I do not know whether the hon. member for Weyburn has seen it.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): We don't get a cent from the United States.

Mr. BENNETT: I am glad to hear that. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, you will recall the

words of Richard Cobden, that capital shrinks instinctively from insecurity of tenure. It may surprise some hon. members opposite that from a bulletin issued by the Minister of Trade and Commerce it appears that this country is exporting capital; in other words, this new country, which, according to all the statements that have been made, requires large sums of money to develop its resources, finds it necessary to export capital because of the conditions that now prevail in Canada. The statement made by the statistician of the department is that during the last year for which we have a record, 1927, these exports amounted to $81,000,000; and in the meantime the adverse balance of Canadian trade is increasing. I ask the Minister of Finance this question: Did you, year after year, stand up and say to the Canadian people that the so-called favourable balance of trade was an indication of great prosperity? Did you tell them that when the exports exceeded the imports it was an indication of prosperity? I find your record here in Hansard, and that was one particular point upon which you laid great stress. Then what of to-day? If it was a sign of prosperity in the years that have gone by, when the opposite is the fact it must be a sign of depression, must it not? Otherwise you have deceived the Canadian people in the statements you have made in the past. It must be one or the other; there is no halfway position. Listen to these figures; in January of this year we imported $2,034,444 worth of goods more than we sold; in February we bought $4,782,710 worth more than we sold; in March we bought $20,565,548 more than we sold and in April, $31,789,608; in other words, in these four months there was an adverse trade balance of $59,172,310, increasing monthly from $2,000,000 to nearly $32,000,000. When the opposite condition prevailed the minister told us that was prosperity; now what about it? Is the converse true, or is it not? If it is not true someone has been deceived, because these are the figures produced by this government, and they indicate all too well what is now happening in this country.

Once more I would like to ask the government, when they talk about prosperity, to tell us what they have done to increase the selling power of this country. It was the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia which had to do with forest products, over which this government has no control; it was the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba which produced our wealth of cereals and grain. So much is that the case that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in answer to my question the other day, said he could give no assistance in the selling of contract goods such as wheat and other grain, nor could he assist in the selling of newsprint and forest products, yet those items alone made up nearly half the entire exports of this Dominion last year. This government claims credit for prosperity and that claim was based on our exports, but the production of these exports rests with the provinces; if this government has any claim with respect to prosperity that claim must be based on our imports, over which they have control and over which they may exercise supervision. There are the figures of the visible adverse trade balance during the last four months, and I ask the Minister of Finance to say frankly to the people of this country that we have here clear and plain indication of what is transpiring in Canada to-day.

Those are the conditions confronting us; what shall we do? Will the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) go down and tell the farmers of Quebec, "My dear friends, it is true we are shut out of the markets of the United States by a hostile and adverse tariff, but we have taken the tax off Pullman car tickets." Is that the way in which these matters are to be dealt with? Perhaps my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Sinclair) will go back to the potato growers of Prince Edward Island and tell them that the United States proposes to raise the tariff on potatoes from 50 to 75 cents per hundred pounds, then say, "Oh, that is nothing; we have taken the tax off telegrams." Is that what will be done? There is only one way in which this matter can be dealt with by the people of this country, and that is the way suggested by the Toronto Globe and approved by every thoughtful man in this country, namely by seeing to it that Canadians developing the vast resources of Canada shall have an equal opportunity and shall meet fair competition with the rest of the world. If they are given that opportunity they can meet the competition which may be offered anywhere.

How can this be done? It may be done by tariffs; it may be done by excise taxes, by drawbacks, by bounties or by preferences; all these are available to the government. There is some talk of an extra session of parliament. We who sit here have declared that we are ready and willing, and have been ready and willing since the very inception of this menace to our economic life, to remain here so long as may be necessary in order that Canada may make it clear to all the world that we are hewers of wood and drawers of water for no nation, that we will develop our

own resources and that no one may with impunity strike a blow at the economic life of this country, aimed directly at prohibiting our having access to the markets of the great republic, without our taking notice of that fact. We seek no retaliation; that is not the policy of any party in this country. The policy of this party, which has been declared from time immemorial, is a policy of developing Canada for Canadians, a policy which seeks to make this Dominion a country of homes, to give employment to men and women in order that they may be able to live their lives and develop and work out their destinies in the country in which they were born, rather than seek under an alien flag and in a strange land those opportunities which are denied them at home. This party to the left of the Speaker never will be content so long as 75,000, 100,000 or 200,000 Canadians are annually compelled to leave this country because they are denied the opportunity for self-expression here. We will not be content while that condition prevails, and we say now that anything we can do that will contribute to a policy which will make it certain that this country has a mission and a destiny on this continent will be done. Our integrity cannot be invaded; we must work out our destiny as a free people and end an economic slavery that comes from being dependent upon people in another land for the very necessities of life. We care not where those necessities be found, whether they are within the British Empire or somewhere else; when we find a great basic industry which is being destroyed by the policies of the government, it is our duty to see to it that that condition no longer prevails.

That is the attitude we take with respect to these problems, and to the support of that attitude we invite all lovers of Canada, all men and women who believe in their country, as I believe in it, as distinguished from those who believe in internationalism, all those who love Canada as a nation and a people and who believe that if we would only do what I suggested in the opening days of this session, that is, call here at Ottawa an economic conference of the British Empire, we could work out, not by blanket preferences which have brought such disaster to this country but by a consideration of the production of the various parts of the British Empire, a scheme of preferences which will do good to all and harm to none. Then there would be no New Zealand treaty by order in council, working a benefit to New Zealand for the moment and a detriment to the dairy industry of this country. That is the policy and the duty of this party. While at times we may meet with evidences of the appeals made to men of divers opinions and economic views to join together for the purpose of retaining place and power, there will come a time—it always comes—when the people of this country will waken from their dreams and, realizing their dangers, will turn again to the party which has given them the only steady policy ever given with respect to the future of this country and this empire and its place amongst the peoples of the world, which has laid the foundations for the economic life of this country and, please God, will endeavour, so far as it lies within its power to see that that life is maintained against the peril which now threatens it.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to delay on going into supply and proceeding with the business of the house and I regret, as I am sure the house regrets, that the budget speech of my hon. friend has been delayed until the last days of the session. As I listened to the eloquent arguments of my hon. friend the leader of the Conservative party I observed what a wonderful change has taken place in the attitude of mind of this great party from the days when their slogan was "No truck nor trade with the Yankee." To-day the whole complaint is that the people of the United States, rightly or wrongly, down in Washington where the weather is hot, are debating to what greater extent they are going to tax the women and the children who are crying for bread and butter and milk and cream. I am sure that the argument which my hon. friend has presented to-day will be read with delight by those in Washington who are urging a policy which will compel the workers in the United States to pay more for their milk, their cream, their butter and their bread. It seems to be impossible to please the Conservative party. I recall meeting a very good personal friend in Winnipeg last fall, a former member of parliament, and one who understood the cattle business fairly well and his one complaint to me was that the Americans were coming over here and paying too much for our cattle. He complained that they were taking our cattle away by paying too high a price. I cannot help comparing that attitude with the attitude taken by another good friend whom I met recently in the eastern townships. He told me, as my hon. friend has stated to-day, that the people of the United States were coming here and buying cattle and paying very high prices for milch cows. I asked him how it would affect his business and he replied that if

they wanted to milk the cows, we would raise them. That is the attitude which was taken by a dairy farmer.

One part of my hon. friend's speech was preaching blue ruin, while the other part was an explanation of our existing prosperity. My hon. friend complained that this government had been asleep at the switch after the action which was taken by the government of the United States in 1922. Canada should not be complaining about the tariff policy adopted by the United States. Had they followed the same policy which has been followed in this country we would not have heard the kind of speeches which were uttered during the last presidential campaign. My hon. friend admits that we have prosperity, but he claims it is the wrong kind. Did any member of either party in the last presidential campaign admit that they had prosperity in that country? The cry of blue ruin was raised by all parties and they stressed the necessity of doing something to bring about prosperity.

My hon. friend has discussed at some length our trade with only one country, but Canada to-day is dealing with the world. The United States can adjust their fiscal policy to suit themselves, and if they want to pay more for the milk and cream produced by Canadian farmers; if they want to tax their people more for food commodities, that is their business. If they think that 40 cents per bushel duty on wheat is not high enough and want to put it up to 75 cents or $1 per bushel, that is their business; they can put it up as high as they like.

Mr. BENNETT: That was Italy.

Mr. ROBB: The United States have had a duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat.

Mr. BENNETT: Not 75 cents per bushel.

Mr. ROBB: Our busines is to adjust our trade to suit Canadians and to help Canadians. What have we been doing in this regard?

An hon. MEMBER: Allowing Americans to milk our cows.

Mr. ROBB: I do not propose to delay the house at any great length, but I would like to give some trade figures commencing with the year 1922, which is the point at which my hon. friend started. In 1922 Canada had treaty agreements with fourteen countries, and in that particular year we had a favourable balance of trade of $6,000,000. At the present time we have treaty agreements with forty-three countries. In 1922 we exported to those fourteen treaty countries goods to the value of $75,000,000, while our exports in 1929 to the forty-three treaty countries amounted to over $220,000,000. Our imports in 1922 from the fourteen treaty countries amounted to $45,000,000, while our imports in 1929 from the forty-three treaty countries amounted to over $103,000,000. We had a favourable trade balance in 1922 with these treaty countries amounting to $30,000,000, while in 1929 that favourable trade balance had increased to over $117,000,000.

My hon. friend has complained of our trade with the United States, but where would he start to check that trade? It is quite easy to talk in generalities but let us get down to the hard facts. Where would my hon. friend start? I am no more satisfied with our present trade arrangements with the United States than anyone else; I would like to have them improved and better our trading conditions, but they have the same rights at Washington as we have here in Ottawa. I will repeat what was said at the time the budget was delivered; that in the light of events we will take care of Canadian trade in the future as we have taken care of it in the past, and we will fix our tariff to suit Canadians and not to take care of any other part of the world. Supposing my hon. friend were in office, what would be his policy? It is true that he has promised he would have an economic conference with the people of the British Empire, but what for? What did he say to those gentlemen when he was welcoming them here to Ottawa? Did he say to the people of Australia and New Zealand, "We are ready to sell you everything which you need, but we cannot buy anything from you"?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No butter, anyway.

Mr. ROBB: We have had a favourable trade balance throughout the British Empire, and we believe that we can improve that. I do not know that I should delay the house any longer. My hon. friend has largely rehashed the debate which we had upon the budget. When he quoted the importations and trade figures with other countries he was very careful not to go into details as to where he would stop trading. Until my hon. friend can be more definite as to his policy, it seems to me that we might very well proceed with the business of the house and vote the necessary supply to carry on the business of this country.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Department of Agriculture—Experimental farms, including necessary new buildings, $2,050,000.

Mr. MANION: I wish to say a few words on this item and if the chairman would not mind calling it one o'clock, I shall speak after recess. I will take only a few minutes.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. MANION: Just as the committee rose at one o'clock and we went into the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, I was about to say a few words regarding the possibility of establishing an experimental farm station at the head of the lakes or somewhere in that neighbourhood. According to a return that was furnished to me sometime ago there are twenty-two experimental stations in the Dominion of Canada, and I intend to put them on record in Hansard for future reference:

Experimental station, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.
Experimental station, Kentville, Nova Scotia.
Experimental farm, Nappan, Nova Scotia.
Experimental station, Fredericton, New Brunswick.
Experimental station, Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Quebec.
Experimental station, Cap Rouge, Quebec.
Experimental station, Lennoxville, Quebec.
Experimental station, La Ferme, Quebec.
Experimental station, Kapuskasing, Ontario.
Experimental farm, Ottawa, Ontario.
Experimental station, Morden, Manitoba.
Experimental farm, Brandon, Manitoba.
Experimental farm, Indian Head, Saskatchewan.
Experimental station, Rosthern, Saskatchewan.
Experimental station, Scott, Saskatchewan.
Experimental station, Swift Current, Saskatchewan.
Experimental station, Lethbridge, Alberta.
Experimental station, Lacombe, Alberta.
Experimental station, Summerland, British Columbia.
Experimental farm, Agassiz, British Columbia.
Experimental station, Invermere, British Columbia.
Experimental station, Sidney, British Columbia.
Experimental substation, Beaverlodge, Alberta.
Tobacco station, Farnham, Quebec.
Tobacco station, L'Assomption, Quebec.
Tobacco station, Harrow, Ontario.
Experimental Fox Ranch, Summerside, Prince Edward Island.

Of the twenty-six experimental stations there are only two in the province of Ontario, one this well-known and beautiful farm at Ottawa, and the other at Kapuskasing. From Kapuskasing we jump to Morden, Manitoba, a distance of about seven or eight hundred miles, without an experimental station. I would point out to the Minister of Agriculture, as I pointed out to the Minister of Public Works when his estimates were up, that there is a real reason for having an experimental farm station some place between Kapuskasing on the east and Morden, Manitoba, on the west. Northern Ontario comprises an immense area, as large as Germany and Great Britain put together, and with the exception of the experimental station at Kapuskasing, at the extreme eastern end of that section, there is no experimental station in all that area. I do not need to point out to the minister, who is familiar with that section, that those farmers who have taken up these bush lands in northern Ontario and are hewing out homes for themselves have a very difficult time. I think it would be a very good gesture on the part of this government and be very helpful to the farmers in that vast section of country, an empire in itself, if an experimental farm station were to be established somewhere between Kapuskasing in Ontario and Morden in Manitoba. A very natural place to locate it would be at the head of the lakes, either at Fort William or Port Arthur. An experimental station at either of these points would serve a large territory comprising very fine agricultural land, which is settled by a very fine group of farmers, who have gone in there in the last twenty or twenty-five years, and who deserve any assistance they can get. I do not wish to take up further time at this stage, but I do wish very sincerely and in a non-political way to impress upon the minister and upon the government the need of establishing something in the way of an experimental farm in that section. About two months ago I received a resolution, as no doubt did the Minister of Agriculture and the government, from some of the farming communities at the head of the lakes asking for an experimental farm in that section, and I appeal to the minister in fairness to that part of the country to give this request favourable consideration. Particularly I appeal on the ground that looking over this list of experimental stations starting from Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and going clear through to British Columbia, there is no space I should judge of more than about two hundred miles without an experimental farm except lying between Kapuskasing and Morden, Manitoba, a distance of about seven or

eight hundred miles. I therefore would urge very seriously upon the minister and the government the necessity for considering establishing an experimental farm at the head of the lakes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The tributes that have been paid to the usefulness of these experimental stations by my hon. friend and others are very gratifying. It will be recalled that when this government first took power in 1922, times were pretty hard and it was difficult to get our estimates increased as we would have liked to increase them. That applied to all departments. We were trying to retrench. There was a feeling throughout the country against further expenditures. That has entirely disappeared so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned because the real value of these experimental stations is becoming more and more appreciated every year.

When I first took charge of the department I felt that it was incumbent upon me, and I so advised my colleagues, before we started in to establish new experimental stations, to endeavour to put the present ones in good shape, better equipped, and in some cases enlarge the farms. That is the position we have taken up to the present.

There are three places throughout Canada —I do not know that Fort William is one of them—that were examined before I had the honour of taking over this work, with a view to establishing an experimental station, and I believe that some hope was held out. I understand that in those three the Fort William district was included. Another one was in that vast area, the Bulkley valley extending from Fort George to Prince Rupert. I took a trip through that vast country myself and was impressed with its enormous possibilities. Later I find that there was some investigational work done in connection with the Swan River country in northern Manitoba where there are heavy fat black soil lands that require some work of this nature to get the best out of them. I am informed by my deputy that Fort William was another place in prospect. But we have kept them all waiting in the meantime, hoping to get in ship-shape the farms at present established, and I think that that policy has been justified in the main by the better results from the twenty-three farms now established. It is better to have a comparatively small number of farms in good shape for efficient work than a large number not in good shape. We have, however, in the meantime been pursuing a policy of establishing a considerable number of small illustration stations, where with the cooperation of some enterprising local farmer of an experimental turn of mind a plot of say forty acres is worked under the supervision of an officer of the department. That has proved very popular. It requires no capital investment and displays in a miniature way the work that is being done on the experimental farms, and it brings the work home to the farmers of the district. We have now over two hundred of these small demonstration plots. Some people think that they are a little bit too small to be worth while, but they have done very valuable service. In some places that takes care of the local need for a fully fledged farm. I feel that that policy could yet be pursued a little while longer.

A part of the increase in the vote this year is due to the enlargement of the Morden farm, which we have doubled in size this spring. We are now in occupation of that farm, which is a very useful one, consisting of half a section in southern Manitoba. As I say, we have doubled the size of that farm, and in view of the development of the fruit industry, apples and other fruits, in that part of Manitoba I think it will be found to be none too large. We have also added to the farm at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Quebec, and further expenditures will be required to meet enlargements to the central farm at Ottawa and to provide for further buildings, horticultural buildings and such like, necessitated by the larger operations. At the same time I am friendly disposed towards the establishment of an experimental farm in the vicinity of Fort William, and also in northern Manitoba and in the area between Fort George and Prince Rupert in British Columbia. Those would seem to be the most urgent when we do begin to establish new experimental farms.

Mr. MANION: I am very glad to have the minister declare that he is giving consideration to the matter. If he will permit me to say so, I think the appointed time to act is now. I suggest that particularly in view of the fact that if the minister does not move fairly rapidly in establishing this farm, the next government will have to do it for him, and in future years I should very much like to be able to give credit to the minister in this connection. So I hope he will hurry along.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Thank you.

Mr. TUMMON: Recently it has been announced that property has been purchased in the city of Belleville for the establishment

of an entomological branch of the Department of Agriculture. Does the money necessary for that come under this item? If so, will the minister state what it is proposed to carry on there?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, that comes under the heading of the entomological vote.

Mr. FRASER: I want to enter a plea with the minister for another experimental farm. He has mentioned the area from Telkwa, in the Bulkley valley to Prince George as being a very likely district in which to establish a farm some time in the future. I want to draw his attention to the area in British Columbia which lies south of the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I can start him in as a matter of fact at the southern boundary of British Columbia and take him up through the central valleys for a distance of some four hundred and fifty miles. I would particularly direct the minister's attention to the fact that this is one of the largest areas for livestock production in the Dominion. In this area we have, I should say, about 100,000 cattle. We turn off every year about 20,000 head at an average of $100 a head. The minister will see that this must mean a very considerable production. The federal government has never done anything in any shape or form to assist livestock production in that area. I am told by the provincial district agriculturist in the neighbourhood that there is a loss to the cattlemen of 1,000 head per annum from preventable diseases. These diseases are not understood by the stock men. It requires a man with special technical knowledge to investigate these diseases in order to discover proper remedies to prevent this heavy annual loss. I submit that that is the duty of the federal Department of Agriculture, and that it should provide the necessary service for the stock men.

I am asking for consideration by the minister of the establishment of this experimental farm for another reason. In that area the percentage of pure bred sires and dams is very small. This is simply because the stock men have to go thousands of miles in order to secure pure bred stock, and it is impossible for the small stock man to incur this heavy expense. I think a farm should be established there for the purpose of providing foundation stock for the whole area.

In addition to the livestock business we have very extensive areas in which a large amount of grain is produced, and an experimental farm as well as providing a service for the livestock men would also provide a very much needed service for the producers of all kinds of grain. In this connection I want the minister to take into consideration this other fact. There is no question about the market for the stock which may be raised in that area. The beef production can easily be doubled if the increase is brought about in a systematic way. Not only that, but we have in that area only about 6,000 head of sheep. This can be increased at least a hundredfold if proper methods are taken for securing suitable kinds of stock, and if a certain amount of supervision is exercised over those who are desirous to take up this branch of stock raising. Very few swine are raised in this area. The conditions are ideal for the production of all kinds of livestock, and I submit that in making a request to the minister to have this area thoroughly investigated I am not asking anything that is at all unreasonable. True, the northern district is important, but it is a small area in comparison with the one which I am dealing with. In other words, it is four or five hundred miles from north to south and from two hundred to two hundred and fifty miles from east to west. Within those limits there is an immense area of pastoral land admirably suited for the production of all kinds of livestock.

Let me repeat. At the present time the federal Department of Agriculture has done absolutely nothing in any shape or form to assist the stock men in that area. With all deference to the minister and the government, I think it is pretty nearly time that the department gave some attention to an area which has such wonderful potentialities. To-day in British Columbia, we are producing only about one-half of the meat consumed in the city of Vancouver. Let me remind the minister that with the rapid development of that city it is no stretch of the imagination to forecast that in the next ten or fifteen years its present population of about 325,000 will have increased to a million. With that market available I think it is high time that the minister took into serious consideration the question of making a real and comprehensive survey of the whole situation throughout that area. I do not want to labour the question any longer because I am sure that when the minister understands the conditions thoroughly he will give the matter his very serious consideration. But I should be very glad indeed to hear him give some word of encouragement to the people in that district in regard to the establishment of this experimental farm.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: A great part of my hon. friend's remarks, which were perfectly proper, would come more appropriately under the live stock vote, in connection with which I shall have a statement to make; a part of what he has said relates also to the health of animals branch regarding the diseases of animals.

Mr. FRASER: I do not agree with the minister. I am discussing experimental farms, which include live stock, grain and various other things.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend spoke of the large losses sustained in the live stock world as the result of certain diseases.

Mr. FRASER: Preventable diseases.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would point out to my hon. friend that only certain diseases come within the scope of the federal department, such as glanders, bovine tuberculosis, rabies, hog cholera and mange; these are pretty nearly the only diseases that come under this department. If my hon. friend will let me know whether any of these diseases are responsible for the great loss to which he has referred I shall be glad to have the matter looked into. The major portion of his remarks have reference to the need of experimental farms in the vast empire extending from the international boundary up to Fort George. We have four experimental farms in British Columbia besides the illustration stations, and when the time comes we shall have five including the Bulkley valley country. That will be the maximum to be found even in the older provinces. Of course, that should not debar British Columbia from having still more, because her physical features are of such a character that one farm will not of necessity serve as large an area as it would elsewhere; and the conditions are so diversified and numerous that I suppose I myself could put up an argument for more farms in that province. But we must have a reasonable regard for the number of experimental farms in each province. For example, there are only two in Manitoba, and no doubt there is reason why it might be argued that there should be another one in the northern part of that province. Alberta has only two full fledged experimental farms, although there are two very important substations up in the Peace River. My hon. friend's claim may be considered in due course but we shall have to have a good deal more money before we establish new farms throughout the country. particularly when there are so many not yet properly equipped.

Mr. FRASER: In my opinion, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba might be regarded as comprising one area; the conditions throughout those provinces are pretty much the same. And the minister has admitted that he has nine farms in that area. He has also admitted that the conditions in connection with experimental farms throughout British Columbia are so diversified as to entitle the province to a great number of farms. With all deference to the minister, I submit that the three prairie provinces together might be compared with the province of British Columbia in this regard; if we had as many experimental farms in British Columbia as there are in the three prairie provinces, British Columbia would not be better served than those provinces are at the present time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What my hon. friend says is worth considering.

Mr. FRASER: Can I not get some definite indication from the minister? He has not told me anything; he has not given any promises—he is extremely careful in that respect. Can I not get some indication that he will make a survey of the situation?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes; we will look into it and if we find towards the end of the year, or well on in the year, that by strict economy we have a little money left over, we shall be more disposed to give heed not only to the representations of my hon. friend but to the other claims to which I referred a few moments ago.

Mr. FRASER: Do I understand from the minister, then, that if he has a little money left over later in the year he will send a man to investigate?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think I can safely say that we can send a man into any of those territories to make further investigation.

Mr. FRASER: That is a little better.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: But I should like to know at first hand something more about the matter.

Mr. FRASER: The minister need not take my word for it; let him send his technical officials to make a comprehensive survey of the situation to see whether what I have told him is not absolutely correct.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is not that I doubt my hon. friend, but there is a good deal of other information that might be gathered at the same time.

Mr. FRASER: Surely; and let me make this observation to the minister while I am on the subject. I think his officials could get a large amount of very useful information from the provincial Department of Agriculture, and the two departments working together ought to be able to show that what I have been trying to convince the minister of is absolutely correct.

Mr. BRADETTE: I can understand the earnestness with which the hon. member for Fort William made his plea for an experimental farm in the section of the province of Ontario for which he spoke, because I have reason to know the great benefit which the Kapuskasing experimental farm in my part of the country has been to the farmers. Our people are making application for an increase of at least $10,000 in the grant to that farm. We always think of northern Ontario in terms of mining or of lumbering; but it is also a well-known fact that in that part of the province we have one of the finest sections for colonization and for purposes of cultivation. It is well known that the forestry branch in Ontario is spending nearly one million dollars in preventive work to safeguard our forests from the fire danger. And so far as the mining industry is concerned, large sums are being spent in several sections in the way of experimentation. The Kapuskasing farm is doing wonderful work among the settlers, encouraging them in experimenting with new kinds of grain which mature earlier than in other sections of Ontario and Quebec by reason of the fact that the season is shorter. This farm has a total area of 1,270 acres. From this area, about 300 acres are under stump pasture and 650 acres under cultivation. From this last amount over 200 acres are under experimental work and those who know what work is associated with such a large field of experimentation will have an idea of the cost of operation.

The labour conditions in the northern section of northern Ontario are such that we have to pay very high wages. The climatic conditions and the short seasons make it necessary to do the work as rapidly as possible, which in many cases increases the expense.

The appropriation for this station last year was $45,759. It will take, roughly $41,500 for salaries and wages only, leaving less than $5,000 for purchases and improvements. When we take from this amount the cost of supplies and feeding stuffs, it does not leave any for improvements and extension work. However, there is a big need for expansion and certain improvements. For instance, a better drainage system should be established on parts of the farm, which would increase the yield of crops and facilitate the working of the land. The roads should be fixed so as to facilitate the haulage of crops; better facilities should be arranged to clean the grain for the settlers at cost, and assist them in that way in sowing clean seed; and more pure-bred live stock and poultry should be kept to enable the settlers to procure foundation stock at reasonable prices. Last year Alaska oats was introduced to the settlers by that farm. This is a variety that is sure to mature in that district, and as it is very satisfactory the demand is so great that they will not be able to supply more than 10 per cent of what is required. This means that it may take several years before the settlers can be supplied with that seed. The demand has been so great that at least fifty thousand bushels could have been sold in this district last year.

Then there is a great deal of land which has been burned over and on which second growth poplar is growing. If we delay this work a few years more it will mean that the cost of clearing this land will be two or three times as great as it would be if the work were done now. If a comparison should be made between the different farms as to the acreage, the climatic conditions, the wages paid and the amount provided by the government it would be seen that this station is not getting its proper share, and I hope the minister will take the matter into consideration as soon as possible.

In 1925 some complaints were made in connection with that farm; a great deal of heavy construction was being done by the Spruce Falls Company at Kapuskasing, and I heard that the experimental farm horses were being used by the company. I made a personal inquiry into the matter and found that the company wanted a certain kind of heavy draft horse which could be supplied only by the experimental farm, so the complaints were not really serious. However, I found also that the superintendent, who is a man well known throughout northern Ontario, a great friend of the northland, appreciated by everyone, a very capable administrator, a man who puts his heart and soul in his work, had to carry an overdraft in his own name amounting to at least $5,000 or $6,000 every year, and I do not think it right that any employee of the government should on his own responsibility be compelled to provide such a large amount of money for governmental work.

I desire to make this plea very earnestly; millions of dollars have been spent in experimental work in connection with mining and forestry, and I am firmly convinced that the house will support an increase of at least $10,000 in the estimates for the farm at Kapuskasing. Just to mention one point which requires consideration, hon. members may be aware that when trees are brought up from the southern part of the province they do not get on very well; they are not adapted to the northern country. I believe there is a good deal of work to be done in that connection, and this could be carried on at the farm. So I hope the Minister of Agriculture will see his way clear to increase the estimate for the Kapuskasing experimental farm by at least $10,000, and I feel confident that if he does he will receive the wholehearted support of the entire representation in the house.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This farm at Kapuskasing was established during the war, largely to demonstrate the agricultural possibilities of that great clay belt along the line of the Canadian National railway. It happens that while this farm is easy of access it is the only farm in the Dominion which I have not visited; I have been so delighted with the look of it from the train that perhaps I have passed it over for that reason. You know, once you get on a railway train you want to get to your destination as quickly as possible, but I think I can promise my hon. friend that I will stop off at this farm sometime during the coming summer, and if circumstances seem to warrant it we will see if we cannot provide more than $46,000 for that work. However, my hon. friend's suggestion that $10,000 is necessary properly to equip that farm is an argument in favour of out general policy of putting the existing farms in better shape before establishing new ones.

Mr. EVANS: Our expenditure on experimental farms seems to increase year by year, but I am not sure that our agricultural industry has been improved in any way. The fact is that we are using up our resources of soil and fertility, and the farmer is not able even to get credit at the bank in order to carry him through his working season. The fact is that the man on the land who is farming in a small way is not able to make it go, and our experimental work does not seem to touch that man or make life easier for him in any way. Unless a man is a capitalist and spends a good deal of money on his farm he cannot make it pay; he must have modern machinery and live stock and everything else in connection with a big farm. The man who is on the land to make his home through his own efforts is gradually squeezed off, and somehow our experimental farm work does not help him.

This is a condition of affairs which I should like to see remedied. There is no doubt that this morning the leader of the opposition was quite right in his description of agriculture, but the remedy he suggests is quite wrong; he wants a still bigger dose of the poison which has ruined the whole system of agriculture already. We must get closer to the man on the land and allow him to settle there and make his home through his own efforts. It is not a case of providing city conditions for young people on the farms; it is a case of making the farm pay.

How is that to be done? I hope the minister has thought it out. If he possibly can, the farmer will improve his land, but he is up against the big factor of inadequate returns for his labour, and we are forever making more distinct the dividing line between the capitalist and the worker; we are bringing our people to the servitude of wage earners instead of the freedom of home builders. I will leave that point for the minister to consider.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend is a practical farmer himself and I would be very glad to sit at his or anyone else's feet in order to learn how better to apply the work of these farms to the individual. We have the publicity branch, with which we will deal later, sending out bulletins containing information as to what is done on these farms, and I am sure my hon. friend will agree that since our chief occupation in the west so far has been the growing of cereals, incalculable benefit has been done every individual in the west through the new varieties of wheat which have been propagated here at the central farm and distributed throughout the west. I think a review of these matters will convince him of that fact.

It always has been the case, and I presume it always will be so, that there are certain farmers not doing very well, but there is real cause for complaint when the majority of the farmers are not doing as well as they might. I do not want to go into the economics of this question on a vote of this nature, but if my hon. friend or anyone else will show me how these farms can be made to touch the lives of the individual farmers to a greater extent than is the case now I shall be glad to have that information, because I have often wondered if that could not be done. What

further media, what further facilities can we use to get right home to the individual? Unfortunately, very frequently the man who needs these things most is the least desirous of securing them, while the man who needs them least is on the alert and secures all the information available as new ideas are brought forward. I would be delighted to have anyone who is engaged in agriculture suggest how these farms can be improved; there is no question as to their value, and I do not think any country in the world has a better system of experimental farms than we have in Canada. If the information does not get home to the individuals I am open to any suggestions as to how it can be put across.

Mr. SPENCER: I appreciate that the experimental farms which are being carried on throughout the Dominion are providing very valuable information, and also that one cannot expect them to pay their way, but in view of the great interest shown by the farmers and the difficulty many of them have in visiting these experimental farms, I think something should be done in the way of running excursions to enable farmers to visit them.

A suggestion was made by the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Evans) and the minister asked for suggestions along this line, as to a possible way of demonstrating the fact that farming can be made to pay. I think it would be a very excellent thing to establish demonstration farms in every province of the Dominion. Accurate accounts could be kept but the farms should be conducted on a scale of living comparable with the ordinary farmer's. It could be clearly established whether or not farming would pay in a particular locality, and if it was found that farming would not pay then the government would have no right to put out propaganda through the Minister of Immigration in an effort to induce people to come into those particular areas to settle upon the land.

The minister stated that there were about two hundred demonstration plots in the Dominion. Is there any other cost connected with these plots except the $5 per acre rental? What would be the cost of starting a new experimental farm, and what is the average cost of running such a farm?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The majority of these plots are on a rental basis of $5 per acre for a forty acre tract. In some districts it is impossible to get forty acres, and then we are forced to work on a different basis. The hon. member mentioned excursions to these farms. I can remember that twenty or twenty-five years ago the most popular events of the summer were excursions to the older farms like Indian Head and Brandon. It was necessary to guarantee that a certain number of passengers would be carried on those excursion trains, and if the day turned out to be a bad one at times the trains would be only half filled and we were forced to pay the deficit. After fifteen or twenty years it was found that this interest died out, although it is reviving. In some of the older districts there is a new interest in diversification, the growing of more grasses and clover, more seeding down, and such matters, and we are beginning to find that these excursions are regaining popularity. The excursions to the Scott farm are particularly popular, and if we can get the provincial governments to cooperate with us and assume some of the responsibilities in the event of it being a bad day, we feel that the number of these excursions can be increased. When a farmer visits one of these farms and is able to see with his own eyes just what is being done, he tries to apply those things to his own individual case, and I think we are reaching the time when more and more farmers will come in contact with these farms.

The hon. member asked the cost of starting a new farm. We started a tobacco station last year at L'Assomption, and the initial cost was about $30,000. To establish a live stock farm would cost between $40,000 and $50,000, depending upon the area and the price per acre for farm land.

Mr. SPENCER: What would be the annual cost?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: From about $30,000 to $50,000 depending upon the size.

Mr. SPENCER: It costs nearly as much to keep it going as it does to establish it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If you install full equipment and machinery and buildings, of course it costs more. As a rule, we are putting on new equipment all the time as the work is extended; there is a little capital outlay being made all the time which goes in with the annual cost of administration.

Mr. SPENCER: I am quite aware of the fact that the work being carried on at these farms is of an experimental nature and that the cost is more or less enhanced, but the minister did not reply to my suggestion that it might be a very good thing to establish some demonstration farms upon the same standard as the surrounding farms.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know how that could be done if it were necessary to put on all the frills which are demanded by the public in relation to a government farm.

Mr. SPENCER: I would suggest that there be no frills at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If it is run as an ordinary farm without any regard for public sentiment, perhaps it could be done. The public exact certain conditions in connection with government farms, and to carry those out takes away all possible profit. If it is a farm run by an individual who has some knowledge of farm management, and who is reasonably young, vigorous and healthy, he should certainly be able to make it pay.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the minister will think that it is utter nonsense for an advocate like myself to talk about farming, but I happen to have a farm of my own. I have been reading the reports issued by the experimental farms, and although I can understand ordinary technical language I venture to say that these reports have no educational value whatever to the average country farmer. As for helping the farmer, I think the publication of these reports is a useless expense. I would suggest to the minister that it would be a great help to the farmer if the department would prepare and send out these reports worded so that he could understand just what is being done at these experimental farms. But the information is not brought home to the mind of the ordinary farmer, and a great reform is necessary in that respect. I do not wish to elaborate, but I think the hon. gentleman is wasting a good part of his time and a considerable amount of the public money in the way in which he is conducting his department which should be of educational value to the ordinary farmer.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I shall be delighted if my hon. friend will particularize, because I do not think I am wasting, and I have no desire to waste, the public money.

Mr. CAHAN: To take one instance, the reports of the experimental farms are not issued in language that is comprehensible to the ordinary farmer in the country districts of the province, for example, where I reside, so that those reports are of no educational value to those farmers and that expenditure is wasted. By a proper use of the officials of his department, those reports might all be sent out in a simplified form so that they would be comprehended by the ordinary farmer and prove of considerable educational value to him.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend has reference to the annual report which is used for distribution and for filing purposes.

Mr. CAHAN: I am referring to the reports of the experimental farms.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: From time to time we send out bulletins and leaflets dealing with farm work, particularly under the headings of "Seasonable Hints." These we send out four times a year. They are seasonable hints prepared by the superintendents of the various farms. In this way the farmers get four times a year a brief review of what is going on. I have received a good many compliments and favourable comments in connection with these little bulletins, because the message is a short one that can be read quickly and does not terrify a man as if he had to sit down and read such a formidable report as that to which my hon. friend refers. I will read over the reports in the light of my hon. friend's criticism and see whether there is any warrant for it. There is a bulletin summarizing the work in a popular form.

Mr. CAHAN: For my own information I obtained from the Department of Agriculture at Washington a series of simple pamphlets on dairy production, explaining in simple language to the farmer that a cow that was giving so many pounds of milk a year was a loss, telling him how he should select his cattle, how he can prove whether cows are profitable or not. By a simple process it educated the farmer in raising and maintaining milch cows which will prove profitable to him. It was very instructive to me.

I saw another series of pamphlets on the raising of potatoes, showing that raising so many bushels, for instance, 100 or 150 bushels to the acre, which seemed to be the average in many districts of the United States, was an unprofitable venture, pointing out how by the selection of seed and by spraying and certain other simple processes, the productivity of the same land could be and had been raised to as high as 300 and 350 bushels to the acre, making a profitable farmer out of one who had hitherto simply been earning a dollar or a dollar and a half a day by his own labour. In every other branch of such farming as we have east of the Ottawa river—and I am not dealing with grain culture, but with vegetables, fruit, eggs, milk and the rest—a series of simple pamphlets should be issued which would be educational in value. Although I asked the minister's department three years ago for a complete series of their publications and I thought I had been receiving them since, I have not seen pamphlets of this nature although they may exist. I have been studying the reports I have received, because I need education myself. I have the ordinary intelligence, but I find that for me they are not

informative and educational. There should be some change so as to bring home to the ordinary farmer every bit of information available of an educational value to him, showing what things he can produce and how he should produce them so as to give him a profitable return on the labour and money he expends annually upon his farm.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are so many of these little bulletins that I sometimes think the work, instead of being underdone, is being overdone already in that respect. I shall be glad to send my hon. friend a list of the publications for 1929. These are distributed from place to place wherever we find any interest is being taken in them. We ask the man to mark those he prefers and we send him those in which he is interested. Some of the titles of these pamphlets are as follows:

Flowers for the Prairie Home.
Fruit Crop Reports.
Fruit Trees, Protection of, from Mice and Rabbits.
Fruit and Vegetables, Canning, Drying, Storing.
The Prairie Farmer's Vegetable Garden.
Grapes for Home Use, Growing.
Hardy Roses, Their Culture in Canada.
Homes Beautiful.
Home Lot, Planning the.
Mushroom Culture.
Orchard Practices, Modern.

There must be thirty of these listed on each page and there are ten or eleven pages of them, so that these bulletins must run into several hundred. These people have their choice of one, two, three or half a dozen that they may desire. If there is any criticism that I would make, it would be that there are too many of them.

Mr. CAHAN: Could something not be done in the way of sending students or teachers from the experimental farms or from the department into the rural districts at certain seasons of the year, who, after having made a study of the productive possibilities of the particular district, would gather the farmers together, come into direct personal contact with them, make suggestions to them, listen to their criticisms, study their needs, because they feel that they are in need of educational assistance in the way of making their farms profitable? The real fact is that the farming districts east of the Ottawa river are not as profitable to-day as they were some years ago. The small farmer is finding greater difficulty in making his farm productively profitable and he is anxious for expert assistance. It seems to me that in this way, if your agents would go into the country districts and come into direct contact with the people themselves, thence reporting to the hon. minister, you would have a new vision of the necessities of agriculture in those provinces which lie to the east.

Mr. IRVINE: I hardly think that some members who have spoken on this question can be quite serious, particularly the hon. member for Rosetown when he suggests that probably the experimental farms do not justify the expenditure. I do not wish to misrepresent him, but I think that that was his idea. I do not think there is any doubt in anybody's mind to-day that these experimental stations are of great value. I do not think that we expect them to pay. Experimental work of that kind is not done to pay; it is done to find out things and then to disseminate the knowledge gained by the experiments and I am quite sure that this is being done to a great extent in all the farm stations throughout the country. Particularly do I believe that this is being well done in the experimental farm at Lacombe. I notice that the farmers in that district get a good deal of assistance and acquire must useful knowledge from being in close touch with the sources of information at that institution. I would ask the minister if there is any increase this year in the vote for the experimental farm at Lacombe.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is an increase of $3,000. We would like to get an addition to that farm, and intend to do so as soon as possible.

Mr. IRVINE: That is what I was asking for.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There have been urgent representations from there that the farm is too restricted in its area. We are adding to the size of our farms. We added to the Lethbridge farm a year ago, and we hope to get around to Lacombe before too long, but we have to cut our coat according to our cloth. These farms are requiring money all the time. There is a little complaint as to the expenditure, but not much because I think the people generally feel that the expenditure is well justified, but we cannot go very much faster than we are doing and do the work properly.

With regard to getting closer to the homes of the farmers, I would point out that the question of production is looked upon as essentially a provincial matter. Nevertheless we found it advisable to do a certain amount of work in cooperation with the provincial departments, because if we are going to have an article that will be acceptable to the

market, the first thing to be done is to see that it is produced properly, that the article is what the public wants. Consequently, in the maritimes and in the province of Quebec, we have been working in cooperation with the provincial governments in the matter of production, doing what we call promoting. We will have, for instance, a livestock promoter. That is being done in the east and to a certain extent in the west, but we have to do it with a good deal of care or there will be over-lapping, which will cause a little friction. I am happy to say, however, that there is very little friction throughout the whole of Canada in connection with our work in conjunction with the provincial departments of agriculture. But we recognize that production is primarily a matter for the provinces.

Mr. IRVINE: I just want to impress upon the minister the importance of that increase that I have been asking for, for the farm at Lacombe. I presume that the minister is aware of all the circumstances there and realizes how important it is that there should be an increased vote for this purpose.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. IRVINE: I am glad that the minister is thinking about it, and I hope that at this session of parliament he will find a little more cloth so that he can cut the coat a little longer. He might take a few yards of cloth from the Department of Immigration, for instance; in fact, he could take the entire salary of the Minister of Immigration and put the minister in the Senate or some place else, and apply that amount to the farm at Lacombe, or he could take the salary of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of the Interior—the salaries of all three of them—and cutting out this unnecessary expenditure apply the money to carry on successful experiments at the farm at Lacombe. But if the minister will not accept that suggestion I would offer another, and that is that he appropriate a certain percentage of the money that is supposed to be expended this year on immigration itself and apply that to the farm at Lacombe, because I am sure that it would be of far greater value to Canada if expended in that way, giving real practical knowledge to the agriculturists.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: Some mention has been made of illustration farms. I was not in when these estimates came up, and I am not sure whether the minister has touched on that feature or not or whether illustration farms are included in this vote.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, they are included.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: If the minister has not already done so, I would like him to outline the system under which these farms are established and how they are conducted, and to state whether it is the intention of the government to extend that policy and establish more farms of that kind.

Coming as I do from one of the older settled areas in the province of Manitoba, I feel that we are being somewhat neglected in that regard. In that province we have two experimental stations, one at Morden and one at Brandon, but they are a long way from the part of the province that I represent, and consequently we do not have the advantage of visiting those farms very often, as they are not very accessible to a great many of our people. While we all admit the splendid work that is being done on these farms, we believe that it woud be profitable and be to the greater advantage of the people if some of these experimental farms and illustration stations were brought closer to the people. I feel that there is a very great need at the present time in those older areas for something of that nature.

We have got to the point now where we must change our system of agriculture to some extent. We have been growing wheat. The area that I come from put Canada on the map for the production of No. 1 hard wheat. The minister knows that himself without being told by me. But conditions have changed. Our crops have been attacked by rust and we have suffered largely from the ravages of that wheat disease. Consequently we have had to change from the growing of bread wheat to other varieties. We have come to the stage where we must almost abandon altogether the idea of continuing to produce a bread wheat, but we are in hopes that some of the varieties that are being propagated by the various experimental stations and scientific agriculturists will come to our rescue to a certain extent, but we realize in any event that we must change our system. We are therefore to-day looking for other varieties of wheat and for varieties of grasses and clover that we can use in crop rotation and that will build up and return to the soil fibre and other properties that have become to some extent weakened. We feel that we should have some assistance in that, and I am urging upon the minister, if it is the intention of the government to establish illustration farms, that there is a field where he could very well expend some money to very great advantage.

It is a tragedy to see the ravages of rust and other diseases affecting the crops in those areas. We have gone through all the period of wheat production, and now we must change our system. We need some assistance to help solve our problems and to demonstrate to us the varities of grasses, clovers and fodder crops, if you will, and barley that we can grow to advantage. We must look to barley largely as our commercial product. We have of necessity to summer-fallow a great deal of our land, and we have not at the present time a known variety of barley that we can successfully grow on summer-fallow.

Mr. SENN: What part does your provincial government in Manitoba take in helping you out in that direction?

Mr. STEEDSMAN: None so far as I know.

Mr. SENN: The provincial government does all that work for Ontario.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: I understand the federal government have illustration farms in operation in every province. I know they have some in my province. In the district west of Morden and south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway there are no illustration stations whatsoever. That is a very large and important part of Manitoba. If it is the intention of the government to extend this work, I think it might very properly be undertaken in that part of the country. What is the policy of the government in regard to it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did touch very briefly on illustration farms before my hon. friend came in. They are very important in my estimation and apparently in his. His major question is as to the procedure to obtain one of these stations. I am afraid if I go too elaborately into the procedure I shall be smothered with applications. We have been endeavouring to establish these small illustration stations in the newer districts where the farmers are more in need of them, but it is difficult to keep them there because in the older districts problems are constantly arising which necessitate the establishment of such stations. Out of two hundred illustration stations that we have established, at least one hundred and fifty have been set up during the last seven or eight years. When an application is received for an illustration station the first step is to look into our records and find if a station has been established within a reasonable distance. This reasonable distance is twenty-five or thirty-five miles, but sometimes certain physical features compel us to disregard this limit. We ask the applicant what particular line of experimentation he wishes to take up, what is bothering the farmers in the district, whether it is a question of soil, disappearing fertility, deterioration of soil due to the absence of humus, weeds, or a dozen other things. Out in Saskatchewan in the drier areas they have all kinds of difficulty getting a catch of grass or clover. After we have received that information we get the names of two or three farmers in the vicinity who are of an experimental turn of mind. It is absolutely useless to ask anybody to undertake the work of an illustration station if he has no inclination for experimentation. Not having any predisposition for this class of work, under such a man the forty-acre experimental plot will be a failure. We also take the ground that the station should be on a highway accessible to the public so the sign "Dominion Illustration Station" will be seen by passersby. Then we send one of our representatives to the locality to have a chat with the prospective men whose names have been given to us as being likely to engage successfully in this class of work. Finally one of those men is decided on. The whole of the work is explained to him, and that he has to put himself under the auspices of the department through the medium of one of the staff of the experimental farms in the province. For instance in Saskatchewan it is Mr. Taggert at Swift Current; in Manitoba it is Mr. Tinline at Brandon. Nearly all our illustration stations in Manitoba have been established within the last seven or eight years; they are Arborg, Dauphin, Dugald, Eriksdale, Gilbert Plains, Gunton, Inwood, Katrine, Pipestone, Plumas, Petersfield, Roblin, Ste. Rose du Lac. There is no capital outlay involved except two or three dollars in putting up a sign "Dominion Illustration Station" and keeping it painted. The produce grown on the forty acres belongs to the farmer, with the exception of any special varieties of seed that the government may require.

In reply to the other question, do we intend to continue these illustration stations?—I do not see how we can do otherwise. They are more popular than the large farms, although some people turn up their noses when I suggest one of these illustration farms instead of one of the large farms with buildings, equipment and live stock. These illustration stations are so popular that we can scarcely keep up with the demand for them.

Mr. SENN: I should like to get a list of the illustration stations.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Someone asked for all the illustration stations in every province.

Mr. SENN: Only the number in each province.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: These are: British Columbia, 16; Alberta, 19; Saskatchewan, 28; Manitoba, 13; Ontario, 15; Quebec, 64; New Brunswick, 18; Nova Scotia, 16; Prince Edward Island, 12. My hon. friend will notice that they are not evenly distributed, because it depends upon the applications. We treat the provinces all alike; we have the same policy for all. But there is no use in seeking opportunities for locating these stations unless we get applications.

Mr. DONNELLY: What is the average cost per year of one of these illustration stations?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They run all the way from $10 up at Hudson bay, where we have a very small station, up to $300 or $400, the average being about $200.

Mr. KENNEDY: What is the program for the Peace River district this year? Do I understand that there is a farm there?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I remember the time when, a few years ago, my hon. friend did not think much of these substations.

Mr. KENNEDY: I understood that a farm would be established there.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think not; there is a pretty good substation there now under Mr. Albright, and some day it may be a full fledged farm. Just at the present time we are not prepared to establish a farm. There is a substation at Fort Vermilion, a remote locality, three hundred miles north of the Peace River country, and it is doing very useful work. It seems out of the way, but it is well to retain it. The substation at Beaver Lodge has done excellent work under Mr. Albright; it is giving good results with a comparatively small expenditure.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Will the minister give the number of farms in the Dominion by provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are twenty-three full fledged farms.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Then there are some experimental stations which are not designated farms.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are three tobacco stations and a fox farm in Prince Edward Island; there is a substation at Beaver Lodge and another at Fort Vermilion. Of all-round experimental farms, such as branch farms, there are twenty-three; five were organized under the government that established experimental farms first in the eighties; eight were established under the government that followed them; nine were established under the government that preceded this one, and not one to our credit. We are trying to put them all into shape before establishing new ones. Our frontiers are being flung back further all the time, and as my hon. friend from Peace River indicates, the Peace River area is becoming a tremendously important one and it is only a matter of time when we shall have to establish one there. That makes four in the offing so far as that district is concerned. But we shall have to have more money.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Will the minister give the number of experimental farms in each province?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I suppose my hon. friend means the full fledged farms. I think I can give them from memory. In British Columbia there are four; Alberta, two, besides the substations at Beaver Lodge and Fort Vermilion, which are nearly as good as farms; Saskatchewan, 4; Manitoba, 2; Ontario, 2, the central farm and one at Kapuskasing, besides a tobacco station at Harrow, which is a very important one; Quebec, five, with two tobacco stations; Prince Edward Island, one; Nova Scotia, two, and New Brunswick, one. There is also a fox station in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SENN: Does the minister consider the Central experimental farm at Ottawa a purely Ontario institution, or is it Dominion-wide?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is very much an Ontario institution; it is something like the Guelph college, which at one time represented all Canada, although it happened to be located at Guelph. I do not think there is any farm in Canada that receives the number of visitors who go through the Central farm here; there are good roads leading to it from all over the country, and various organizations meet there. It is undoubtedly an Ontario farm, although it serves the Dominion as a whole. My deputy reminds me that in the beginning it was primarily intended to serve Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member for Wetaskiwin suggested to the minister that he discuss with his colleagues the advisability of securing a certain portion of the vote intended for immigration purposes and have it devoted to agriculture. The hon. member spoke, of course, in his usual jocular way, and lest the minister did not take him seriously I wish to repeat the suggestion. I have here

a letter from a municipal council officer in the west making this very suggestion. I will quote it in part:

> Owing to the enormous damage done by the spreading of weeds in this province and the losses incurred thereby, I am instructed, as weed inspector for division 1, Spalding municipality—No. 368, to ask if you could sponsor a motion to transfer $2,000,000 from either the military or immigration apportionments to the Department of Agriculture to be used solely in destroying the noxious weeks on crown lands.

The letter is signed H. R. Brown. This matter has been a source of contention and dissatisfaction in the district for many years. As the miinster knows, there is a large area surrounding the Quill lakes, which has been set aside as a bird sanctuary. That land is polluted with sow thistle and other noxious weeds, and it is practically impossible for the municipal authorities in any part of that surrounding country to cope with the weeds. The minister and his colleagues will no doubt say that the eradication of weeds is a provincial problem; in the case of privately owned lands the municipal or provincial authorities have power under provincial laws to go on these lands and take the necessary means to eradicate the weeds, charging the cost against the land. But here you have land belonging to the federal government against which no taxation can be levied, and the area is so large that it would be altogether too expensive for the municipalities to undertake the work of eradicating the weeds. Indeed, they have not even the right to go on the land, as the minister knows. If that land were leased or allowed to be cultivated, if something were done with it, then of course it would come under the provisions of the provincial statutes. But year after year this problem remains. The farmers are doing everything they can to cope with the sow thistle, experimenting on their own land; but here is a large area of land belonging to the federal government, land which is not leased, over which the provincial authorities have no control, and which is just a breeding ground for these weeds, creating a tremendous problem for the farmers of the district. It seems to me to be useless to discuss the matter with the provincial government. It really is not and should not be the business of the provincial government to handle the situation there; and even if the municipal authorities were permitted to go on the land—which they are not—they cannot be expected to expend their funds for this purpose. If that land is to be continued as a bird sanctuary then I suggest that there should be a vote for the purpose of eradicating these weeds. The minister may say that this comes under the Department of the Interior; that is correct, but that department is not particularly interested in the eradication of weeds, and I suggest that the minister discuss this question with his colleagues and try to arrange some method of handling this problem. The hon. member for Melfort is not in his seat just now, but he attended a conference at Star city about a year ago which was attended by representatives of the municipal authorities covering a wide area, at which this problem was thoroughly gone into. Petitions were forwarded to the provincial and federal governments; there was a good deal of correspondence about it but so far nothing has been done. After all, this matter comes under this department; it is a federal problem and it seems to me the Department of Agriculture should at least press for something to be done.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not want to take advantage of the fact that this vote covers experimental farms; I suppose almost anything can be brought up now. This weed problem on crown lands has been up many times; the Minister of the Interior and I have had many discussions about it, and for some years he has adopted the policy of getting rid of many of these lands and letting those who take them over meet the situation. For the government to undertake to eradicate sow thistle, let us say, around Quill lakes would be a tremendous task; the only method I could imagine would be to pasture it with animals so heavily that the sow thistle would be killed, but by the time you did that the animals probably would be dead from starvation. I visited that district recently, and having viewed the terrific destruction the birds are doing my suggestion is that the sanctuary be thrown open. There is a time in the agricultural life of the community when you cannot both farm and protect the beaver, for instance; they will cut down your trees and fence posts as quickly as you can put them up. Then you have to sacrifice them in the interests of the farmer and let them go back to the frontier where there are not so many farms and where there are more trees for them to cut down.

With regard to this bird sanctuary, I had charge of that work when I was a provincial minister; I have a great deal of interest in bird life, but my interest in human life is much greater. I have every sympathy for the farmers who are trying to make a living, but who find that the ducks reap the harvest. There are enough people taking a slice off the farmer's harvest without letting millions of ducks interfere as well. That would be my solution of the problem.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I agree that the only real solution is to have this land thrown open; once it is privately owned it is subject to taxation and the necessary action can be taken to eradicate the weeds. I hope something may be done along that line, but if the Department of the Interior retains that land I think they should eradicate these weeds. I know it is a big problem, but it could be handled if the land was completely mowed before the sow thistle goes to seed. The weed might continue to spread by the roots but certainly there would be no seeds blowing on to the farmer's land. That would not require such a very large expenditure, and certainly if the land is retained as a bird sanctuary something should be done.

Mr. CAHAN: I have been waiting to ask the minister a question, and perhaps he will allow me to ask it now. What is the Department of Agriculture doing to improve the culture of tobacco in the province of Quebec? I am reliably informed that the tobacco production of the province of Quebec could be increased to two or three times what it is at present if it were possible to establish warehouses in which the farmers could place their tobacco during the time it is maturing for the market and obtain a warehouse receipt. I am informed also that the ordinary small farmer who raises tobacco finds it very difficult indeed at present to obtain the amount of money necessary to carry him over the time of culture, and then he has to carry the tobacco for a long time while it is maturing. If some means could be found, either under this or some other department, whereby warehouses could be established at convenient points where the raw product could be stored while maturing, the banks would be quite willing to advance to the farmers a very considerable portion of the price on warehouse receipts, which would enable the farmers to pay their current expenses and carry their product until it is ready for the market. In fact I am told that if some such reform were made it would double and treble the production of tobacco in that province, as, owing to the extensive use of tobacco in various forms, a very good market could be found even for a much increased production. Has the hon. gentleman studied that question at all?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend has brought up a very important question, because there are a few tobacco growers who possess sufficient means to establish a proper warehouse, and as yet I do not think anything has been done by the government in the way of assisting in the establishment of these warehouses. I understand that in Quebec there is quite a large number of cooperative warehouses, and I remember from my experience with this question in the county of Essex that some of the tobacco companies advanced sufficient money to the farmers to enable them to put up proper buildings for the purposes indicated by my hon. friend. Then, in the fall of the year, the tobacco would be sold and a certain amount of money would be applied to the cost of the building, and in five or six years it would be paid for. Unfortunately sometimes the grower found himself tied up to a tobacco company when he could have done better elsewhere, and that caused some dissatisfaction. However, I think if that sort of thing is carried on squarely it is a very good thing.

Mr. CAHAN: Will the hon. gentleman promise me that during the recess and before parliament meets again he will study that question? I have a long brief here which would require perhaps three-quarters of an hour to present; I intended to deal with the matter at length, but, since these estimates have come down at the close of the session that has become impossible. However, I do suggest to the minister that he study the question because I intend to bring it up in earnest, if I attend another session of this parliament.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would like to ask the minister if this department has done anything to encourage the industry of muskrat farming. Only a few years ago this was looked upon as something of a joke, but to-day it is getting to be a very important industry.

Mr. CAHAN: Is that agriculture?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes, most decidedly so. This would be a most profitable venture to be carried on as a side line to the ordinary cultivation of the land. Wild animals are being almost completely trapped out; muskrat furs as well as other furs are becoming scarcer year by year and we will have to rely upon the farms to supply the markets. In the newer portions of western Canada there is a lot of rough, sloughy land, and with a little encouragement and the proper technical advice many of the settlers in those parts could make a considerable amount of money out of land which is almost valueless for agricultural purposes. There are several of these muskrat ranches in my constituency

and I believe the men running them are doing very well. The Saskatchewan government has done something towards scattering some technical advice, but I think this is a proper matter for the Dominion Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have an officer who is working on that question at the present time. These farms are spread all over Canada, and some of them are being operated on dry land. The general impression has been that muskrats must be raised near the water, but one of the hon. members of this house has been very successful in raising rats on ordinary dry land within a short distance of Ottawa.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Have any bulletins been published by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We had a bulletin but the demand was so large that it is now out of print.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I suggest that the minister do everything possible during the coming season to distribute this information to the farmers. In many parts of the country the farmers could be very easily encouraged to engage in this profitable business, and many of them are looking for some kind of technical advice.

Mr. KENNEDY: Has the minister received a request for the establishment of an experimental substation on the north side of the Peace? I think a request was made by the board of trade of Fairview.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We are investigating that matter to see what the prospects are in that particular district. In connection with these substations the objection is taken to paying a salary to a man for operating his own farm. There is not the same control over him as if the land belonged to the government, and I do not know how far we will go in the establishment of these substations. The substation at Beaver Lodge has been quite successful, but I imagine that any capital outlays will remain on that farm, and I look with a considerable amount of disfavour upon establishing too many of these substations.

Mr. KELLNER: When the minister is discussing the matter of noxious weeds, I think he should confer with the Minister of Justice as well as the Minister of the Interior. There is a considerable tract of land in the city of Edmonton owned by the penitentiaries branch. The city of Edmonton has approached the government several times with a view to disposing of this land, but I understand that the answer has always been given that they were unable to do so. I think the Minister of Agriculture should see that the weeds are controlled on that property, as it is very unfair to have such a large tract of land in the city of Edmonton covered with all sorts of weeds.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will remember the recommendation of the hon. member. If they have no use for the penitentiary at Edmonton there is no need to grow weeds upon the property. If they cannot keep the penitentiary filled it should be disposed of.

Mr. SENN: Some additional property has been purchased by the government for the use of the experimental farm at Ottawa, and I would like to ask the minister if it is proposed to use that additional property as an experimental farm or as a general farm.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The department has not received the judgment rendered by the exchequer court, but, according to the newspaper reports, the price has been set at $700 per acre, with an additional 10 per cent levied for forcible expropriation, and $30,000 for the buildings thereon. The total acreage of the additional property is three hundred and sixty.

Mr. SENN: Is this property to be used for experimental purposes or for general farming?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The whole farm is experimental in nature but a certain amount of commercial farming will have to be carried on in order to provide for the live stock.

Mr. GARDINER: What kind of buildings were on the land?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There was one house, and pretty extensive stabling adjoining the house with four or five of the usual old frame barns.

Mr. CAHAN: Does not the minister find it difficult to conduct profitable operations upon land which costs $700 per acre?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We were not prepared to pay that much for the land, but where there is a difference of opinion in a matter of that kind, it is necessary to refer the matter to the exchequer court for a decision. Whatever they decide, of course, I feel I must accept.

Mr. CAHAN: Is there any possibility of its being profitably used for farming purposes?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. It was expensive land, but it would be much more unprofitable not to have it even at that price. Canada is expanding so rapidly, agriculturally

and othewise, that the central experimental farm requires more farm space for the purpose of developing new varieties of grains, grasses and so forth and propagating them on the twenty-two branch farms. Therefore the success of the twenty-two branch farms is dependent upon the central farm which is the nerve centre of the whole system. I do not know that the price paid is reasonable, but it would be more expensive not to have it than to have it even at that price, for the simple reason that if we did not have proper room to develop our activities at our headquarters at Ottawa, the whole system throughout the Dominion would be in danger of being paralysed.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): How many acres are there now in the central experimental farm?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: About 825. The original farm was 465 acres and this addition consists of 360 acres.

Mr. SENN: A few moments age the minister informed me that the central experimental farm was an institution for the use of Ontario; that it could be considered a provincial institution, or one for the use of the province alone. Now he tells us that it is used for developing seeds and so forth to furnish the branch farms which, I understand, are situated throughout the Dominion. He tells us also that there are some 700 or 800 acres in the whole farm. May I ask him whether the acreage of the original farm was all used for experimental purposes and for developing the necessary seeds for the branch farms? If not, why was it necessary to purchase the additional land?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As time went on, the original farm was used for many purposes besides what might be termed agriculture, strictly speaking. There is an arboretum consisting of sixty acres in which the late Doctor Saunders took a great pride. Then we have to have some grounds around the farm. We have established branches dealing with horticulture, orchardry and poultry, and as each new branch was established it took up a little more ground. We started in a small way with one or two divisions and we have developed until now there are fifteen. This means that the farm had been reduced to three fields of forty acres each, or 120 acres in all. That is really all that is strictly speaking, the agricultural ground we had. The farm was really top heavy with beauty without having a farm associated with it until we secured this additional acreage. I am sure my hon. friends from the west would not like to call an experimental farm a farm when there were only 120 acres for actual operations.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister will now admit it is top heavy with cost.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We hope to get results commensurate with the cost, and I think we shall.

Mr. SENN: Will the minister admit that it is a Dominion-wide institution and not confined to Ontario?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will admit that, but at the same time one cannot help realizing that it is of tremendous benefit to Ontario. It is, strictly speaking, a Dominion-wide institution because it supplies the whole system, but it is a valuable adjunct to the agriculture of Ontario because it is accessible by good roads from half of the province.

Mr. SENN: How many of these branch farms are located in Ontario?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is Kapuskasing and there is a tobacco farm at Harrow.

Mr. WARD: Does the Minister of Agriculture think that the Booth farm which has been recently purchased is worth anything like the price that has been paid for it, or does he think it was good business to call upon the exchequer court to arbitrate in connection with the price? Is that court in a position to know land values? I looked all over the Booth farm the other day and I think the government has paid about five times more than the property was worth. The buildings could be put up for much less than $30,000, the price we paid for them. They did not cost $30,000 new, and no practical man would value them to-day at over $8,000. If the government had paid $75,000 for the farm itself, they would have paid a long price. It is a wet, low-lying piece of land, and it will cost a great deal of money to drain it before it is fit for experimental purposes. As an hon. member beside me suggests, it might make a good muskrat farm.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We could not agree on a price and I do not know of any other way of obtaining a decision than through the court. That is the regular way. Whether it was a correct decision or not, my hon. friend is more at liberty to criticise it than I am. I was one of the interested parties in submitting the matter to the court, and I feel I have to accept the decision, whatever I may think about it. The price is unquestionably high for farm land, but I take the ground that it would have been a greater mistake not to have had it than to take it even at that price,

because we needed it so badly for the purpose of keeping the branch farms across the Dominion going. That is different from saying that the price is high or low. The decision is that of a court and I am prepared to accept it.

Mr. SENN: Were there not in the locality other farms that could have been purchased at a more reasonable price and that would have answered the purpose of the department just as well?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. If my hon. friend has ever operated two farms with a road between them, he knows the tremendous inconvenience involved. You spend a great deal of time on the road. The Booth farm abutted on the experimental farm, there being an imaginary line—in fact, just a hedge—between. It is hard to describe just how valuable it is to have the farm so located as against a farm, perhaps just as good, but farther away, and with a public road between. My hon. friend, I believe, is a farmer.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The hon. member tells us that he has operated a farm all his life under similar conditions.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If he has, he knows the inconvenience involved. We have investigated the whole matter and there would have to be a subway. The drainage there would not permit of a subway to get from one farm to the other. Another way to get from one to the other would be by an overhead bridge.

Mr. SENN: I understand fully the inconvenience involved in crossing a highway all the time to get from one farm to another. At the same time, this is a considerable amount of money to expend. Is the minister finished buying land for the experimental farm now? I heard that further developments were likely to follow and that other land might be acquired in the near future.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am through for the present, at least until we get the new farm developed. I will not say that it is large enough. Someone may follow me who may have ambitions to enlarge it, but for the immediate present we have sufficient land to meet the requirements.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The cost of the Booth farm was over $300,000?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Something like that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is over $800 an acre.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is right.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. CHAPLIN: At five per cent this farm is costing for carrying charges alone nearly $20,000 a year, or $40 an acre. I think it is pretty nearly time the minister came to the conclusion not to spend any more money on these farms.

Mr. PECK: Was a valuation made before the purchase of the land by any local valuator, and if so, by whom?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does the hon. member mean a valuation for strictly farm purposes?

Mr. PECK: It would not matter what you bought it for. What was the farm worth? What would it sell for to the ordinary purchaser?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I presume that the price set by the court would be what anybody else would have to pay for it.

Mr. PECK: Did you not endeavour to settle the price amicably before going to court?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. PECK: Before doing that you would require to have a valuation made.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. PECK: Who were the valuators who acted for the government?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We had two farmers who looked into it very thoroughly as a strictly farming proposition compared with other lines in that vicinity, and having regard to the condition it was in, with quackgrass and lack of drainage, they valued it at $75 an acre.

Mr. PECK: Is there any reason why the government should pay more than $75 an acre for it, plus the extra ten per cent which would be allowed by any arbitrator?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There seems to be a tremendous diversity of prices in that vicinity. The Caldwell farm could be got for a little less than $400 an acre. For the farm adjoining the Caldwell farm and butting up against the Booth farm, Mr. Scott wanted $700 an acre. There is a gentleman farming sixty acres there, and he valued his land at $700 an acre. It just shows the difference between the individuality of these men and what they think the land is worth, depending on what they can make out of it in the matter of production. The Scott farm

is an exceedingly well handled farm and very, very clean. I do not know whether Mr. Scott feels that he can make interest on it at that price, but I am given to understand that he does.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The price the minister paid for this acreage puts me in mind of the prices charged for a subdivision in some western town. Suppose you figured eight lots to an acre, that would figure out to $80 for a small lot.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The court puts an appraisal on the property. We needed the land and needed it badly, and so we sent the matter to an impartial tribunal, where lawyers on both sides were heard and witnesses galore.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The court did not put a price on it until you asked them to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We felt that the only way to arrive at a decision that would be equitable to all parties would be to submit the question to an impartial tribunal.

Mr. GARDINER: What was the price per acre originally asked for this land?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They put it at $700 per acre, plus 10 per cent for forcible possession, plus $30,000 for the buildings, bringing the total to $823,000. They were asking in the court proceedings $1,200 per acre, and our lawyers were offering $400.

Mr. GARDINER: Did they set any prices privately on this land before the matter went to the court?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There was no offer on our part, but there was a tentative offer on their part of $700 an acre. That was some time ago. Prior to that, before the father of the present owners died, they asked $1,500 an acre for it.

Mr. GARDINER: This tentative offer of $700 prior to the case going to the exchequer court would include the buildings, I presume. I think the minister said something about that last session, that they had offered this land at $700.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It included the buildings.

Mr. GARDINER: So by going to the exchequer court we paid 10 per cent on the purchase price of $700 and $30,000 for the buildings.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We had to pay a little more on account of the lawyer's fees, I suppose.

Mr. GARDINER: The lawyer's fees were on top of that. It strikes me as poor business.

Mr. SENN: It seems to me that the minister must have thought that offer of $700 per acre was too high a price to pay or he would not have gone to court.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is right.

Mr. SENN: I understand that this is a low-lying farm and hard to drain, that it needs under-draining. It seems there is no system of under-drainage in that section of the county. Does the minister think it is possible to under-drain this farm properly in the next few years?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, yes. While it is in need of draining very badly, it is not expensive to drain. There are good outlets.

Mr. SENN: The minister told me a few moments ago that he could not put a subway under the road because of the lack of drainage.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Because of the fall at that end of it. That is opposite the Caldwell farm. That was in the event of our getting the Caldwell farm, but we do not require it under the circumstances.

Mr. PECK: Did the judge give a written judgment? It would be interesting to see how he arrived at this enormous price for the property. I think his judgment should be produced.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not had much experience in the exchequer court or in any other court proceedings, but there is a regular routine to follow, and following the course of that routine the judgment has not yet arrived in our office.

Mr. PECK: When was the judgment given?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The case was heard about the 10th of May and judgment was given almost immediately.

Mr. PECK: It was a regular trial, with evidence given on both sides as to the value of the property, and after hearing the evidence the judge handed down his judgment. I think it could be very interesting to the committee to have the text of his judgment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend has the substance of it.

Mr. PECK: In his judgment the judge would sum up the situation and show how he arrived at the price he fixed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am awaiting that information myself. I am somewhat curious to know how it was figured out.

Mr. GARDINER: Was any evidence offered to the court on behalf of the department that the Booth family had offered this land to the department at $700 an acre, and if so, how on earth could the court have given the judgment it did?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was not at the court, but I understand not. The communication that was sent to us with regard to that was confidential and in confirmation of an interview between Mr. Booth, Doctor Grisdale and myself. Doctor Grisdale communicated with Mr. Booth and asked him if the understanding was so and so. Mr. Booth marked his reply "confidential," and our lawyers advised us not to use the letter. I think the contents were meant to be confidential at the time, but I did not so regard the letter after the case went into court.

Mr. WARD: The witnesses in the exchequer court must have been great real estate boomers.

Mr. SENN: I understand the minister himself is not too well satisfied with the judgment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, I have gotten over it.

Mr. SENN: From what he said a little while ago I understood he thought the judgment was perhaps a little too high. That being the case, does the minister intend to appeal the judgment?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, when I got the judgment first I thought it was high. If my view had prevailed at the outset in the price we offered for the land we would not have had to go to the exchequer court, but the other gentleman entertained a different view; that is why we had to go to the exchequer court. We were advised by the Justice department not to appeal; the result would be doubtful and in any case it would involve further expense.

Mr. SENN: The minister did consider an appeal?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thought over it and we submitted our view to the Justice department. We were advised that it would not be good tactics and would probably result in simply adding to the expense.

Mr. PECK: I cannot agree with the minister. You are spending on the purchase of this property over $300,000, and the costs of an appeal would be scarcely worth considering in view of the amount involved. Personally I should like to see an appeal taken to the supreme court against the judgment. I think it might be reversed. Certainly it would be more satisfactory to the government and the people generally if an appeal were taken to the supreme court.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): It is just such transactions as this that bring the department into disrepute with the ordinary farmer. When he realizes that the interest on the purchase price of the Booth farm is about $40 an acre, or the purchase price per acre of the average farm in Ontario, a great deal of the investigation work carried on by the experimental farm and the advice given by the department from time to time are discounted. I have often heard the ordinary farmer say: "There is no use my trying to follow the advice offered by these experimental farms. They are backed by the government, they have all the money they require to carry on things as they like, and I cannot do that." As a consequence he passes up a lot of good advice. I censure vey severely the paying of this amount of money for farm land in Ontario. No land for farming purposes is worth the price or anywhere near it. How any court could award such a fabulous price, and expect to have it accepted by the farming community of this country, I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. GARDINER: I would call the attention of the minister and the committee to the fact that treating this so-called confidential letter as such—and in my judgment it was only confidential for the time being—has cost the country $55,000 over and above the price that the Booth family required in the first instance.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Unfortunately there is no other tribunal to which we could resort in arriving at the value of this land. We needed the land so badly that we were prepared to pay the price rather than be without it. Personally, after the negotiations were made public I did not think the letter was any longer confidential, but our lawyer did not regard it in that way. The land at Morden we bought for about $46 or $47 an acre. We considered it was a good buy. We had to pay $100 an acre for the land we bought at Lethbridge because it was irrigated. So sometimes we get land adjoining our present farms at their rock bottom value for farm purposes. At other places we have to give a price quite out of line with agricul-

tural valuation. In this instance when the whole system was depending on the nerve centre being properly taken care of we had to get the land at that price.

Mr. SENN: I understood the minister to say that this land was valued by two farmers, who were acting as valuators, at something like $75 an acre. Did they appear in the exchequer court as witnesses?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. TUMMON: Was there no other property close by available for the same purpose?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, but it was not so desirable. The Booth property was much more valuable for our purposes because it adjoined the experimental farm.

Mr. TUMMON: But was there no other property available in the vicinity?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is other property on the other side of the road, but it is intersected by two roads.

Mr. TUMMON: My information is that there is a piece of land two or three hundred acres in extent very close by and perhaps better suited for farming purposes than the property under discussion, and that it was available at about $250 an acre.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. If we took the whole farm that my hon. friend refers to it would have cost us $375 an acre, and it is cut off from the main farm by two public highways.

Mr. GARDINER: After looking over the farm very carefully there is no question in my mind that more land was required. But I would remind the minister that last session he stated the Booth family had offered this land to the government at $700 an acre, and at that time the minister thought it was too high a price to pay. In view of that statement, I really think a great mistake was made in not bringing the offer to the attention of the exchequer court. I do not know who was responsible; I am not blaming the minister, but I do say some official in his department should be called on the carpet for making such a blunder.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When you go to the exchequer court you must get lawyers to take care of your case, and you must either accept the decision of the court or take the chance of getting a worse decision in another court. My hon. friend is complaining about not making further use of the letter marked confidential. Counsel said it would be bad policy and bad ethics to go into court and use a letter marked confidential, no matter how it had been obtained.

Mr. GARDINER: But that information was given to the house last session when the minister's estimates were under consideration, because I remember the occasion distinctly. Well, if it could be given to the house it could be given to the exchequer court.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Having submitted the matter to the court, and needing the property as we did, we had either to appeal or to acquiesce in the judgment, and we were advised not to appeal.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not appear to have got the point clearly to the minister. Last year he said in this house that it was the intention of the department to buy the Booth farm because of lack of sufficient land for experimental farm purposes. The minister stated in the house last year that the offer was $700 per acre; and he added, if I remember rightly, that in the judgment of the department this was too much. He instanced a certain gentleman out at Indian Head, known to both the minister and myself, who gave a piece of land to the government for that class of work for nothing, and he made the comparison. So did the member for Qu'Appelle. Now in view of the fact that the information had been given to the house, that the Booth family had offered the land at $700 an acre, I wish to know why that information was not submitted to the exchequer court. I maintain that if it could be given to this house it could be given to the exchequer court; and I should like to know what court would raise the price over and above what had been proposed by the people who wanted to sell the property.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The information was not confidential then.

Mr. GARDINER: No.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: After the tentative negotiations were over I never looked upon that letter as confidential and that is why I gave it to the house; but the lawyers regarded it as confidential and held that it would be bad ethics to use it. And we were guided by their advice.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister gave that information to the house twelve months ago; I think there is something wrong somewhere in this particular matter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; my hon. friend is quite wrong.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not suggest anything like bribery or anything of that sort, but someone slipped on the job; whether it was the lawyers or the officials of the department. I do not know, but someone was at fault.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend is quite wrong. There is no justification for suggesting any jugglery or wrongdoing.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not say that, but they fell down on the job.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Even lawyers sometimes do that, I suppose; but we got a good lawyer and in his opinion it was not good tactics to use that letter, and we acted accordingly.

Mr. FRASER: Who was the lawyer?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Wilson of Ottawa and Mr. Robertson of Toronto, while Mr. Tilley was Mr. Booth's lawyer in Toronto; who his local representative was I do not know.

Mr. GARDINER: I am to understand, then, that the lawyers for the department never presented this letter to the court at all. If I know anything about jurisprudence or pleading, I take it it would be up to the lawyers for the other party to object to the evidence going in.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My deputy, who was present in court, informs me that the lawyer did not submit that letter. I discussed it with him myself a month before the case was heard and it was my opinion that he should have submitted it. That was my own view, because I considered it was meant to be confidential only during the tentative negotiations but not for an indefinite length of time.

Mr. GARDINER: I still hold that the lawyers for the department should have submitted the information to the court, and if opposing counsel objected then the court would rule on the point. I say therefore that in that regard they fell down and fell down badly. When was the case submitted to the exchequer court? What was the date?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not the exact date, but it was well into the beginning of winter.

Mr. GARDINER: This last winter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. I am speaking from memory, but I think it was late in November or early in December.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Mr. GARDINER: I again direct the minister's attention to the debate that took place on his estimates last year. If I mistake not, he made the statement then that the offer from the Booth family was $700 an acre. I intend to look up the debate. In any case I submit that someone has fallen down badly.

Mr. ROWE: It seems to me that the minister, judging from his statement of the situation, has clearly shown that the Booth property has cost this country about $170,000 or $175,000 more than the Scott-Caldwell property would have cost; and from experienced farmers who are familiar with the value of soil I learn that the Scott-Caldwell property is equally as valuable for farming purposes. As to the suitability of its location, I understand that it is only sixty feet further from the main grounds; and as for the road dividing it from the farm, it divides only one field. The minister could have saved the country, I should say, at least $150,000 and would have had a property adequate for his purposes. It seems to me that his purchase has been extravagant.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is entirely a matter of judgment whether it would have been better to have taken the other property rather than the one we secured. But I would point out to the hon. gentlemen that if we had selected the property he suggests the choice would have been wrong for all time, whereas the one selected is right permanently so far as location is concerned. And that is an important consideration.

Mr. ROWE: But the minister in one case would have been buying farm property, whereas in the other he is buying city property ready for subdivision.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The possibilities in regard to subdivision must have been taken into consideration by the court. That was the whole argument of the owners, and it is an important factor in determining the value of the property. I do not know of any other lands around here which would be worth three or four hundred dollars an acre. I understand that the Caldwell farm had been floated as a subdivision proposition by a company in the early years of the war, but it has gone back to farming operations. That was at a time of special boom, but the proposition petered out. In years to come, of course, it may be worth what they are asking for it, but at the present time it is not worth their figure either for subdivision or for farming purposes.

Mr. ROWE: It seems an unwise policy for the Department of Agriculture to purchase land capable of subdivision when there is adjacent a desirable property which is worth almost dollar for dollar what the other represents. It seems to me that the minister has wasted from $150,000 to $175,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend did not appreciate what I said with regard to what is known as the Caldwell farm. That was a subdivision project floated by a company of which Mr. Caldwell was one, but it broke up and the property went back into his hands. Some day it may be worth as much as the other, but it is not worth it now either for subdivision purposes or for farming.

Mr. FRASER: I find that according to the auditor General's report for 1927-28 there is an increase of $454,000 in this vote. Can the minister give me the reasons for that increase?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will have to look that up.

Item agreed to.

Health of animals, administration of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and Meat and Canned Foods Act, and necessary buildings, $2,450,000.

Mr. KAISER: There is a great deal to be said in favour of spending this amount of money in looking after the health of animals, but it is not an unmixed blessing to the farmers of this country as the work is carried on at present. I am going to draw the attention of the minister to a case which, although I cite a particular instance, is by no means an isolated example. In my community there is a great deal of dissatisfaction among people who concern themselves with the production of high grade stock, and I will tell the minister the reason for this dissatisfaction. My particular complaint has to do with the method by which the government handles a disease known as mange.

For the benefit of those who may not understand what I have to say, I may state that mange is a parasitic disease which breaks out among animals. I have had experience with it; I have seen it in human beings, in horses, in dogs and in cattle, and therefore I believe I have some knowledge of the disease. Mange is caused by a parasite which attaches itself to the animal, and there is a period of what is called incubation, but I would like to point out that this government does not recognize the scientific knowledge which is applied by other countries in handling this disease. In this connection I might quote what the German authorities have to say:

> The tenacity of scab mite varies according to different varieties. According to Gerlach, the least resistant are the sarcoptis which die in dry air in a few days.
>
> The dermatocoptis mites live outside the body from 4 to 6 weeks, but longer in damp and dirty stables, and can remain alive even in dry air for 10 to 14 days.

This is an authoritative statement, and now I want to show how this department handles this situation. In November, 1927, a very high class farmer named Richardson bought an animal at auction which may be described by the following couplet:

> The farmer called him Mike, because
> That's the kind of a cow he was.

We admit that mange existed on the farm from which the animal was bought, but the government inspectors investigated conditions there, ordered all the cattle dipped, cleaned them all up and certified that it was safe for this farmer to buy "mike".

Mr. Richardson bought the animal and took it to his farm. Three months later, on March 8, this animal was put up for sale at Bowmanville and was purchased by a man living near Peterborough, and eleven months later the government inspectors found that the animal had mange. Then Mr. Richardson, who had sold the animal, prepared his stock for sale; he had worked on his heard for twenty years and it had been regularly inspected by the government inspectors; as a matter of fact they went to this farm thirteen times in one year, 1928, and examined these animals, and gave a certificate to the effect that Mr. Richardson had an accredited herd. However, after these thirteen visits, another inspector discovered that this animal Mike at Peterborough had mange. Just when Mr. Richardson has his herd ready to sell, and after he had paid $10 a head to have them included in the sale, the inspector came along and notified him that the cattle were not to be placed on the block, and he advertised that fact all over the country. Then he inspected the premises and the entire herd; unable to find any trace of mange on any animal, he then issued a certificate saying that this action had been taken on "suspicion"; he only suspected that something was wrong with this herd.

The situation was so critical and so unbelievable that I engaged a high class veterinary

and took him to this farm, where he and I examined every animal. This veterinary gave me the following certificate:

March 5th, 1929.

This is to certify that this day, at the request of Dr. Kaiser, member of parliament for Ontario riding, I made a special inspection of the premises and entire herd of cattle owned by L. Richardson and Son of Ashburn, township of Whitby, and herein state that in no case could be found a visible sign of mange, past or present, in any animal of the whole herd; and furthermore, as a veterinary, I have visited the stock for many years past, and I have never seen any skin affection which even suggested mange, upon any animal upon the farm.

W. A. MacNeely, V.S.,
Brooklin, Ontario.

This farmer had gone to considerable trouble and had built up a magnificent herd but on account of this interference on the part of the department he was deprived of the only chance he had to cash in. He could not put these cattle up as high grade stock and receive up to $300 per head for them, but was obliged to take them from the block and sell them on the market as ordinary animals. I saw one of these animals myself; it looked to be absolutely perfect, and a stockman assured me that it was easily worth $500. Instead of accomplishing something of value to stockmen these officials are actually doing damage not only to this man's herd, but to other herds in the same neighbourhood. The British and European authorities claim that mange cannot exist beyond three months, even under the most favourable circumstances. During the last fifteen or twenty years it has been proved that there are periods of incubation beyond which there is no danger. It might as well be said that a man should not risk catching smallpox by going to the home of another man who had it three years ago, as to say that an animal can catch the mange after eleven or twelve months. The government has enacted certain regulations which appear to me in some respects to be as old as, or perhaps older, than the Minister of Agriculture. Let any sensible man consider these regulations and see what conclusion he can arrive at from such a regulation as this:

No animal which is affected or has been exposed to the infection of mange shall be permitted to run at large or come in contact with any animal not so affected or exposed.

This does not recognize the period of incubation or make any time allowance for quarantine, but if such an animal comes in contact with another animal then the department may step in at any time and destroy the results of efforts extending over twenty-five or thirty years. If the minister should conclude that what I am saying is the truth, then this government should compensate that farmer for the loss which he has sustained. He has suffered not only a loss in the value of his cattle, but also a loss in prestige. I ask the government to investigate this case, and if I am correct in my statements then the minister should call off some of these half educated veterinary surgeons and place in charge of this work sensible men who understand something of the evolution of disease.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The officers of the department put a quarantine on these animals and said that they were unsafe to be sent out to a sale. There is no doubt that an animal can carry mange for as long as two years and show no visible signs of it.

Mr. KAISER: Where does the minister get that authority?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Anyone who knows anything about what is called burrowing mange knows that it can be carried that length of time. Surface mange is easily diagnosed, but the experience with this burrowing mange has shown that it may be carried at least two years without being diagnosed. Our records show that a veterinary practitioner reported mange on the premises of Mr. Melville Pinnett, of Indian River, Ontario, and scrapings taken by Inspector Gibson from a bull in Pinnett's herd were examined in our laboratory and sarcoptes found. These are the burrowing mites and this mange is difficult to cure. The following is a memorandum regarding this outbreak at Indian River:

The disease was probably introduced into the herd of Mr. Melville Pinnett, of Indian River, Ont., by a bull purchased at a Bowmanville sale in March, 1928, and originally coming from the herd of James Compton, of Ashburn, Ont.

Mr. Compton's premises were quarantined for sarcoptic mange in the fall of 1926 and released in March, 1927, after the cattle had been treated three times, but this bull probably carried infection in spite of treatments.

The outbreak on Mr. Compton's premises was apparently introduced through a cow purchased from Mr. John Miller of Ashburn, Ont., and which had been purchased by the latter in Alberta some five years previously. This animal had shown skin trouble at the time of purchase by Mr. Miller but had subsequently apparently recovered.

Further evidence that sarcoptic mange was present in Mr. Miller's herd before 1924, probably brought in by western cattle, is found in the fact that a number of cattle imported by Messrs. Dryden and Miller from Scotland in 1924 and subsequently sold in 1925 were found to be infected. It is unlikely that the infection

was introduced by the imported cattle since these were inspected by a Canadian veterinary officer in Scotland and kept under continual observation during the quarantine period at Quebec, and no clinical symptoms noted.

The hon. member is complaining that we did not allow these suspected animals to go to this sale and thus be distributed to the four corners of Ontario. In order to safeguard our live stock it is necessary to take every precaution to see that such animals are not let loose at a sale. There is no question that it is a hardship, but in the public interests of the community it is necessary that these precautionary measures be taken. They are carried out on the advice of the very best veterinary surgeons we can obtain, and it is regrettable that these hardships must prevail with respect to the individual. You cannot take a chance with any of these diseases. It has been found necessary to impose regulations as to shipments of merchandise, et cetera, with regard to the foot and mouth disease, and although they may seem very harsh it is necessary to take every precaution to keep out any of these infectious diseases. Safety first must be our policy, especially when action is being taken under the advice of one of our competent authorities. I am very sorry for the gentleman who apparently suffered loss by reason of not being able to submit his cattle at the sale. I understand from my deputy—I did not catch it from my hon. friend—that this man, by reason of not being able to submit these animals at the sale, lost the sale of them and that he wants compensation. The law makes no such provision and therefore I am unable to give the matter favourable consideration. We give compensation for animals slaughtered for bovine tuberculosis, but not for cases of this kind.

Mr. KAISER: The minister misunderstands me altogether. I do not complain because this man was shut off from the sale. What I complain of is this, that when he bought this animal the government certified that it was right; that it was clean; that it would not scatter the disease. The animal was observed for sixty days and then the man was assured that it was all right. Of what benefit is this government certificate? A man in good faith accepted it; he built up his herd and then when he expected to make a few dollars, he was told that he could not cash in.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no system of governmental or other inspection that is 100 per cent correct. This kind of mange does not show at times. It is a burrowing mange that is beyond the ken of the ordinary eye. At certain periods of the year it will develop and manifest itself, but it may be carried for at least two years and in the interim a clean certificate may be given. Otherwise it might have to be quarantined still further. When there is a reasonable presumption that there is no danger of mange, the quarantine is removed and the certificate is given. If the inspector had taken absolutely no chance for that period of two years, there would have been all the greater howl because we kept the animal in quarantine for so long. We took a chance in liberating it and eventually it developed that it had the mange of this description. Then the gentleman, not being able to sell it, no doubt suffered loss. We have had placed before us a number of claims for compensation of that nature, but before we could deal with them, the law would have to be amended. The question whether we shall widen the scope of the law as regards compensation is a matter for consideration. The act has not been up for revision for some years and I should be glad to consider the question of widening its scope. But if the door is opened for compensation for that disease, it will have to be opened for some others and we shall have claims for all kinds of cases similar to the one which my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think the trouble with the department is that having the life history of this burrowing mange, they did not act as they should have done. As soon as mange is discovered amongst animals on a farm, they should prevent the sale of them. The trouble arose when the department permitted the animal to be sold in the first instance. Having the life history of the burrowing mange as the department has it, that it may remain concealed for two years, I cannot understand how any veterinary officer would release an animal for sale within that period and take chances of the disease being distributed to other farms. The criticism would lie there rather than in the permission to allow the second sale. If the department is satisfied as to its diagnosis that this burrowing mange may exist for two years—and I agree with them in that so far as mange goes—they should issue regulations providing that no sale may take place from a farm where such mange has been found.

I want to bring a different case of quarantine to the attention of the minister and I do not think he can find any regulations whereby he can escape responsibility. I brought to his attention a farm where a quarantine

had been established some four months previously in a case of suspected rabies. A man had lost several cattle and also a dog had been acting suspiciously. A quarantine had been established. Following that a biological examination, I have no doubt, was made, and the possibility of rabies was disproved, negatived. But notwithstanding that, this man was allowed to continue for four months with that quarantine on his farm. I have a letter under my hand and if the deputy will kindly wait, he can get all the details. I am not going to say that the greatest precaution should not be taken in the matter of quarantine. That is one action which you must take in preventing the spread of disease. But in this case what happened is that I verily believe the inspector forgot all about his quarantine and that farm was quarantined from May to September, although, as I say, a pathological examination had been made and the result was negative as regards rabies. The inspector should have gone back to that farm. He comes back and says: "Oh, I permitted him to sell farm produce." The farmer did not understand that and I could not get the quarantine placard because the inspector came out, grabbed it and took it away. I should like to see that quarantine placard. Why was he so keen to grab it and take it away when his attention was drawn to the length of the quarantine? That farmer was left there for four months under quarantine without any reason whatever and he had reached almost a destitute condition before the attention of the department was called to the matter. Then the inspector rushed up, removed the placard and said: "Everything is fine, but we think we were justified in our quarantine."

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 344, for the relief of Kenneth Blackwood Gibb.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 345, for the relief of Edith Spencley.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 346, for the relief of Annie Farrow.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park), (for Mr. Boys).

Bill No. 347, for the relief of Evelyn Mae Warren.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park), (for Mr. Boys).

Bill No. 349, for the relief of Vera Maud Gendron.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 350, for the relief of Lillian Ainsworth.—Mr. Lawson.

Bill No. 351, for the relief of Sarah Berkovitz.—Mr. Sanderson.

Bill No. 352, for the relief of George Frederick Wilson.—Mr. McGregor.

Bill No. 353, for the relief of Roy Franklin Beattie.—Mr. Spence.

Bill No. 354, for the relief of John George Laney.—Mr. Hepburn.

Bill No. 355, for the relief of Albert Nott.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 356, for the relief of John Thomas Legge.—Mr. Geary.

Bill No. 358, for the relief of Emil Henry Hornburg.—Mr. Edwards (Waterloo).

WILLIAM JOHN BLIGHT

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni) moved the third reading of Bill No. 336, for the relief of William John Blight.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, representations have been made to me that there is evidence that was not presented to the senate committee. Those representations come from those whose word I can trust, and for that reason, and for that reason only, I do not challenge this bill at the present stage. I would say, however, that the evidence as it comes to us from the senate committee does not prove the charges alleged. I hope the time will soon come when we shall not pay so much regard to lobbyists either in the senate or in the House of Commons.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

LOUIS COIT DARGAVEL

Mr. A. J. ANDERSON (Toronto-High Park), (for Mr. Casselman) moved the third reading of Bill No. 348, for the relief of Louis Coit Dargavel.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the third reading of this bill on the ground that evidence was improperly admitted, and once this evidence was admitted the co-respondent was not given sufficient time to face the charges that were made. In the insufficient time which was given, only about four days, part of the accusation made was proven to be entirely false and the evidence submitted did not prove the case. This is a case not proven, and because it is not proven I object to the third

reading of the bill. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth):

That the said bill be not now read a third time, but that it be sent back to the select standing committee on private bills with instructions that they have power to make further investigation.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle): I was not present last night when this bill was being considered in committee, but I have read what took place. It seems to me that in spite of the apparent desire of the house to vote all these bills through without any regard to the merits of each case or to the evidence brought or not brought in connection therewith, there should be at least some semblance of decency. I appeal to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe). I do not know this case, and I am simply taking the declarations as they were made last night in the house. It was stated last night by two hon. members that this divorce was being granted on a charge the witness to which was a perjurer—at least the evidence of his perjury was quite clear; that the proof made by the police agent was entirely unsound. He stated that the respondent and another party stopped at a certain hotel under a certain name. Now the person to whom that name belongs states that he lived at that place with his wife. Therefore this is a clear case, if not of perjury, of gross mistake. Application was made for a new hearing, and it was refused because of lack of time. The position seems to have been taken generally in this house that the whole responsibility rests with the committee of the Senate, but surely what we are doing here must count for something. Quebec claims to be opposed to the establishment of divorce courts on principle and believes that it is better to keep the present system because it offers a guarantee of careful scrutiny and is in effect a law instead of a judgment. But in a case like this if the statements, corroborated yesterday by the member for Brant (Mr. Smoke) and the member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan), are accurate, our decision may be in the form of a law, but we shall make it in defiance of the most elementary principles of justice and equity. We shall be ratifying blindly not a judgment but a decision by another body forming part of this parliament. For my part I protest once more most emphatically and most unequivocally against this manner of dissolving marriages. It is against all principles of morality, it is against all principles of law, it is against all principles of evidence, it is against all principles which are supposed to be upheld by parliaments and courts of justice. I refuse to be a party responsible for any such miscarriage of justice.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we had considerable discussion of the details of this case yesterday and the hon. member for Brant—who unfortunately has had to leave the city—made certain definite charges with regard to the procedure followed. Those charges have not been answered, nor has there been any review whatever by the private bills committee of this house or by the committee of the whole; we have simply acquiesced in what the Senate committee has done. I am informed that the Senate committee was not by any means a unit in this matter, though of that I have not any information in the report itself. But we have in this case as in many others evidence given by certain detectives. Their work is being recognize as a greater outrage than anyone could have imagined before we started discussing divorce bills this session. I am informed that one detective with his accomplice—if I may use that term, and I think it is proper here—has been responsible for securing evidence in some fifty cases, and that in some instances he has resorted to the most abominable practices in order to secure that evidence. These professional detectives try to lure their victims into vice and then turn round and report the evidence thus framed up in order that they may secure sufficient grounds on which to obtain a divorce. I say it is an abominable practice, and I cannot think that the conscience of this country will tolerate very much longer the practice of relying on evidence coming from such a source.

With regard to this particular case, it is quite obvious that somebody is committing perjury. I am not sure who it is. Any one who merely reads this evidence taken before the Senate committee has no opportunity of observing the witnesses at first hand, and therefore cannot so well judge who is the guilty party. May I read a sentence or two from the report that comes to us from the Senate committee? This will be found at page 58:

Mr. Beament: I have no further evidence today, but I have been able to obtain certain affidavits which I wish to read.

Mr. Beament, I believe, was acting as counsel for the respondent.

The Chairman: No.

Mr. Beament: For the purpose of asking for an adjournment.

Hon. Mr. Schaffner: No.

Mr. Beament: At least, I submit, the committee should hear the nature of the evidence.

The Chairman: What is the ground upon which you are asking for the adjournment?

Mr. Beament: On the ground that I can produce evidence to substantiate the fact that the co-respondent was ill in the apartment house he lives in, during the period he mentioned, but that it was impossible for him to get the witness to come with him to-day owing to his business engagements, but that he can come in a week from now.

The Chairman: The last sitting of this committee will take place on Friday next. We are going to close up then, absolutely.

And so to suit the conveniences of the Senate committee counsel for the respondent was refused the opportunity of bringing the wintesses which he said he could bring. As we were told by the member for Brant, the charges which were originally made in the petition were not followed up at the trial, but at that time other charges were substitued, and when it was attempted to refute those other charges counsel could not obtain a sufficiently long adjournment. The Senate committee had to get on with its work, it was going to close up, and whether it involved injustice or not did not seem to make very much difference, so no adjournment was granted. If we are in any sense a court of review I say we cannot do other than ask that this bill be not now read a third time; I am glad to support the amendment.

Mr. A. C. CASSELMAN (Grenvelle-Dundas): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements that have been made with respect to this bill I feel I should reply briefly. The whole argument against the bill is based on the fact that certain evidence was improperly admitted, and that certain evidence which should have been admitted was not allowed to be put in. The first hearing of this case was on the seventeenth day of May, and at that time the evidence which was attempted to be contradicted by affidavit was given. The last sitting of the Senate committee on this bill was on the twenty-ninth of May, so there were twelve days intervening during which this evidence could have been secured. Failing to do that there was an opportunity to adduce this evidence before the private bills committee of this house. I believe that the applicant understood that the bill was going to be opposed before the private bills committee, and he presented himself to that committee. There was no objection taken whatever. The first objection was taken in this house yesterday and resulted in the bill being carried on a vote in committee of the whole. May I repeat that I am aware of the facts in connection with this case. The petitioner is personally known to me. I am satisfied that the evidence produced by him was of such a nature that in any court of law he would have been given the relief which the Senate committee saw fit to give him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park) moves that Bill No. 348 be now read a third time, to which Miss Macphail moves in amendment, seconded by Mr. Woodsworth:

That the said bill be not now read a third time but that it be sent back to the select standing committee on private bills with instructions that they have power to make further investigation.

M. SEGUIN: En français, s'il vous plaît.

M. l'ORATEUR: M. Anderson (Toronto-High Park) propose que le bill n° 348 soit maintenant lu une troisième fois, et mademoiselle Macphail propose en amendement, appuyée par M. Woodsworth:

Que le dit bill ne soit pas lu maintenant une troisième fois, mais qu'il soit renvoyé au comité permanent des bills privés avec autorisation de poursuivre son enquête.

The house divided on the amendment (Miss Macphail), which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Bancroft,	Lapierre,
Benoit,	Lapointe,
Bourassa,	Lavigueur,
Bowman,	Letellier,
Campbell,	Lucas,
Casgrain,	MacLean (Prince),
Chevrier,	Macphail (Miss),
Delisle,	McMillan,
Deslauriers,	Morin (Bagot),
Evans,	Perras,
Fansher (Last Mountain),	Pouliot,
	Prévost,
Fansher (Lambton East),	Ralston,
	Roberge,
Forke,	Séguin,
Gardiner,	Sinclair (Queens),
Gervais,	Speakman,
Girouard,	Spencer,
Guérin,	Stewart (Edmonton West),
Heaps,	
Heenan,	Sylvestre,
Irvine,	Telford,
Jelliff,	Tobin,
Kellner,	Veniot,
Lacombe,	Ward,
Laflamme,	Woodsworth.—49.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),	MacDonald (Cape Breton South),
Arthurs,	McGregor,
Barber,	McRae,
Bell (St. Antoine),	Neill,
Bell (St. John-Albert),	Peck,
Bowen,	Plunkett,
Cantley,	Robinson,
Casselman,	Ross (Moose Jaw),
Chaplin,	Rowe,
Edwards (Waterloo South),	Sanderson,
Fraser,	Simpson,
Garland (Carleton),	Spence,
Gray,	Stewart (Leeds),
Harris,	Stinson,
Hepburn,	Stirling,
Jenkins,	Thompson,
Johnston (Long Lake),	Tummon,
Ladner,	Young (Saskatoon),
Lawson,	Young (Toronto Northeast).—38.

CHARLES EDWIN WALKER

Mr. F. G. SANDERSON (South Perth) moved the third reading of Bill No. 296, for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): I wish to direct the attention of the house once more to this case. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre presented the facts some little time ago when the bill came up for second reading, and I reviewed the case a few nights ago when the bill was in committee, so I do not need to take up very much time to explain the situation.

Briefly, in this case the main witness for the respondent was unable to appear because of illness. There was no doubt of that; a doctor's certificate was presented proving that the witness could not appear. Counsel asked that the case be postponed, but that request was refused on the ground that it would be difficult to have the same members of the committee present at a subsequent sitting. The case was proceeded with. In addition, three co-respondents were named, but the respondent was not aware that these three people would be named and was not in a position to refute the evidence. Moreover, the woman in the case is very poor; she works for her living and could not engage proper counsel, nor could she be present when the bill was referred to the committee on private bills for further investigation.

The fact of the matter is that this case received no attention from the committee of this house, and surely any hon. member who has read the evidence will see at a glance that the grounds for divorce are very slim indeed, with the woman emphatically denying the charges but unable to bring the witnesses to prove her case. I am sure any hon. member who has read the evidence will be willing to give this woman the benefit of the doubt. I beg to move, therefore, seconded by Mr. Jelliff:

That Bill No. 296 (letter O7 of the senate), intituled "An act for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker" be not now read a third time but that it be sent back to the select standing committee on private bills with instructions that they have power to make further investigation.

Mr. SPENCE: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking for the sponsor of the bill, who had to leave the city to-day.

Mr. IRVINE: The sponsor of the bill is in his seat.

Mr. SANDERSON: I thank my hon. friend for taking my place, but I happen to be here to-night. I have very little to say with regard to this bill, but I happen to be the sponsor of it and have read the evidence very carefully. When it was up for second reading in the house I moved that it be referred back to the private bills committee because the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) raised some objections and attempted to read a letter from the respondent.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, I made no attempt to read the letter. If I had I would have read it.

Mr. SANDERSON: I do not want to get into controversy with my hon. friend, but my recollection is that he attempted to read the letter but was not permitted to do so.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I merely said that I had a letter.

Mr. SANDERSON: We will let it go at that. I moved that the bill be referred back to the private bills committee because I felt that in view of the argument presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre it should be given further consideration. The bill was referred back to the private bills committee and counsel was there representing the respondent but he stated that he had no brief or instructions from his principal and it was decided to have the bill come up on the following Friday. The bill came up on that day but the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was not there, nor was the petitioner or the respondent. The hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) was there and pleaded the case of the respondent, and may I say that he pleaded it very well.

Mr. IRVINE: When?

Mr. SANDERSON: In the committee.

Mr. IRVINE: When?

Mr. SANDERSON: The time the hon. member acted as chief counsel. A vote was taken in the committee and the hon. member for Wetaskiwin voted alone. I submit that this bill should pass the house because careful consideration has been given to it, not once, not twice, but three times.

Mr. IRVINE: Was the evidence in this case ever presented to the committee?

Mr. SANDERSON: The evidence was taken before the senate committee and a copy was sent to every member of the house. The hon. member apparently reads all this evidence and I rather think he likes to read it, because he seems to be thoroughly well posted. The evidence was reviewed by the private bills committee when the matter came up the other day.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): The hon. member for Wetaskiwin has a somewhat short memory as to what happened in the committee. During the last discussion on this subject he said that every bill which had been referred to the committee had been thrown out, and I thought at the time he made that statement that he was a little astray; this is one bill which was not thrown out. He is also astray in his statement of the position of this bill before the committee. It was referred to the committee and was considered on two different occasions. When it came to the committee it was debated at some length and a legal gentleman of very high qualifications from the province of Manitoba made a vigorous opposition to the bill. The bill received a good deal of consideration but it was felt that more time should be given, consequently action on it was delayed. It was considered the second time and the result was as stated by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Sanderson); it was passed by the committee. While it is true that the hon. member for Wetaskiwin was alone in voting against the bill, I was personally opposed to its passage, and to that extent I am in agreement with the hon. gentleman. However, it happened that I was in the chair at the time and, therefore, did not vote. This bill is one which might properly be described as a dirty mess all round. The evidence was that at one time the petitioner had been guilty of adultery but when an alimony action was brought by the wife it was agreed that the charges which were being made one against the other should be withdrawn, and legally they were withdrawn.

Mr. CAHAN: Withdrawn in the case before the court?

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. BROWN: Withdrawn in the case before the court, but that does not alter the realities of the case. It seemed to me to be proven conclusively that the man did not come before this court of parliament with clean hands.

Mr. CAHAN: If I read the case correctly, he came before parliament simply to get rid of having to pay the alimony which he agreed to pay.

Mr. BROWN: Undoubtedly that was the case. I, for my part, would have preferred that the amendment moved by the hon. member should have been to the effect that the bill be read this day six months hence. In that event I would have been prepared to vote against the passage of the bill. In most of these cases one side is involved in what may be described as a dirty mess, but in this particular case it seemed to me that both sides were involved, and so far as I am concerned I do not feel like giving any particular relief to one side or the other. As the husband is asking for the divorce in this instance, I propose to vote against his receiving it.

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Smoke) left last night, he asked me to present the facts of this case to the house. The hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Irvine) has said that no adjournment was given in the divorce committee of the Senate. An adjournment of from ten to twelve days was given, and at the adjourned hearing the lawyer for the respondent did not appear. He sent an Ottawa agent there merely for the purpose of having a few lines of evidence expunged, and the agent then left the court. It has been said that the lady is poor and had not any money to bring witnesses, but for two or three years she has been receiving $35 per week alimony, and $10 per week for her daughter, so she could not have been very hard up. She claimed that she had three witnesses who could come and prove an alibi, but in each case the witnesses did not show up. It was thought in the private bills committee, after considering the matter for two days, that if she had any witnesses who could give evidence in her favour, they would have appeared. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Smoke) knows the petition well, and it is at his request I am speaking.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): It may be that this case is what has been described as a dirty mess, but I submit that even a criminal is entitled to fair play, and I do not think that has been given in this case.

Mr. CAHAN: And the respondent, the woman, has not been proven to be a criminal.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) says, this woman has not been proven to be a criminal. That is clear. This case is one that I called to the attention of the house at an earlier stage and asked that it be carefully studied by the private bills committee. That careful consideration has not been given. It is true that the matter was brought up; it was discussed and a strong case was made out for delay. Indeed, so strong a case was made out that it was decided to adjourn and call the woman. When she was communicated with, it was found that she had exhausted what money she had and she could not afford to come here or to retain a lawyer. She had spent all that she could rake up in appearing before the senate divorce committee and in endeavouring to answer charges that were then unexpectedly brought up against her. Let me remind the house, as I stated the other day, that the original charge against her—

Mr. SANDERSON: I understand my hon. friend to say that this bill was not given careful consideration before the private bills committee of the commons. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes.

Mr. SANDERSON: How does my hon. friend know that? He was not a member of that committee and he was not present at the committee when the bill was brought up.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not a member of that committee, but I received a very thorough report from those who were there. Would the hon. gentleman venture to say that the case received careful consideration when the respondent was not even there, when there was not a single witness, when no further evidence was taken than that which is now before us? It was on account of the lack of that evidence that I took the matter up.

Mr. CAHAN: And they did not take a single step to bring the woman here.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It was quite possible that the woman might have been brought here as in the Bourdon case; that her expenses might have been paid. As it was, her expenses were not arranged for. A wire was sent to her saying that she might come.

Mr. IRVINE: The wire was not sent to her. The lawyer who had been her agent was communicated with, but she had no agent.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. gentleman across the way says that she had an agent and that he did not act. He had no instructions to act. He had acted and was paid for acting in the other committee. I do not know whether he had obtained the full payment or not.

Mr. SANDERSON: The hon. member is wrong again. Counsel for the respondent did appear. With all due respect to my hon. friend, I want to give the facts as I see them.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I know the facts.

Mr. SANDERSON: My hon. friend does not know the facts of the case or he would not adduce the arguments he has before the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am quite aware that counsel was present, but I am also informed that counsel said he had no instructions to act for the woman. Those are the facts in the case and I would just as soon in this take the word of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin as that of the hon. member across the way, the sponsor of the bill. The record will corroborate the word of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin that counsel stated he had no instructions to act. He had been counsel before the senate committee. I want once more for the benefit of the house to quote from the evidence taken before the senate committee. I quoted this the other night, but there may be some hon. members present now who were not present at that time:

W. D. M. Shorey, barrister-at-law, of the city of Toronto, appeared as counsel for the respondent.

Mr. Shorey: Mr. Chairman, before the evidence is taken I want to make a formal application for a postponement on behalf of the respondent. I assume ordinarily that it would be made after the plaintiff's case is in. I do not want to delay the taking of evidence this morning, but there is one witness in particular for the respondent, a Mrs. Irene Henderson, a cousin with whom the respondent has been living practically since the respondent and her husband separated, who is a most material witness for the respondent. In March she had a major operation performed—

And so on. Further on in the same page this appears:

The Chairman: One of the difficulties is this: the committee is made up of different members, and you cannot always get the same members together to hear the second part of the case.

And because the same members, the same jury, could not be brought together throughout the entire hearing, it was decided that nothing further be done. So the senate did not give a fair hearing to this woman. She

was not able to bring her witnesses and when the case actually came up before the private bills committee, we did not summon a witness; we did not make any real inquiry; the woman was not represented by counsel. Under those conditions I claim that it would be doing a serious injustice to her if at the present time we should let this bill pass.

Mr. SPENCE: I understand an adjournment of from ten to twelve days was given in the senate. If this sort of thing is allowed to continue, it is just making a farce of the private bills committee, and many members of that committee will not want to serve on it again.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Irvine) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Arthurs,	Jelliff,
Benoit,	Kennedy,
Bourassa,	Lacombe,
Brown,	Laflamme,
Cahan,	Lapointe,
Campbell,	Lucas,
Coote,	Luchkovich,
Delisle,	Macphail (Miss),
Deslauriers,	Morin (Bagot),
Evans,	Peck,
Fansher (Last Mountain),	Perras,
Fansher (Lambton East),	Prévost,
Forke,	Rinfret,
Gardiner,	Séguin,
Girouard,	Speakman,
Guérin,	Spencer,
Heaps,	Sylvestre,
Irvine,	Tobin,
	Woodsworth.—37.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),	MacLean (Prince),
Bancroft,	McLean (Melfort),
Barber,	McGregor,
Bell (St. John-Albert),	McKenzie,
Bock,	McRae,
Bowen,	Neill,
Bowman,	Ralston,
Casselman,	Ross (Moose Jaw),
Cayley,	Rowe,
Chaplin,	Sanderson,
Foster,	Senn,
Fraser,	Sinclair (Queens),
Garland (Carleton),	Spence,
Gray,	Spotton,
Harris,	Stewart (Leeds),
Hepburn,	Stirling,
Jenkins,	Telford,
Kaiser,	Thompson,
Ladner,	Totzke,
Lawson,	Young (Saskatoon),
MacDonald (Cape Breton South),	Young (Weyburn).—42.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion.

Mr. IRVINE: I would draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that it is after nine o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have to finish the proceeding once it has started.

Mr. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): I move in amendment to the main motion that this bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read this day three months hence.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for private bills being exhausted, the house will revert to supply.

SUPPLY

MINES AND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mines Branch

For investigation of mineral resources and deposits; of the mining and metallurgical industries, and of mineral technology; wages, expenses of testing and research laboratories, investigations by Dominion Fuel Board, including salaries and all other expenses, $257,000.

For operation of peat bog at Alfred, Ontario, $25,000.

For publications, English and French, purchase of books, laboratory supplies, instruments, miscellaneous assistance and contingencies, $45,000.

For transportation charges from out-lying provinces on ore shipments which may be sent to the ore dressing plant of the Mines branch at Ottawa for testing purposes, under regulations approved by the Minister of Mines, $1,000.

To compensate J. H. Fortune for quarters, fuel, light and water supplied him as resident caretaker of the Mines branch building, Sussex St., vacated because of the necessity of utilizing the caretaker's quarters for storage and laboratory space, $400.

Mr. NEILL: Will the minister be kind enough to make a statement in connection with what he has done to carry out the resolution of the house at last session:

That in the opinion of this house, in order to test and demonstrate the possibilities of pulverized coal, the government should adapt one of their steamers on the Pacific coast, and the furnace of one of the government public buildings in British Columbia, to the use of pulverized coal from Vancouver island mines.

I have been taking this matter up with the government from time to time. At first there was delay owing to the fact that the department was observing the result of the experiment on the Lingan which had been equipped by the British Steel Corporation to use pulverized coal. This delayed the government's plans quite a while, because they

thought they might as well benefit by that experiment. After a prolonged trial it appeared to have been a total failure. This must have been due to some defect either in the system adapted or in its installation, because I have in my hand the record of an experiment on the New Zealand Shipping Company's steamship Hororata, of 11,200 tons gross, which arrived in New Zealand after a voyage of 11,000 miles from the old country. Half of her boilers were equipped for the use of pulverized coal. It was a very thorough and successful experiment. I see they used all sorts of coal—Welsh steam coal, North of England coal, Scottish coal, Virginian coal, and some New River coal which they obtained at Panama. On the homeward voyage they were going to burn New Zealand coal.

As regards adapting the furnace of one of the government public buildings in British Columbia to use pulverized coal, while the resolution called for that to be done one must not be unreasonable. I have been informed that the only buildings that could be suitably equipped in that way would require a boiler having a rating of 300 horse-power or over, and that there are only two public buildings in Canada that could make use of a heating apparatus of that size. Therefore we cannot expect the experiment to be carried out in British Columbia. But it has been ascertained almost beyond doubt that pulverized coal can be successfully used on land. Several factories have been equipped with apparatus for this purpose, and the system is beyond the experimental stage. But apparently there are vast differences between the conditions governing the installation of the system on land and on the sea; why I do not know. Some people put it down to the Scotch marine boiler, which they claim is not adapted for the use of pulverized coal, and that the tubular boiler should be used. To solve such and other problems is why this house endorsed the idea that the government should experiment on some of the boats of the Canadian government. The British government has done a great deal of research in that way, but it is not entirely useful to us on the Pacific coast, because it appears that the coal from each mine requires special adjustment of the equipment to handle it, and that is why it was thought advisable that we should experiment with our own coal on one of our government boats on the Pacific coast. We are disappointed to find that the Canadian government merchant marine has ordered two boats to be equipped for oil burning. That is against the spirit and the letter of the resolution of this house.

I find in a report I have here that the Blue Star line—a British line of course—operating a fleet of twenty-six vessels, proposes at the earliest possible moment to equip its fleet with the Clarke Chapman pulverized fuel system. A recently ordered 9,000 tonner will be equipped to burn pulverized fuel by the Brand system. The P. & O. Steam Navigating Company—one of the biggest in the world—have decided to convert several of their steamers to the Bauer-Wach system of exhaust steam turbine propulsion in combination with pulverized fuel plants. There has been a company formed in England known as the Howden-Buell Combustion Company, Limited, to develop and exploit both marine and land pulverized fuel installations. It was that system which was used on the Hororata which I mentioned at the outset of my remarks. It is apparent that pulverized coal can be utilized. There is needed only a little more enterprise on the part of the government to make it a success.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. NEILL: I suggested they should adapt one of the fishery patrol boats on the Pacific, but it is objected that they are too small to justify the installation of the system. This would cost some $15,000 to $20,000 whether the boat be large or small, and we do not want the experiment to be made in such a way that it would be abortive and give a black eye to the proposal.

I should like the minister to give the committee a statement of what he has done along these lines, and what we may hope he will do to carry out this resolution in the future.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has dealt fairly thoroughly with the pulverized fuel situation, and undoubtedly he is keeping very closely in touch with the experiments that are being carried on. We have discovered two or three things in this connection. One is that there must be a laboratory test of the fuel before it is attempted to use it for pulverized fuel firing. Another is that the installation of the mechanical devices for the purpose of using pulverized fuel is very expensive. A third is that so far there have been no successful tests made of boilers under 150 horsepower, which is a fairly large boiler. In the Lingan test on the St. Lawrence from Sydney to Montreal, spoken of by my hon. friend,

I think a mistake was made in equipping all the boilers with pulverized fuel apparatus. When the mechanical device went wrong of course the ship was laid up. We watched the experiment very closely. Had they equipped one half of the boilers, then the ship would have been able to keep going. That was the practice followed in most of the cases where attempts were made on British liners going to New Zealand and later by the shipping company mentioned by my hon. friend.

My attention was first directed to the advisability of giving serious consideration to pulverized fuel owing to the statement made to me two years ago by the marine engineers located at the British fuel research station that if a complete mechanical system could be devised for this purpose pulverized coal would be a cheaper steam producer than fuel oil which is so rapidly taking the place of coal on ocean going vessels. I made some inquiries at the British fuel research station and found they were experimenting along those lines. I asked them to keep us closely in touch with the results of their experiments. In most cases where the experiment has been a success they have not equipped the entire ship with pulverized fuel burners. I think it is safe to say that the experiments have been successful and have reduced to a considerable degree the cost of raising steam on these vessels. With respect to our own situation, last year when my hon. friend's motion was being considered I felt it would be possible to install this equipment on some of our lighter craft on the west coast; but after some investigation we deemed it unwise to ask for an experiment on a vessel of the size of the one in the fisheries trade on the coast. With respect to what my hon. friend has said regarding stationary plants, we found them too small for our purposes there. I believe there are very great possibilities in connection with pulverized fuel firing for the raising of steam, but so far the mechanical plant costs a considerable amount of money and we have the full advantage of the experiments carried on by British shipping as well as the attempt made on the St. Lawrence in firing on the Lingan. I am now endeavouring to see whether it is not possible to have the merchant marine make an experiment on one of their ships. I do not think it would be wise on the part of the government to spend a large sum of money only to find that the equipment was faulty. In the experimental stage we are severely criticized for spending money; and as in the case of low temperature carbonization of fuels, in connection with which so much has been done in Great Britain, I thought it would be wise for us to wait until we had available sufficient knowledge as to what had been discovered by the experiments carried on in this respect in Great Britain by private companies. I do think, however, that the equipment of one or two boilers in the merchant marine, burning our own fuel from our own Canadian coal, would be worth while; and with that end in view I shall see whether a further experiment cannot be undertaken on our own behalf with respect to pulverized fuel.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): The minister mentioned something about the low carbonization of fuel. What progress has been made since the last session of parliament in connection with testing fuels in western Canada from the standpoint of the low carbonization problem?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have collected samples from a good many mines in the west. We are establishing now a fairly large plant for testing purposes in the fuel laboratories on Booth street, and as soon as the equipment is in place we shall test fuels by the low carbonization process.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister has referred to the importance of small coal; he says he has not thought it desirable to do any experimental work in this regard. The trouble I find with his whole department is that they have never done any real experimental work; what they have done is, in the main, to copy the work of established plants which have demonstrated certain lines of action, and then play in a childish way with the same thing themselves. I find that in some of the reports made by the department there are put forward, in regard to the investigation of fuels, statements which I do not consider correct, while others are trivialities. Take for instance one of the publications of the department issued in 1926 in reference to fuels and fuel testing. It is said to be a general review of an investigation carried out by two gentlemen of the staff, Mr. Haanel and Mr. Gilmore. I will deal briefly with a few of the statements made by these gentlemen. At page 35 of the report they have something to say with respect to the nature of sulphur in cokes made from Canadian coal, and they discuss the experiment they made in connection with a mixture of Nova Scotia and United States coal. Now I ask the minister this question: Why waste any time on an experiment of that kind, namely, the coking of a mixture of Nova Scotia and United States coal? What good result will fol-

low therefrom? Will the minister tell me that? I can understand his carrying on experiments with Nova Scotia coal so far as coke is concerned, although experience in its use dates back fifty or sixty years: Nova Scotia coal was coked successfully and used to a considerable extent in Nova Scotia before the minister was born, and, as everybody knows, is still used there. Page after page of this report which I hold in my hand is taken up with experiments carried on by the officers of the minister's department—experiments which mean practically nothing. Here for example is a statement appearing on page 36 of the report:

The coke made from the Springhill coal is the only one with a sufficiently low sulphur content to be classed as metallurgical, though the sulphur in the Sydney-Pocohontas, Comox, and Sydney cokes is not much too high.

That statement is absolutely false: thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of tons of pig iron have been made in Nova Scotia with coke solely the product of the coal mines of Pictou and of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia. Of that there is no possible doubt. Why then say that coal made from Springhill coal is the only one produced in Nova Scotia with a sufficiently low sulphur content to be classed as metallurgical fuel? The statement, I say, is absolutely untrue, is most misleading, and is most unfair. In the next paragraph on the same page the writer deals with different forms of sulphur in coal and coke and makes statements which would be challenged by anyone with a practical knowledge of the matter. Further down the page he states:

The writer's earlier paper indicates that, in his opinion, while oxidation of the carbonaceous material in coal is the principal cause of spontaneous combustion, the oxidation of finely disseminated pyrites is also a contributing factor.

Of course it is a contributing factor; that is known to everyone who has handled coal and has been known from time immemorial. Why therefore go into that matter now?

Mr. CHAPLIN: They must print something; that is all.

Mr. CANTLEY: Take page 43:

Typical western Canadian coals were analysed for sulphate, pyritic and organic sulphur, and the following conclusions drawn:

None of the coking coals from the Mountain park or the two Crowsnest pass areas contain any appreciable amount of pyritic sulphur, nor do the partly coking coals from the Nanaimo area contain much of this form of sulphur. The sample of coking coal from the Comox area contained considerable pyritic sulphur, but this would be reduced by washing.

Of course it would be reduced by washing; all coals that contain pyrite—and most of them do—can eliminate the sulphur to workable proportions by that method. Coal is washed in Nova Scotia and in other places for two reasons, first to reduce the sulphur and then to reduce the ash; both can be largely eliminated by successful washing. Here is another gem:

Cokes made from maritime provinces coal, either alone or blended with United States coals, and one coke made from Comox, B.C., coal, were analyzed for sulphide, sulphate, free and solid solution sulphur. It was found that:—

The coke made from Springhill coal was the only one with a low enough sulphur content to be classed as a good metallurgical coke.

That is the second time such a statement is made in this report, and it is not a true statement of fact. Then the report goes on:

The cokes made from the Sydney (unwashed) and Comox (washed) coals contained a little too much sulphur to be classed as satisfactory metallurgical cokes.

The cokes made from Minto coal contained such a large percentage of sulphur as to render them unsatisfactory for almost any purpose whatever. However, coal washing, which would be necessary on account of the high percentage of ash, would greatly reduce the sulphur content.

No one in the maritimes with any sense ever suggested coking Minto coal, because the percentage of sulphur is much too high. It could be washed out, but you would wash out at the same time eight or nine per cent of the total volume of coal, and the ash is also too high; in short it is not a suitable coal. These same arguments apply to other coals, but to state that maritime province coal generally will not produce good metallurgical fuel is to make a statement which is absolutely untrue. Then on page 44 I find the following:

Considerable variations in the specific gravities of the separating solutions did not to any extent affect the division of pyritic sulphur.

There you are dealing with laboratory experiments instead of ordinary commercial washing; you are dealing with methods of treating coal with solutions of different densities at different strengths. That is only a matter for laboratory experiment. What is the use of continuing that sort of thing and spending tens of thousands of dollars to demonstrate something which was demonstrated thirty or forty years ago in a practical way? I do not say that the present steel and coal companies know all there is to be known with regard to their own coal, but they know more than anyone else knows and they have acquired that knowledge through a long period of years in the daily operations of their plants.

Then on page 47 I find a table dealing with cokes made from Sydney, Sydney-Pocohontas,

Springhill, Minto-Elkhorn-Pocohontas and Comox coal. There we find the total sulphur, sulphide, sulphate, free sulphur, solid solution sulphur and ash, but all that information was known long ago by the people interested in this coal, that is, the people who consume large quantities of coal in the manufacture of iron and steel in Nova Scotia and Ontario. On page 61 I find the following:

> As a general rule "mine" samples contain less ash and have higher calorific values than the corresponding "commercial" samples. . . It should also be realized that, generally speaking "slack" coal will contain more moisture and ash and have a lower calorific value than the corresponding screened coal, and that "run-of-mine" coal will be intermediate between the two.

Of course that is so, and any coal miner or coal dealer knows it is so. Why burden a report with material of that kind? It is making this department a laughing stock with people who know anything about this business.

I might proceed to deal with similar matters contained in the report of the Dominion Fuel Board for 1923-28. At page 33 of their report they deal with the low temperature carbonization of bituminous coal, and I want to point out again that Pictou coal has been coked for over sixty years and washed for over forty years. This coal has been coked in beehive ovens for more than three-score years and for one equal period has been used in blast furnace operations. The first rectangular coke ovens on this continent were operated in Pictou county in 1891, and the first commercial coal washer constructed on this continent was operated at the same place in the same year. Half a dozen coal washing plants have been constructed in Pictou county and in Cape Breton since that time, yet here we are given a lot of information which may be of interest to school children but which is of no use to people in the trade. I suggest the minister would be well advised to withdraw a good deal of this information, and I believe his department would stand higher in public estimation if that action were taken.

I might go on and refer to many other matters in connection with these various reports, but I do not think I should take the necessary time. For example, these reports deal with the absorption of moisture, with the depreciation in peat through handling and many other things of that character which are not of any great value to this or any other country. Most of the material contained in these various reports, of which there are half a dozen, is out of date and has been out of date for years.

My quarrel with the department is that to a very large extent the experiments which have been carried on are simply play boy work based on information which was acquired long ago by people in the business. Practically all the information contained in these reports could have been obtained by simply visiting one of several of the plants in Nova Scotia and taking notes on what has been done by the old method of trial and error, the only method by which progress is made.

Now I take up the final report of the peat committee, in which reference is made to an attempt to carbonize peat from the Alfred bog. The approximate analysis is given, as follows:

> Moisture, 25.6 per cent.
> Ash, 4.6 per cent.
> Volatile matter, 48 per cent.
> Fixed carbon, 21.3 per cent.
> Calorific valuer, B.T.U's, 7,040.

This calorific value is just about half that of really good Nova Scotia coal. An experiment was carried on in connection with the carbonization of this peat, and one very peculiar thing in connection with that experiment is that the fuel used to heat the ovens was 2,654 pounds of slack coal. Why did you not use peat; why use slack coal? You are attempting to carbonize peat; is there not sufficient heat units in the peat to warm up the ovens in order to carry out the carbonization? Could anything be more ridiculous than a performance of that kind? There are many like cases which I could mention, but I do not want to take up any more time of the committee. This department has carried on experimental work for more than twenty years at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars and the results have been one continuous failure, especially with regard to the experiments carried on with peat. There has been duplication in the securing of information concerning subjects which have long ago been investigated by private enterprises unassisted by government aids and depending wholly upon the commercial results obtained. In other words, knowledge has been gained by the old method by which all useful information has been acquired. I submit that the time has come when this waste of the public money should be stopped, and I hope the minister will stop it.

I would like to compare the work done by the mines department with that which has been carried on in Great Britain and on the continent. And here may I say I have nothing but praise for the other department under the minister's management, the geological survey, but I can find very little to praise and much to condemn in the work carried on by the mines department. As the result of the war Germany lost a large proportion of the territory which has previously supplied her

with a great deal of her bituminous coal; I refer to Silesia, which was awarded to Poland. How did she meet that situation? By utilizing what they call brown coal, which is practically the same as our lignite, and to-day we find her using that coal, formerly neglected, in her open hearth gas producers, using it to run her steel and iron works, and as the fuel for the carrying on of other industries. Prior to the war they had not dreamed of being able to do this work with their lignite. If the department desires to learn how to deal with the lignite in the western provinces they should send someone to Germany to see how she is solving that problem. It would not cost anything to get that information, outside of sending a really capable man there.

Enormous progress has been made in the use of powdered coal, as was referred to by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). Probably the greatest problem in the use of this fuel is the upkeep of the pulverizing machinery, because that machinery wears out faster than any other known type of machine. Statements have been made in some of these publications that pulverized coal can be stored, can be carried in tubes, can be blown into furnaces, and the same things are said with regard to pulverized peat, such statements are not correct. If such is attempted you will have explosions, because coal in a pulverized condition is highly explosive and when a certain proportion of air is mixed with the coal a spark or even friction will set it off. Anyone who has seen the results of dust explosions in any of our collieries will have some knowledge of the tremendously destructive effect of coal dust explosions. We in Nova Scotia have had for years experience in firing heating furnaces and reheating furnaces with pulverized coal. We at first had the idea that it could be stored in bins, conveyed through pipes and blown into furnaces, but we found that that was impracticable. It collects moisture very rapidly and then cakes up, and there are other reasons which I need not refer to.

Is the minister aware that internal combustion engines are to-day being operated in Germany with pulverized coal in the same manner in which petrol or gasoline is used? The advances made in connection with the use of pulverized fuel in Great Britain have been very great. The minister has said that the boilers which were here available for experimentation by him were too small as they were only 150 horse-power. How many horse-power, may I ask him, is there available in the heating plant in connection with this building? When a new installation of boilers was being asked for last year I suggested to the Minister of Public Works that the boilers be fitted up to use pulverized fuel. If that had been done a demonstration plant would have been provided and the men of the department could have watched the results of the operation every day. Why was not advantage taken of that opportunity? I would like the minister to answer that question.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I thought the hon. member was making a speech and I did not want to interrupt him; I intended to answer him when he had finished.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister has indulged in some talk at times, more particularly when he returned last year from the other side of the Atlantic, regarding the by-products which could be obtained from coal in the form of oil. The latest information which is available in connection with that is to the effect that under existing conditions this process is unprofitable with the use of high temperature distillation and that the profits to be derived from low temperature carbonization are even more problematical. As yet nothing whatever can be said as to the commercial value of the Bergius process to which the minister referred at great length last year.

So far my remarks have been what the minister might term destructive, but I do not want to stop there. I would like to make one recommendation to the minister, and I would be very glad if he would adopt it. It is this: instead of spending time and money in carrying out experiments with regard to things which have been well known, determined and settled long ago, take two or three of the brightest men from his department and send them to the old country, to Germany, to the United States and to France to observe and study what other people are doing in a commercial and practical way. If that were done the minister would be able to give us some information which would be of enormous value to the industries of this country. These books issued from his department may have some value to the primary schools, but are of no value to the industries of this country, whether coal mining, coke producing, iron or steel making, or any of the kindred industries.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go into the intricacies of the analyses of the different grades of coal which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley) has suggested that the government should further investigate, but one thing which is obvious to all the people of Canada is that no serious attempt has been made to develop a national fuel policy. We have a national fuel board costing this country about $20,000 a year. They submit reports to par-

liament, and certain investigations are carried on by them with respect to analyses and other matters of a highly technical and intricate character, but we are left completely in the dark with regard to the general basis of developing a national fuel policy, which is one of the most important matters that the country could deal with. If the expense involved to carry on the fuel board, namely, $20,000, is not sufficient to broaden their scope, I would suggest to the minister that enough money be placed at their disposal to enable them at least to carry on an investigation with respect to the development of a national fuel policy for the Dominion. It is their duty; it is not the duty of members of parliament, and I do not think it can be claimed to be the duty of the Minister of Mines in the federal government to evolve a national fuel policy whereby we shall use our Canadian fuels instead of importing foreign fuels as we have been doing year after year in increasing quantities. Such a move would prove of benefit not only to the eastern portion but also to the midwest and the extreme western portions of the Dominion. I offer this suggestion to the minister in all seriousness and I hope before long some properly constituted agency of the government, it matters little whether it be the fuel board or some other commission, will develop and inaugurate a national fuel policy for the Dominion so that we may use the great resources we have instead of importing such huge quantities of fuel from foreign countries.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): First, let me say a word with respect to the criticism of the hon. member for Pictou. No one denies that Springhill coal and coals of similar character will make good metallurgical coke. That has never been denied; but when the question is one of using Nova Scotia coal for that purpose in central Canada, it becomes purely and simply a question of transportation and costs. Let us for the moment forget altogether about any suggestion of difference in the fuel. That, I think, answers my hon. friend. This is not a problem particularly for a fuel board; it is a mere matter of how much the people of Canada are willing to pay for transporting their own fuel into what we call the acute fuel areas of this country where the larger portion of our manufacturing industries are located. Attempts have been made: indeed, they are under way at this time, to lend assistance in that regard, and a good deal of coal is being moved in. I think I am safe in saying that the water-borne coal to Montreal has reached pretty well into eastern Ontario

—I am now speaking of bituminous coals, coals that are ordinarily used in the United States—in competition with the United States product coming across the line. We have done that and I am asking for a vote of $250,000, as hon. gentlemen will note, in the supplementary estimates, for the purpose of moving coal next year, and, I hope, greater quantities than have been moved heretofore.

As to any question of differences in the fuels, I am not going to raise that at all; I assume they are similar. But the short rail haul from the coal mines in the United States to the south of us, with a low rail rate and a much lower production cost than prevails in Nova Scotia, makes it a little difficult to land here, over the longer haul, coal that is mined in Nova Scotia, to meet the competition in price of the United States product. That is the practical difficulty we have to face. Of course transportation by water relieves the situation very considerably. There is no trouble as regards the department with the statement of my hon. friend that good coke has been made from Springhill coal.

Mr. CANTLEY: That is not my statement. What I was controverting was the statement in one of the minister's publications that Springhill coal was the only coal that would make metallurgical fuel. I deny that absolutely.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): For the moment I am dealing with the Springhill product because it is a representative product of Nova Scotia mines.

Mr. CANTLEY: But the minister is misrepresenting what I said. I found fault with the statement that Springhill coal was the only coal in Nova Scotia that would make satisfactory fuel.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I admit it is not the only one.

Mr. CANTLEY: I know, but one of the minister's publications said it was.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Undoubtedly there are other mines quite comparable as regards product with the Springhill mines.

Mr. CANTLEY: I am quite sure about that.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not saying that it is the only product.

Mr. CANTLEY: But the minister's publication said it was the only coal that would make satisfactory metallurgical fuel.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That was the sample that was tested and the sample referred to in the report, but I do not for a single moment imagine that the officers of the Mines department will say that is the only coal in Nova Scotia that will coke.

Mr. CANTLEY: They so report.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): There is no better coal in Nova Scotia than the Springhill coal.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I have got into trouble on many occasions with Nova Scotians in regard to their coal and I do not want to get into it to-night. I simply want to say that the administration of the department as regards the transportation of coal has been of considerable value to the mine owners of Nova Scotia and I hope it will be of still more value in the future.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister then, repudiates what is said in the report.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The minister does not; I am not dealing with the report. I do not have it before me. The minister will make his own statement so far as that is concerned. I notice that my hon. friends from Nova Scotia are very tender about any criticism that may be offered of the fuel coming from their particular locality. Possibly that is right, and I admire their standing up for the provinces from which they come.

My hon. friend has referred to the installation of a pulverized fuel plant in the heating plant for these buildings. We have been using for a number of years Minto coal of a low grade, burned on grates, and it is giving very good results, although I believe we are paying slightly more for that coal than we could import coal for. That, however, has been the policy of the government with respect to that particular matter.

Mr. CANTLEY: It is the correct policy.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I hope it is. At all events, it is the policy of the government. Dealing with the coking properties of Nova Scotia, we have been endeavouring to supplant the importation of anthracite with coke, as my hon. friend knows and we have been working for some years with that object in view. The Hamilton coking plant is proving itself a very great success. The plant in Montreal has been in operation now for about a year and a half, and is another case in which anthracite coal will be supplanted by domestic coal.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister refers to the sucess of coking plants in Hamilton and Montreal and to their success in displacing American anthracite. What advantage is it to this country to displace American anthracite with American bituminous coal?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am just coming to what I think is of real value. We are informed not only by our own officials but by the officers of the companies that are operating, and with whom costs always count, that to utilize Nova Scotia coal in its entirety would be more costly than to use the imported product, having regard to transportation costs. That is no reflection on Nova Scotia coal at all; it is simply a statement of fact. But we did see if the coal could not be blended. My hon. friend has quoted from the report with regard to the attempt that was made in that direction in the plant at Hamilton. I saw that coke, and it was a very good coke.

With regard to encouraging the consumption of Canadian coal in domestic coking plants, where gas plays a very important part in the high temperature plants, and where gas may be washed so thoroughly that it can be used for domestic purposes, we have had some difficulty in convincing these companies that it would be more in their own interests to burn all Canadian fuel or a large proportion of it. In order to secure the greater use of Canadian fuel we have offered under the statute fairly liberal inducements to these companies to use Canadian coal, with the result that in the city of Halifax they have now established a plant.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister does not say that seriously.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I do say it seriously. The plant has been erected.

Mr. CANTLEY: When, and what capacity?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It certainly would be very strange to me if the plant was not erected because they are making application for the subsidy provided under the act.

Mr. CANTLEY: Does the minister really want information in regard to it.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If my hon. friend is assuming that it is an entirely new plant, it is not; it is a rebuilt plant, but it conforms with the provisions of the act so far as ovens are concerned and comes up to the standard in order to earn the subsidy.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: How much subsidy has been paid?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I do not know that we have paid anything yet.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Absolutely nothing.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): So far as that plant is concerned we have simply been inspecting it as construction went on. I do not know that we have yet paid out anything in subsidies, but we will as construction is completed and the plant gets into operation and meets with the requirements of the act.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: You have paid nothing whatsoever.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That may be true.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: It is true.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The moment the plant is completed and meets with the requirements of the act, we will be prepared to pay the subsidy earned by the plant.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: So far you have paid nothing.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Why should we if it has not yet reached the point where it is earning? We have made several inspections. What is the object of my hon. friend in repeating that statement?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I want you to make the statement whether you have paid anything to this plant or not.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I do know that two inspections have been made. I do not know whether cheques have been issued. I do not know what my hon. friend's object is in raising this question, but I will say this; the moment the plant is in shape to earn the subsidy provided under the act we will pay it.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: So far you have paid nothing.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am assuming that my hon. friend knows.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Absolutely, and you do not. That is the difference between us.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am very glad to get that information from my hon. friend, but I do know that construction has been going on and that they are endeavouring to meet the requirements and earn the subsidy provided under the act.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: But you have paid nothing so far.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I presume that the plant has not yet reached the stage of construction where the subsidy is earned.

[Mr. Macdougall.]

Mr. MACDOUGALL: You ought to know.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I cannot be intimately acquainted with all the details of a large department. My instructions to the officers of the department are to watch the construction and to pay the subsidy as warranted under the provisions of the act. Construction has been going on, the company have undertaken to build that plant and to use Canadian coal. As soon as they have completed the construction, they will get the money they have earned.

My hon. friend says that the officers of the department are confining their activities to trivial undertakings. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that in the experimental stages of such developments as these, experiments carried on by various institutions have been looked upon by some people as a trivial thing. But it is very strange, if these activities are trivial, that one of our bright young chemists has just been taken over by the Besco plant to work in their laboratories. If our work was not considered very satisfactory, if it was considered only trivial, I do not know why our men should be in such demand by commercial companies who value this kind of information very highly, and we have a good deal of difficulty in keeping our men.

With respect to the domestic coking plants I did hope that as large a proportion as possible of Nova Scotia coal would be used. One of the things that we have been working on, although we are not yet in a position to report, is how to treat coal with sulphur content that goes a little bit over the average. That will require considerable experimentation, but I think the results will be very valuable in the treatment of many grades of coal that to-day cannot be utilized for this purpose.

My hon. friend states that in Germany they have been experimenting with the brown coal. I saw those experiments. I saw the various carbonization experiments that were being made at the large plant at Leuna, where they are endeavouring to utilize the coal for various purposes to meet their domestic necessities, and where they are spending very large sums of money.

My hon. friend will agree with me that so far as our ordinary fuel is concerned for raising steam, say, in large plants, very little is necessary to be done to our coals. They are being utilized now, and their further utilization is merely a question of transportation. We had hoped that we would be able to utilize a larger proportion of Nova Scotia coal as domestic fuel than heretofore. There are two ways in which that might be done. One would be by the application of assistance to domestic coking plants, and the other is as-

sistance given in the matter of transportation for the raw product itself. I think that we have met with some success in both methods. I have not time to go into a detailed report of what has been accomplished, but I would point out that Alberta has profited very little from this assistance in the way of the transportation of coal, while Nova Scotia has moved both by water and by rail a considerable quantity of coal and has widened the market for Nova Scotia coal in western Quebec and eastern Ontario.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): How did the experiment of moving that Alberta coal east work out?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Not a very great quantity of it has been moved. Up to date no money has been paid over by the government because while the initial rate was fixed at $6.75 the Board of Railway Commissioners has not adjudicated upon the rate—

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Has any considerable quantity moved under that scheme?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Speaking from memory, last year I think around 30,000 tons. May I finish my statement? The railway commission have to fix the ultimate rate based on an investigation of the movement.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Was the movement successful?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It was not successful in moving a very large quantity.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Why not?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I cannot explain it to my hon. friend. I think the Ontario market was fairly well canvassed.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Was the rate too high?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The rate was fixed lower than the western operators really requested. It was put at $6.75 a ton for all Ontario points.

Mr. MALONEY: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, the minister is aware that the fuel question in central Canada is an outstanding one. We are vitally interested in procuring a supply of fuel from purely Canadian sources. In fact we are prepared to use the soft coal of the east and the soft and hard coal of the west for domestic purposes simply to maintain a market for Canadian coal. It is true the bulk of domestic coal used in Ontario and Quebec is imported from the United States. The people of these two central provinces feel that we should be self-contained so far as our fuel supply is concerned. Viewed from the economic and every other standpoint, from which source would the Minister of Mines advise the people of Ontario and Quebec to procure their coal, from Alberta, from Nova Scotia, or from the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I certainly would advise them to procure it from Alberta and eastern Canada; that would be my first choice. But on the other hand it must be borne in mind that in order to protect the manufacturing interests of central Canada we must get them their fuel somewhere within reasonable reach of the prices at which they can procure it across the line. That is what we have been endeavouring to do.

Mr. MALONEY: I thank the minister for his answer. I feel I am speaking the mind of the great bulk of the people of the central provinces when I say we are prepared to make many sacrifices to secure a supply of coal from our own mines. In this connection I would say that, if necessary, the freight rates on coal should be cut down to a minimum so that we might be able to secure our supply within our own borders.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): What efforts have the department made—outside of those that the minister has mentioned with respect to lower freight rates—to develop in Canada a national fuel policy? If such a policy means anything it must mean an attempt to use as much of our own coal as possible. I cannot see that there has been any concerted effort on the part of the department, outside of reductions in freight rates, to develop a fuel policy for this country. I would ask the minister to enlarge on that point, because it is of very serious interest and concern to the people of the maritime provinces.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is purely and simply a matter of transportation costs, and one of the objects of the present test movement, both from the east and from the west, is to establish what are the actual transportation costs. Once that is established, it is merely a matter for the government or for parliament to decide what contribution, if any, shall be made to assist the railways in this problem. Fortunately from Nova Scotia you have a fairly lengthy season for the water movement, which is very cheap. I think the cost of landing your coal in the port of Montreal is seventy-five cents a ton. From there it is a rail movement for distribution into western Quebec and eastern Ontario. But in the winter season it is a long rail haul at

the very time of the year when most of the fuel is being consumed. The situation from the west is entirely different. It is an all rail movement, and it is a long haul as against a short haul from across the line. So it resolves itself purely and simply into a question of transportation costs.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: The minister says it resolves itself into a question of transportation costs, and that fortunately for Nova Scotia in certain months of the year we can ship our coal by water to Montreal. Is the hon. gentleman convinced that we cannot ship our coal from Nova Scotia to Montreal by rail in the winter months? If so, why?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): For the very simple reason that you have a long rail haul against a short rail haul from across the line.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I quite realize that; but what data has the minister before him to justify the sweeping statement that we cannot ship our coal to Montreal by rail under reasonably fair freight rates? Does he know what it costs to ship a ton of coal from Sydney to Montreal? Why does he make that sweeping statement?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Undoubtedly we shall have the Board of Railway Commissioners report, and it will be authentic. The movement from Nova Scotia last winter was a test movement.

Mr. MACDOUGALL:: What did it cost per ton?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They have not found out.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Then the minister does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): Two or three times I have tried to impress on the minister that what is required in my humble judgment is a national fuel policy. The minister has surrounded the issue with a lot of facts in regard to the movement of the fuel itself. Although that is very important, I do not consider it is an all important feature of the matter. It is not a question only of a reduction in freight rates. It is a question of arrangement with respect to fiscal matters, it is a question of subventions, it may be a question of bonuses, and there may be a dozen other questions surrounding the whole issue of the development of a national fuel policy. The contention of those of us who come from the east is that no effort has been made by this government to overcome obstacles which should be overcome in order to utilize the fuel that we have in the Dominion, and to keep our own miners employed, and so develop our own country rather than bring in from the United States such tremendous quantities of the very kind of fuel that we ourselves produce. I ask the minister if the Department of Mines will not consider seriously the development of a national policy for Canada, not only with respect to a reduction in freight rates, the $2 per ton asked for by the people of Nova Scotia, but also in relation to all the difficulties that surround the question, so that we in Canada may be placed in an independent position so far as fuel is concerned. I think that is only fair. I have asked the minister a question and I am entitled to an answer. The fuel board as at present constituted is not able to cope with the problem; it has not the resources to enable it to carry on investigations. It is therefore the duty of parliament to give the board wider scope and more money to enable it to evolve for Canada a fuel policy which will be beneficial to this country. To-day we are simply drifting so far as fuel consumption is concerned—drifting towards importations from foreign countries, mostly from the United States. This matter, in my opinion should receive serious consideration at the hands of the minister.

An hon. MEMBER: Why not work out a policy?

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): We are relying on the government to work out a policy, but if it were left in our hands we could evolve one. We have sent delegations to the government with suggestions for its consideration, but I do not know that many of those suggestions have received favourable consideration.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I can only repeat what I have said before. So far as bituminous coal is concerned there is in my opinion little or no difference between the Nova Scotia and United States products. I make that statement in a broad general way.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): That has nothing to do with the issue.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, it has. It means that the manufacturing interests—and some of my hon. friends are engaged in manufacturing—buy their coal for their manufacturing plants in Ontario at a fairly low rate, which is a pretty large factor in production costs; they buy it at a rate around $5 or $5.50 a ton. I do not know the exact amount, because it fluctuates from time to time, but that is about the rate. Now that is the identical coal mined in Nova Scotia

and it is used for manufacturing purposes largely in the raw state. You then have to transport your coal, which costs you between $3 and $4 a ton to raise and place on the car; and then you have to ship it all that distance either by water or by rail or partly by both, to give the manufacturer his fuel at a price which will permit him to enter into competition with manufacturers elsewhere. That is his problem, and it is rather a vital one for central Canada. Therefore, when speaking of the national fuel policy, you must be prepared to give the manufacturing interests and the domestic users in this part of Canada fuel at a price at which they can procure it from across the line. That is my conception of the question. That is why I say that, so far as the bulk of the product is concerned, the question is purely one of transportation. As a government we have offered, I think, fairly generous bonuses to enable the railway companies to carry coal. We have placed it at a fairly low rate and asked the railway commission to investigate thoroughly and give us an idea of what it would cost to move coal from Nova Scotia into Central Canada, as well as from Alberta to this part of the Dominion. So far we have not got that information. We have asked for it on one or two occasions but the railway companies have stated that they are not ready to go on with the movement.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: How long is it since the minister submitted that question to the railway board?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Nearly twelve months ago.

Mr. CANTLEY: More than twenty-four months ago.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): And in the meantime the movement is going on east and west.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Is it not nearly two years since the question was submitted?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Since the inception of the movement.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: No, but since the minister submitted to the railway board the question as to how much it would cost to carry Nova Scotia coal to central Canada. Is it not nearer two years than one year?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It may be in the neighbourhood of two years since the movement started but not since we asked for the figures.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I am interested in that, because I believe it is over two years.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I will get the facts. The order in council was passed on March 30, 1928, and one year later we asked for the report from the Board of Railway Commissioners with respect to the amount that we should be called upon to pay.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: What was the answer?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The answer was that the railways were not ready to furnish us with these figures. But in the meantime the movement is going on from both east and west, and it has resulted, particularly in the water and rail carriage, in bringing a fairly large amount of Nova Scotia coal into eastern Ontario, in both years. I am unable to give the figures because the railway board has not yet reported; but when we have those figures we shall be able to formulate a policy as to how much the government of Canada or the railways will have to contribute to make it possible for the consumer in eastern Canada to get his coal as cheaply as he can procure it from across the line. That is the problem in a nutshell, and that is what we are trying to solve.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: The minister says that the railway board has not yet reported and does not know anything about the matter. How then does he know that the movement has resulted in an increased consumption of Nova Scotia coal west of Montreal?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): For the reason that each sale, particularly in the vicinity of Cochrane and points in eastern Ontario, is submitted to us before it takes place.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: By the railway board?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, by the sales agents of the companies.

Mr. SPENCER: How much coal was moved from Alberta and from the maritimes under the reduced rate during 1928?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There were 32,000 tons from Alberta; we have not the figures for the maritimes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am interested in the question of the distillation of oil from coal, and I should like to know what progress has been made along this line. Both in this country and elsewhere this question is receiving attention and it is going to be of great importance to such provinces as my own. I have one or two other questions to ask the minister and perhaps I had better state two or three points in reference to which I wish

information and the minister can answer them at once. There is the question of the distillation of coal: How far has experimentation proceeded along this line? I am aware that it can be done, but the question is whether it can be done in a commercial way. There is also the question with regard to the utilization of the tar sands and oil shale of northern Alberta. I am aware, too, that some experimentation has been carried on along this line, and the utilization of these tremendous deposits is a matter of great importance and considerable interest. From what I could catch of the discussion at the other end of the chamber I believe part of the work of the fuel board and of the research laboratory has been covered, but I notice an increase of $57,000 in the item, and I assume that is partly due to increased activities in that very important line of investigation. I should be glad if the minister would tell me what progress has been made.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have lately arranged a joint investigation into the utilization of the McMurray tar sands, and of course in the parks we have carried out experiments in road building, using those sands without extracting the oil. At the university of Alberta, directly under the supervision of the Alberta Research Council, Mr. Clark and Mr. Stansfield have been working on the problem of extracting oil from the tar sands for some years, and now it is proposed that we should enter into a joint investigation. There is a problem of mining to be dealt with, and I believe an experimental plant will be built jointly; they will carry on the experiments with regard to extraction while we attempt to find a type of machinery to be used in connection with the mining. I believe that work will go on this year; part of the sum included in this vote is for that purpose. So far as the road experiment was concerned, it proved a splendid success but was somewhat expensive due to transportation costs.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The minister realizes, of course, that the extraction of oil from coal on a commercial scale is a matter of tremendous moment, especially to a province such as Alberta where the vast deposits of coal cannot be transported any great distance because of the transportation charges and the fact that it breaks up in handling. This is a subject of such importance that I am sure it will receive attention, and it is a subject on which the people of this country would like as much information as possible.

[Mr. Speakman.]

Mr. STEWART: (Edmonton): We are now creating a position for a trained man who will carry on research work in this connection in our own laboratories. So far we have been watching very carefully what has been done in Germany and in England; perhaps Germany has gone further in research work and tests in this connection than any other country. At the moment I can only say that the plant at Leuna is still very much in the experimental stage, and of course very much depends on the quality of the coal submitted for treatment. However, we do intend to create a position for an engineer who will carry on this research work and of course we will keep closely in touch with what is being done in other countries.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I would like to know also what has been done in connection with the control of the waste gases in the Turner valley. As the minister knows, this question was up last year; it has been discussed from time to time and it is a matter of some importance.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I was in Calgary recently, but was unable to visit the Turner valley field. However, we do know that a very large quantity of gas is escaping at that field, and the provincial government and our own officials have become somewhat concerned about the wastage. We have agreed to appoint a joint commission to investigate the matter and, if possible, suggest methods for its conservation or use. A great many suggestions have been made in this connection, but before taking any definite steps we thought it well to have a thorough investigation made. Doctor Camsell is chairman of the board which has been created for that purpose, the other members being Mr. Ross, our mining engineer, and Mr. Carpenter of the utilities board of the province of Alberta. At the moment I think they are beginning their work and I expect a report in a short time.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am glad some action has been taken, because while possibly a large number of people throughout the country and perhaps many members of this house do not know it, I am sure the minister is aware of the fact that the supply of gas is not unlimited and that a field can be drained as readily as a country can be deforested.

Then there is one other point on which I should like some information; I refer to the oil shale in Athabasca, as distinguished from the tar sand. I understand that these shale

deposits are stated by geologists to hold the greatest known deposits of petroleum in the world, but it has not been found possible to utilize those deposits in a commercial way.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have not conducted any experiments in connection with shale in the north, but for some years we have been carrying on experimental work on New Brunswick shale. Every year we bring quantities of the shale to the laboratories here to see if some plan cannot be devised for the extraction of the oil as a commercial proposition.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Might I ask if there has been any success attained so far? I should like to know if there is any possibility in sight at the moment of accomplishing that task and finding out how to utilize these deposits in a commercial way.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If it were not for the fact that fuel oil is fairly cheap because it is being secured in such large quantities and can be transported at a fairly reasonable cost, the extraction of oil from shale, from the tar sands and from coal could be carried on in a commercial way, but while fuel oil is so cheap it is very difficult to compete with, at least under any present methods of extraction.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is the point I had in mind, because we all know it can be extracted successfully; it is purely a matter of how much it costs, and I was directing my inquiry along that line.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Anyone who has paid any attention to this coal question must realize the difficulties confronting coal producers in Canada. I appreciate the difficulties which face the minister, but I do not think he is proceeding as he should. I quite appreciate the position we are in, with the coal fields of the United States so close to the industrial centres of Canada, which makes it possible for these industrial concerns to get American coal quite cheaply; there is no doubt that we will have a great deal of difficulty in meeting that competition. That is a question of transportation, and the minister appears to devote the most of his attention to that question. But transportation is only one element which has to be considered; there are many other and probably just as important factors in connection with this problem. There is the element of the cost of production; then there is the element of transportation; then comes the element of marketing, and, last but not least, the element of competition. When I had the honour of addressing this house upon this question I pointed out what I thought was a feasible plan, one which might afford some solution of the problem and cause the government to give some consideration to the formulating of a national fuel policy. We admit that under ordinary circumstances it is impossible to put Nova Scotia or Alberta coal into central Canada to compete on an even footing with American coal; that may as well be admitted first as last. But as the hon. member for South Renfrew said a few moments ago, the people of Ontario and western Quebec are willing to make a sacrifice in order that we may become independent as far as fuel resources are concerned. Of course everyone must realize that there is a limit to the extent to which the good people of Ontario would be prepared to go in that direction. The suggestion which I offered last year was the appointment of a commission to investigate the cost of production, the cost of transportation, the cost of marketing, and last but not least, the element of protection, but I am afraid that in that connection we will not have the sympathy of the present Minister of Finance. It was stated this afternoon that the present Minister of Mines rather prided himself on the quotation with reference to the "death knell of protection." Additional protection is needed on our coal in order that it may successfully invade the markets of central Canada. The government deserves credit for giving us a three dollar rate on coal to points in Quebec, but that is not enough. This national fuel policy will never be evolved by considering only one element. I suggest that a commission of outstanding public men be appointed to study this question. The facts are all obtainable from the bureau; the department is excellently staffed and the information is available which will enable a commission composed of such men, as I suggested last year, to solve this problem. I leave that suggestion with the minister.

Last year the government received a delegation from Nova Scotia which asked for a two dollar rate. The Minister of Mines was present and heard that request, but as yet no answer has been made. Is it the intention of the minister to consider that request for a two dollar rate on coal?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): From what points?

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): From all Nova Scotia points; to replace the three dollar rate.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The government does not feel that the rate can be changed until the report is received from the railway commission as to the present movement. The matter still stands awaiting that report.

Mr. MacDONALD (South Cape Breton): Will the minister give some attention to my suggestion as to the appointment of a commission?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Speaking personally, and not for the government, I do not think a commission would be able to gather any more facts than are being collected now with respect to transportation. The hon. member suggests that a duty should be placed against the foreign article, but it would not be necessary to appoint a commission to decide that; that would be a matter of policy. Personally, I have always felt that the manufacturers, as well as the domestic users of Ontario, were entitled to receive their coal, which is such an important factor in manufacturing as well as in domestic heating, at as reasonable a price as it could be procured; I do not think it would be fair to ask them to pay any more than they are paying at present. My endeavour has been to supply those consumers with the Canadian product at a price as near as possible to the price they are now paying. Otherwise they would be handicapped to some extent, and I do not think that would be fair. If a contribution is to be made, it should come from the federal government, but so far as I am concerned I do not think there is any necessity to appoint a commission at the moment. We are conducting test movements from both the east and the west in order to establish what is the actual cost of transportation. These movements are not being conducted to determine whether there shall be a dollar, two dollar or three dollar rate, but to establish the actual cost of transportation.

Mr. CANTLEY: The minister talks about test movements and giving cheap fuel to the Ontario manufacturer, but the fact of the matter is that the coal producers have a protection of about 10 per cent, while some of the Ontario users of coal brought in from the United States have a protection of from 25 to 30 per cent. Is one class of producers not entitled to as adequate protection as another? The minister referred to some of his young men having been taken away by industrial firms and I am very glad that some of them have found useful employment which they certainly could not find when they were in the minister's department. The minister made reference to the fuel policy of the government as it concerns coal and coking ovens, but he was unable to answer the question as to whether or not any bounty has been paid. The fact of the matter is that the only installation able to comply with the conditions of that policy is one consisting of ten or fifteen coking ovens which were built in Halifax to replace an old gas plant which had been in existence from time out of mind. I think this plant has been completed, but when it is in operation it will not amount to a row of pins as a commercial unit, and the minister knows that is so.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The hon. member is aware of the fact that they were using American coal in the old beehive ovens.

Mr. CANTLEY: It was not a beehive oven plant. Why are they using American coal in Montreal? If the policy inaugurated by the government was a reasonable one, a workable one, why was this large coking plant which has been erected on the bank of the Welland canal not built in the east end of Montreal so that Canadian coal could have been used? It was built at the Welland canal where Nova Scotia coal can get to it only by two ways, either by rail or by being lightered up at a cost almost as great as that of bringing it from Sydney to Montreal. The fact of the matter is that the legislation was of no value; it was known to be no good and it has proved to be just as valuable as we said it would be. It was simply a gesture and nothing more than that.

The minister said that one difficulty and a great one was the matter of sulphur. I state that that difficulty is not at all insuperable. All the sulphur could be removed out of the gases for a cost of a good deal less than twenty-five cents per ton. All this talk about high sulphur content is only using camouflage to hide behind, nothing more and nothing less.

Some reference was made to the $6.75 rate from Alberta. Coal coming from Alberta to Ontario travels about 2,000 miles. We in Nova Scotia were given a flat rate of $3. If we were given a rate proportionate to the mileage, as we were entitled to, we would have a rate from Springhill, not of $3 as now, but of $1.80; from Minto, a rate of $1.60 and from Stellarton a rate of $2.20 instead of $3. I want to tell the minister that about twenty years ago a considerable quantity of Nova Scotia coal was carried to Montreal at a rate of $1.80 from Stellarton. During the years when it was so carried during the win-

ter at that rate, we had surpluses on the Intercolonial. I will admit that it costs more to operate the railway to-day than it did sixteen years ago, because that is about the time the movement to which I refer took place, but the cost has not increased so much as to change a profitable $1.80 rate to a losing $2 rate. Why should the government apply a blanket rate over the whole of the maritimes, where there is a difference between Minto, the nearest point, and Sydney the furthest, of nearly 400 miles, or practically four-tenths of the whole mileage?

The minister made some reference to the efforts of himself and his department to further the use of Nova Scotia coal in the Montreal district. Unless the minister is greatly belied, on his return from that very enjoyable trip to Germany I understand he was royally entertained in London and he there took the opportunity of suggesting to the people of Great Britain that they were neglecting the market in the St. Lawrence. He suggested that it was a market to which they ought to pay more attention. I do not think that is quite within his province as Minister of Mines. Still to-night he talks about the great efforts of his department to further the use of Nova Scotia coal in the St. Lawrence valley.

Last winter a considerable quantity of soviet coal entered Canada, and the minister and the government said they were powerless to do anything whatever to prevent such coal from coming in. What was the attitude of the United States in that connection? The first cargo that came into Canada went in the first place to New York. How was it met there? Under the United States system of tariff and under the power given to their president, they were able to deal with it. That coal could not be landed in the United States. The cargo then left New York and travelled all the way around Nova Scotia up the gulf and came into Montreal. Other cargoes followed into Portland thence by rail to Montreal, and this government sat absolutely supine, unable or refusing to do anything to protect the coal industries of Nova Scotia and Alberta, and allowing soviet coal to travel about 6,000 miles, one-third of the circumference of the earth, and enter Canada in free competition with our own coal. The minister did nothing to protect either his friends in the old country or his friends in Nova Scotia or his friends in Alberta in that regard and he has to-day nothing that he can say in defence of his action or lack of action—I leave it to him.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I say in answer to my hon. friend that the only coal that came in from soviet Russia, and a very small quantity at that, was anthracite coal?

Mr. CANTLEY: I know it was anthracite coal and the quantity was considerable.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): With regard to my hon. friend's strictures about my suggesting inter-empire trade in anthracite coal and that alone, this was merely a suggestion on my part that instead of the United States getting the business in anthracite, this trade might well go to Great Britain. I was not interfering for a moment with our own domestic fuel supply, because my hon. friend knows full well that we have no anthracite coal.

Mr. CANTLEY: I absolutely deny that. What did it displace ? What have we been endeavouring to displace for the last ten years? We have been trying to displace British anthracite and United States anthracite with domestic coke and if the minister would give us a chance we would do it. That is the answer. The minister should get a better story than that or else remain silent.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is a plant in Montreal now and my hon. friend can take advantage of the bonus offered by the government. Let him ship coal and have it used in the Montreal plant, and supplant anthracite. That was the purpose for which the bonus was offered.

Mr. CANTLEY: The government is allowing German and British coke and tens of thousands of tons of United States coke to enter Canada simply because they will not protect Canadian coke by a duty on coke coming into this country.

Mr. HEPBURN: Will the hon. member's leader make a declaration in favour of protection on coke or coal?

Mr. CANTLEY: What was it my hon. friend said? I did not hear.

Mr. HEPBURN: Will the hon. member enunciate for his party a policy of a higher tariff on coal or coke?

Mr. CANTLEY: Certainly; on both.

Mr. HEPBURN: Will his leader agree to that?

Mr. CANTLEY: Certainly he will.

Mr. HEPBURN: I should like to have his declaration.

Mr. CANTLEY: Do not make any mistake about his policy. He will.

Mr. HEPBURN: Let whoever is leading the opposition make that declaration now. I challenge them to do it right now. That is a fair question.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Let the hon. member and the hon. member for South Essex debate that.

Mr. HEPBURN: The hon. member for South Essex got all he wanted when he was discussing that.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: The Minister of the Interior has referred to the coking legislation passed by the present government. What have been the results of that legislation? How much more Canadian coal has been produced and used as a result of it?

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, June 12, 1929.

The house met at eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DREDGING EQUIPMENT AT VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. How many government owned dredges and other units of dredging equipment are lying idle at Victoria and Vancouver?
2. What is the total value of such dredges and dredging units?
3. What is the annual cost for maintenance, services of watchmen and upkeep of such dredges and dredging units?
4. What was the cost per cubic yard for dredging and dumping material during the time the dredge Mastodon was operating in Vancouver harbour?
5. Did the board of harbour commissioners for the port of Vancouver, or the government, award a contract for dredging in Vancouver harbour to a private company or person?
6. If so, is such work now being carried on by such company or person, and by whom?
7. If such work is now being performed by a private company or person: (a) what price per cubic yard is being paid for dredging; (b) what price is being paid for dumping the material so dredged?
8. Has the board of harbour commissioners of the port of Vancouver any inspector, or inspectors, employed on the work? If so, how many and at what monthly wages?
9. Did the government or the board of harbour commissioners of the port of Vancouver secure any estimate from the dredging engineer or any other engineer of the Public Works department prior to awarding such contract?
10. If so: (a) what was the estimated price per cubic yard of dredging; (b) of dumping the material so dredged?

[Mr. Hepburn.]

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. Cardin):

Department of Marine:

1 to 4. See information from Public Works department.

5. The Vancouver harbour commissioners let a contract for the supply of 700,000 cu. yds. of gravel fill on the site of a new pier, which included the dredging of 85,680 cu. yds. of mud before the fill was deposited.

6. Yes. By the North Western Dredging Company.

7. (a) No unit price is being paid for dredging the material required to be removed before the filling is deposited. The price for this is included in the 24 cents per cu. yd., being paid for the 700,000 cu. yds. of filling. (b) Answered by (a).

8. Yes, three. Regular employees of the commissioners' engineering department. One at $175 per month. One at $7 per day, and one at $6 per day; working three shifts of 8 hours each.

9. No, answering for the harbour commissioners, they had the advice of their own engineers and consulted no one else.

10. The estimate of the commissioners' engineers was that securing the dredging and filling at the bid price offered by the North Western Dredging Company at 24 cents per cu. yd., was cheaper than they could accomplish the same result in any other manner.

Public Works department:

1. Dredge No. 301—(Ajax)—Laid up at Victoria; dredge No. 306—(Mastodon)—Laid up at Vancouver; Rock breaker No. 1—Laid up at Vancouver; Rock breaker No. 2—Laid up at Vancouver; Tug Point Grey—Laid up at Vancouver; Tug Petrel—Laid up at Vancouver; Launch Knockabout—Laid up at Vancouver; Derrick scow of dredge No. 306—Laid up at Vancouver; Diving scow—Laid up at Victoria.

2. $422,025.

3. $15,486.40. (Fiscal year 1928-29).

4. Cost of Mastodon's work averages 20.24 cents per cubic yard while in Vancouver.

5, 6 and 7. Contracts for dredging awarded by Public Works department in 1928; Calamity Point, First Narrows, to North Western Dredging Company, Ltd., at 18.7 cents per cubic yard, class B. work proceeding. Burnaby Shoal, to North Western Dredging Company,

Ltd., at 26.8 cents per cubic yard, class B. work discontinued. Price includes dredging and ordinary disposal of waste material.

8. Please refer to Marine department's answer.

9 and 10. Estimate of cost of work contracted for was made to Public Works department by chief engineer, Department of Public Works, prior to tenders being received at 20 cents per cubic yard for Calamity Point, First Narrows. 25½ cents per cubic yard for Burnaby Shoal covering dredging and ordinary disposal of waste material.

ACCIDENTS IN PENITENTIARIES

Miss MACPHAIL:

1. How many fatal accidents have occurred in each penitentiary in Canada since 1925?

2. How many serious accidents have occurred in each penitentiary since 1925?

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. One in Manitoba penitentiary; none in the others.

2. Kingston penitentiary	5
St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary	15
Dorchester	3
Manitoba	2
British Columbia	3
Saskatchewan	
Total	28

THE HUNTINGDON GLEANER

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine):

1. What amount has been paid by the government to the Huntingdon Gleaner since the year 1920 to date?

2. What amount has been paid to said paper each year from 1920 to date, and how much from each department of the government?

Mr. RINFRET:

Auditor General:

1 and 2.

General election of 1921	$ 179 79
General election of 1925	246 39
By election of 1926	3 60
Total	$ 429 78

Department of Finance:

1. $45.36.

2. 1922-3—$45.36 (advertising).

Department of Indian Affairs:

1. $8.10.

2. 1927, $2.70; 1928, $5.40.

Department of the Interior:

1. $23.87.

2.

1920-21	Nil
1921-22	Nil
1922-23	$ 1 37
1923-24	1 50
1924-25	1 50
1925-26	6 60
1926-27	9 90
1927-28	1 50
1928-29	1 50

National Revenue:

Customs and Excise Divisions

1. $68.73.

2.

Fiscal Year	Amount
1920-21	$ 3 40
1921-22	10 43
1922-23	24 05
1923-24	6 90
1924-25	15 10
1925-26	8 85
1926-27	Nil
1927-28	Nil
1928-29	Nil
Total	$ 68 73

Income Tax Division

1. In March, 1929, paid William Findlay Company, Limited, $14 account Huntingdon Gleaner.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Post Office Department:

1 and 2.

Fiscal Year	
1920-21	Nil
1921-22	Nil
1922-23	$ 4 80
1923-24	9 78
1924-25	Nil
1925-26	5 88
1926-27	31 36
1927-28	15 64
1928-29	6 90
Total	$ 74 36

Department of Public Works:

1. $31.88.

2. Fiscal Year

1925-26	$ 7 35
1927-28	10 50
1928-29	14 03

HIGHWAY EXPENDITURE

Mr. COWAN:

1. Has the whole of the $20,000,000 provided for by the Canada Highways Act of 1919, being chapter 54 of 9-10 George V, been expended?

2. Is there a record available of the amount paid to each province?
3. If so, what amount was received by each province?
4. Is there a record of the highways upon which said funds were expended?
5. If so, what mileage has been built and what is the location of such highway?

Mr. ROBB: The information asked for in this question is all contained in the annual report of the commissioner of highways for the year ending March 31, 1928. A marked copy was sent to the hon. member, and I understand he is prepared to have the question dropped, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped as being answered.

BEAUHARNOIS LIGHT HEAT AND POWER COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. N. SMITH (Stormont): I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Elliott) whether any contract has yet been signed between the Beauharnois Light, Heat and Power Company and the government; if not, will one be signed shortly ?

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (Minister of Public Works): No contract has yet been signed. Negotiations are in progress.

SUPPLY—TIME OF MEETING OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the house for a very few minutes to a question of considerable importance, at least to working men. I ask the government to consider the desirability of opening the parliamentary session at a different time of the year from that which is now the practice. I do not know whether the month of February was selected to inconvenience western members as much as possible, particularly farmer members, but were that the purpose it has been very well executed. It is the custom for parliament to meet in February, or perhaps even later. As a result we are now in the summer months roasting and frying in this building, when we ought to be out in the sunshine storing up health, especially when we have to stay indoors so long during the winter months. Surely the time is come for us to consider whether February is the best time for parliament to meet.

It goes without saying that seed time is one of great importance to the farmer members, and it also goes without saying that the members coming from the maritime provinces on the one hand and from British Columbia and the western provinces on the other have to stay here steadily throughout the session; they have no opportunity of going home over the week end or during a short adjournment; and to have to remain in Ottawa during the spring season when they ought to be at their work at home imposes on them a very serious inconvenience. I believe it would be better for all concerned were parliament to meet two or three months earlier than it usually does. I think November would be a very excellent time to open the session, have a recess for Christmas and New Year, and then come back and conclude our parliamentary work before the first of May at least.

That is the suggestion I wish to make. It may be that some members from the eastern provinces would rather continue the present practice, but I think they ought to be prepared to give a little consideration to this suggestion, since the change would involve no inconvenience to any one, whereas if we continue to meet in February western members are very seriously inconvenienced.

There is a further reason why I think eastern members ought to give favourable consideration to my plea. I think it is clear to any one who looks at the matter from the point of view of indemnities that the western members are discriminated against. No man can be here steadily for four months and attend to any kind of personal business. He has practically to give it up. That is true also of the maritime members. I do not know whether one should mention the word "indemnity" or not. Far be it from me to suggest any increase!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. IRVINE: I would not think of making such a suggestion. I know that all parties are very much afraid of this question, especially the leaders. I might go so far as to suggest that $1,000 be taken off the indemnity of the eastern members and added to that of the western members. This would not increase the taxation in any way, while it would make up some of the difference which now exists as between eastern and western members. It is clear I think that eastern members have a little advantage over those from the west, and if $4,000 be a reasonable indemnity for a man who can be in his office every day in the year it is very unfair to a member from Vancouver or from any of the western provinces. Even if for some minor reason eastern members would rather be here

in the spring of the year, I submit that in view of all the circumstances they ought to be prepared to assist us in our effort to impress upon the government the advisability of changing the time at which parliament meets, making it November instead of February.

In conclusion, I wish to say this. There is a great deal more in the suggestion than may appear on the surface, for the question of indemnity is one which leads us to another question of moment to the people of Canada and to the democratic system in general. I believe that it is becoming more and more the tendency that only rich men can come to this parliament; and poor men, however able they may be, may ultimately be debarred except they may possibly receive assistance from some other source to enable them to attend parliament—which is perhaps a principle equally as dangerous as the principle of having only rich men in parliament. And there is a tendency in Canada for that principle to take root. I think we can find instances, without going back very far, of outstanding men of the main parties in Canada who have been assisted or indemnified by private persons—we do not know who they are—in order that they might be in a position to give their services to the country. Now I offer no criticism of any individual; I do not know any case in which this has been done wherein the individual concerned was not an outstanding man whose services Canada could ill afford to lose, and of which we are very glad to have had the benefit. That is not my criticism, however; my criticism is that the principle is a very bad one. At least we ought to know in every case who the men are that subscribe funds, and I would rather advocate that Canada be prepared to give, to those whose services the country accepts, a remuneration sufficient to maintain them, having full control over them, than prejudice their services by allowing private individuals to keep them in public life.

I hope that in view of all the circumstances the government will listen to our request that parliament meet in the fall instead of in the spring, and that we be careful not to allow mere wealth to supersede other qualities in this parliament. I frankly admit, of course, that I should be very glad indeed if I had sufficient political influence to be worth $200,000 to anybody outside parliament. Unfortunately, however, I am not in that happy position and so I stand for the democratic principle of having the people of Canada pay the services of their representatives. And if it were necessary I would even suggest that the personnel of parliament be reduced by half, paying the members an adequate compensation, and applying the same principle to ministers, reducing their number to the same extent and adequately remunerating them in order to keep in public life men whose services are of value to the country.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Finance—charges of management, $979,290.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the reason for the increase of $50,000 in connection with printing Dominion notes?

Mr. ROBB: This is to cover an increase of about 15 per cent in the number of one dollar and two dollar notes in circulation, and to provide an adequate reserve of notes.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the cost of printing notes of one dollar and two dollar denomination?

Mr. ROBB: These are the figures: 290,000 sheets of 25 cent notes, $62.70 per thousand sheets; 6,240,000 sheets of one dollar notes, $58.90 per thousand sheets; 2,240,000 sheets of two dollar notes, $58.90 per thousand sheets; 15,000 sheets of five hundred dollar and one thousand dollar bearer notes, at $80.75 per thousand sheets. There was a 3 per cent excise tax on that.

Mr. SPENCER: Does the department contemplate issuing notes of larger denominations than the one and two dollars for general distribution among the people?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. SPENCER: Why? There is a general opinion on the part of the public that the government should issue more notes for circulation among the people. Why is this not done?

Mr. ROBB: I have heard that suggestion made occasionally in the house, but I am bound to admit that I cannot agree with my hon. friend that there is any general public demand for such issue.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister explain the item, "Commission for payment of interest on public debt, purchase of sinking funds," and so forth, $105,000.

Mr. ROBB: To the Bank of Montreal, for services as financial agents in London, at the rate of £150 per million pounds of debt; commission, Bank of Montreal, New York, cashing interest coupons, at $\frac{1}{8}$ of 1 per cent; registration fees for bonds, domiciled in New York, $6,000; commission to Bank of Montreal for purchase of sinking funds, estimated

at $10,000; commission to banks for cashing interest coupons on renewal and refunding loans at one-eighth of one per cent, estimated at $22,000.

Mr. COOTE: Has the minister ever considered the advisability of having these notes printed by the government? We have a royal mint in Ottawa and I have often thought it would be well for the government to consider the advisability of putting in a proper printing press and producing their own notes instead of having the work done by a private firm.

Mr. ROBB: That question is before the department. As my hon. friend knows, the contract for the printing is given by public tender, and if at any time we discover that those tendering are attempting to hold up the government we always have it in mind that we will be able to take care of the work ourselves. At present, however, it looks as though we were getting the work done more cheaply than it could be done by the government.

Mr. COOTE: Who has the contract now?

Mr. ROBB: The Canadian Bank Note Company; they have had it for some years.

Mr. COOTE: Is it a yearly contract or is it for a number of years?

Mr. ROBB: It is a five year contract. I believe we called for tenders only this year; I think the present contract runs out next year. I will give that information later on.

Mr. FRASER: At this point I would like to ask the minister one or two questions with regard to the audit board. What are the functions of that board; who are the members; what are they paid; are they employed during the whole of the year or just for a few days during the year?

Mr. ROBB: I have not before me any memorandum as to the audit board, but the chairman is Mr. Gordon Scott of the firm of Ross and Sons, Montreal. Whenever they are ordered by the Minister of Finance to do so they proceed to audit the accounts of any department. We make use of them frequently to audit the accounts of harbour commissions, for instance, and other organizations whose bonds or securities are guaranteed by the government.

Mr. FRASER: Are their functions supplementary to those of the Auditor General? I thought the Auditor General was the man who did that work, and I would like to know why it is necessary to employ an audit board costing the country $70,000, to supplement the work of the Auditor General.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: That is a very fair question, and I can give a fair answer; it is because parliament ordered this to be done under the act passed some years ago. I will be glad to have this information compiled and given to my hon. friend, but I have not the details before me at present.

Mr. FRASER: Can the minister give me the details of the amounts paid these officials?

Mr. ROBB: No, I have not that information here, but I will get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. FRASER: How much work did they do last year; what accounts have they been asked to audit during the last fiscal year?

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps later on I might let any one item stand and give that information to my hon. friend when I have secured it.

Mr. FRASER: Just here I might ask the minister one other question with regard to the sinking fund, as referred to in the Auditor General's report at page 21 of volume 1, as follows:

The amounts available for investment during the year on account of these sinking funds were as follows:

Annual contribution of ½ of one per cent of amount of loans..	$1,272,263 60
Interest on sinking funds investments (London loans)..	1,582,054 97
Total..	$2,854,318 57

Of this amount $2,845,589.55 was invested in Dominion securities of the par value of $3,418,685.69, purchased at a net discount of $573,096.14. In the public accounts and in this report (Volume II, page F-13) the amount of $3,418,685.69 added to the sinking fund is the par value of the securities purchased, the discount being credited to the current year's revenue.

In other words, the minister purchased bonds at a discount of $573,096.14 and that amount has been included as revenue. I want to know from the minister how much of his surplus is accounted for in this way. He buys bonds at a discount, immediately puts them into the public accounts at par and takes credit to himself for the difference in the revenue for the year. How does he explain a transaction of that kind?

Mr. ROBB: Will my hon. friend tell me how we could explain to the country what has been done with these earnings if we did not so report them?

Mr. FRASER: That is the point; is this earnings? Does the Minister of Finance claim this is earnings?

Mr. ROBB: I am not claiming that, but I am claiming that it belongs to the people of Canada and must be accounted for.

Mr. FRASER: But it has no value to the people of Canada; because the government bought these bonds at a discount how can you say half a million dollars has been earned? Perhaps the bonds may go down on the market; then would you charge up to your revenue the amount you lost on the bonds?

Mr. ROBB: We certainly would.

Mr. FRASER: I would like a little better explanation from the minister. Here is an item of over half a million dollars accounted for by the Minister of Finance as revenue which he has never collected and for which he has nothing to show; this is a part of his $70,000,000 surplus. I think we are entitled to know how he justifies an accounting of that kind.

Mr. ROBB: I am bound to say that I think my hon. friend is a little mixed in his financing. Provision was made by order in council to purchase sinking funds not to exceed one-half of one per cent per annum, on the following loans: War loan 1915-25, order in council of December 4, 1915; war loan of 1916-31, order in council of June, 1917; war loan of 1917-37. Purchases were made until May, 1924, when they were discontinued as the three loans were then selling above par. On April 13, 1929, the Bank of Montreal, Montreal, were instructed to purchase 5 per cent 1916-31 war loan bonds at a price not to net the department more than par. Between April 13 and April 27, 1929—

Mr. FRASER: Will the minister permit me to interrupt?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend asked for the information; now I am going to give it to him. Between April 13 and April 27, 1929, $200,000 had been purchased, leaving a balance of $188,587.08 in our sinking fund cash account, standing to our credit in a savings account. The accounts stood, as of April 30, 1929, as follows:

Sinking fund, 1915-25	Redeemed
Sinking fund, 1916-31	$999,300 00
Sinking fund, 1917-37	$379,800 00
Sinking fund, cash balance to our credit in savings account	$188,587 08

The Bank of Montreal, Montreal, are trustees for this sinking fund.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I am sorry to say that the minister is blocking his own estimates; he is giving a lot of information which is very interesting but which has nothing to do with the question asked by the hon. member for Cariboo. The hon. gentleman referred to the purchase of bonds below par and asked why the discount should be included in the current revenues of the country. The minister is reading the figures for the last few months and they have nothing to do with the question at issue.

Mr. FRASER: That is exactly what I was going to bring up; the minister has given me the information for the last year just closed and he knows very well that I have no criticism to make of those figures. The only information I have before me is for the previous years and he expects me to be satisfied with an answer concerning last year. That is not what I expect from the minister, and I do not think it is fair when I ask a question of that kind that I should receive an evasive answer.

Mr. ROBB: I hope my hon. friends are not developing too much heat in regard to this matter. I told the hon. member that we had to account for this in some way; if we buy in these bonds and earn upon them we must report those earnings to parliament.

Mr. FRASER: Why could not the bonds be put in at the amount they were purchased at? Is that the regular custom of the department?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: When bonds are purchased at a discount the department takes credit for that as being money earned, but as far as I can see it is not money earned. I am puzzled to know just how much of this surplus the minister has presented to the country could be accounted for in a similar fashion?

Mr. ROBB: There has been no difference in the system of accounting in the department for many years; we are following the same procedure followed by my predecessors of both parties.

Mr. FRASER: I look upon the Minister of Finance as being a good, sound business man, but I do not know how he can justify the position which he has taken in regard to this matter. Even supposing that previous ministers of finance had accounted to the country in that way, it is poor business and the Finance minister should find a better way of accounting for these revenues to the country.

Mr. ROBB: If I go into the market and retire Dominion bonds at a premium I must report to parliament that I have paid that much more for them, and when I buy them at a discount I must report the discount as well as the premium.

Mr. FRASER: I do not know why the bonds are not taken in at the amount paid for them.

Mr. ROBB: I do not know of any other commercial concern which does it in that way.

Mr. FRASER: I think all commercial concerns take them into account at the amount actually paid.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under what item would we vote the item of interest on public debt which appears on page 6 of the estimates?

Mr. ROBB: That is statutory.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then we do not discuss it at all?

Mr. ROBB: We can discuss it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If we can discuss it, it would be just as well to discuss it under this item, because I have one or two remarks to make in connection with the statement made to the house by the right hon. the Prime Minister, when speaking on the budget. I want to get this matter straightened out because, in my judgment, the statement made by the Prime Minister was very misleading and not at all in accordance with the facts. I take it that the funded debt of Canada on March 31, 1922, was $2,420,000,000, in round figures, and according to the Canadian Gazette of April 13, I find that the funded debt of Canada on March 31, 1929, was $2,363,000,000. It will be understood that I am giving round figures. When I was speaking on the budget I gave the funded debt of Canada as of March 31 last as being $2,330,000,000, so it would appear that I was just $33,000,000 too low. I obtained those figures in the course of conversation a day or two before with the Minister of Finance. When I stated that there had been a reduction in seven years of $90,000,000 in the funded debt of Canada, I should have stated that there had been a reduction of $57,000,000. The right hon. the Prime Minister made what to my mind is the most ridiculous financial statement which has ever been made in the House of Commons. The right hon. the Prime Minister said that I had overlooked entirely the fact that in 1922 there was a floating debt of $144,000,000, and that this government had paid that floating debt because it had disappeared. According to the statement of 1922 there were against that funded debt assets which have also disappeared from the public accounts of Canada. Schedule B of the public accounts for 1922, shows the following assets as appearing on the balance sheet of Canada and which are carried as cash:

[Mr. Robb.]

Imperial government account..	$122,719,711 71
Italian government..	702 52
Belgian government..	6,291,125 64
French government..	5,730,000 00
Greek government..	7,520,473 17
Roumanian government	20,449,104 49
Russian government..	55,571 82

Making a total of $162,766,689.35 which was carried on the balance sheet of Canada as of that date. The minister stated that the government had paid $144,000,000 of floating debt, but I ask him where these assets have gone. According to the statement which appears in the Canada Gazette, the assets amount to $31,049,000, while in March, 1922, they amounted to $162,766,000. What has become of those assets, cash assets which were carried on the balance sheet of the Dominion of Canada? Those assets have been liquidated and the money has been used to pay the floating debt of $144,000,000. The assets are gone and the floating debt is gone, and the balance has not been affected at all.

The right hon. the Prime Minister knew that fact when he made his speech, or if he did not know he should have known. I submitted those figures to an accountant and I was told that a more ridiculous proposition had never been put up to him in all his experience. If the assets were still there then I could understand that the debt had been paid, but that debt was paid out of the cash assets. The money had been borrowed from the banks to advance to these foreign governments, and when that was paid the money was repaid to the banks and the balance of the Dominion of Canada was not affected at all. When I stated that in seven years the Minister of Finance had reduced the funded debt by $90,000,000, I was giving him credit for $33,000,000 too much; the amount should have been $57,000,000 and not $90,000,000. I cannot say who supplied this information to the Minister of Finance, but if it was a member of the Finance department, that man should be hauled over the coals and brought before the Auditor General because he does not know his business.

Mr. ROBB: This is not the first time that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has challenged the correctness of the financial statement put out by a minister of finance of this government. My hon. friend made even wilder statements in 1927—

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am making that statement, and I am not going to have my hon. friend say that I made wilder statements. That statement was made to this house by the Finance minister of Canada, and if he can explain it we would like him to do so.

Mr. ROBB: I repeat that my hon. friend made even wilder statements from the public platforms of this country in 1927 when he was seeking to injure the government and advance his own political interests. I could see that at that time there might be created by the speech of my hon. friend who occupied then a very high position, as he does now, a feeling of unrest throughout the country and it would not be a good thing for the Dominion of Canada if the idea should go abroad that the finances of the country were being in any way juggled or interfered with. So to get an independent audit that at least the Conservative party could not find any fault with, the treasury board, on my recommendation, instructed P. S. Ross and Sons of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, a very large auditing house throughout Canada, to make an audit of the accounts of the department. I may say, by the way, that they are relatives of that very estimable gentleman who controls the Ottawa Journal, and who, I am told, is president of the Conservative Association of this city; brothers of a gentleman who was Conservative candidate in Montreal at one time; P. S. Ross and Sons who were selected by the government of Sir Robert Borden and the Union government to audit the accounts overseas. They were instructed to go into the accounts of the department, audit them carefully, make the most thorough examination and report to parliament as to the position. The answer will be found in the public accounts for the fiscal year, ended March 31, 1927, on page xiv. I will put the report on Hansard now so that the public will be able to see it in answer to my hon. friend. It is as follows:

P. S. Ross and Sons,
Chartered Accountants,
Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg.
Montreal, 5th December, 1927.

Honourable J. A. Robb,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—By authority of the treasury board, given 28th June, 1927, we have examined the balance sheets of the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal years ended 31st March, 1924, 1925, 1926 and 1927.

We certify that the published balance sheets examined by us have been compiled in a manner similar to the corresponding statements of previous years, and do not include in the net debt of the Dominion, issues of the Canadian National Railway Company and the companies included in its system which carry the guarantee of the Dominion. The details of such guarantees have been shown separately each year in the public accounts.

We further certify that the surplus of revenues over expenditures, as audited by the Auditor General of Canada and as shown by the books of the department for the four years ended 31st March, 1927, has been as hereunder:—

1924..	$73,420,808 30	
1925..	28,163,127 26	
1926..	55,711,045 04	
1927..	73,024,845 86	
		$230,319,826 46

and that the same has been properly reflected in the respective balance sheets as follows:—

Additions to capital or non-active asset accounts:—

1924..	$37,427,214 44	
1925..	27,817,537 97	
1926..	28,004,458 87	
1927..	31,128,116 53	
		$124,377,327 81
Reduction in net debt:—		
1924..	$35,993,593 86	
1925..	345,589 29	
1926..	27,706,586 17	
1927..	41,896,729 33	
		$105,942,498 65

The net debt of Canada, as shown by the public accounts at 31st March 1927, which has been substantially verified by the board of audit in conjunction with us, was..	$2,347,834,370 09
The net debt at 31st March, 1923, was..	2,453,776,868 74
A reduction in the net debt, during the period, of.. ..	$ 105,942,498 65

Respectfully submitted,
(Sgd.) P. S. Ross and Sons,
Chartered Accountants.

That is the answer to my hon. friend. I prefer to take the certificate of P. S. Ross and Sons to the statement of my hon. friend, much as I esteem him.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What has my hon. friend done? He might just as well talk about the weather or the opening of the new hotel in Toronto as read the statements he has read. I agree that the public accounts are correct, but I am just as satisfied that the statements of the Minister of Finance in the house in the last five or six years were incorrect and that the statement made in the house by the Prime Minister was also incorrect. That is my objection. The public accounts are correct; stick to them, and I am pointing out to-day that the statements in the public accounts will not bear out the statements made by the Minister of Finance as to the funded debt and the reductions in the funded debt.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did the hon. member take account of the assets in his statement?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the whole point. He left out of account the other matter to which I referred.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I left nothing out of account; I took the statements from the public accounts, but my right hon. friend left out the assets.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was drawing attention to what my hon. friend left out and which he admits he left out.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I took in neither the floating debt nor the assets connected with it. I took the funded debt as given by the public accounts, and the only mistake I made was to give credit to the Minister of Finance for paying off $33,000,000 more than he did. The reason was that I got the figures from the minister in conversation with him, and he said that he would not know the exact amount until the end of the year. This was a day or two before the end of the year. When the figures up to the end of the year came out, I found that I gave him credit for $33,000,000 more than he was entitled to, and instead of reducing the funded debt by $90,000,000, as I stated, he has reduced it by $57,000,000 and that only. The statement made by the Prime Minister in regard to the floating debt of Canada, according to information I get from men who are accustomed to bookkeeping, is absolute nonsense. You have wiped out the floating debt of $144,000,000, but you have wiped all the assets too, and this does not change the account at all. My right hon. friend said that he should have credit for paying, not only the $90,000,000 matter I spoke of, but $144,000,000 more. He should also have credit for spending $144,000,000 of the assets of the country, because they are not shown to-day on the balance sheet of Canada. They have been paid and the debt incurred with the banks when those assets were created, has been wiped off. That is the transaction. The $57,000,000 is the reduction in the funded debt of Canada.

Mr. ROBB: But the people who gave the interest know what the debt is.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister may submit my statement to any of his officials and I will guarantee that my statement is substantiated by men in his department who know. I am not talking about the net debt. I am not seeking to impugn the public accounts of Canada. I am standing by the public accounts; I say they are correct. What the minister should have had audited by P. S. Ross and Sons was not the public accounts but his own statement in regard to them, as I pointed out last year. The minister showed from $30,000,000 to $40,000,000 too much, and he knows it.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand that a certain amount of printing of Dominion notes is done in the basement of the east block. Does the minister consider it cheaper to have most of the notes printed outside by contract than doing the printing ourselves? What would be the difference in the cost?

Mr. ROBB: No one has seriously suggested that we would save any money by printing the notes ourselves. The whole experience of business is that it is not cheaper to do the work ourselves. For instance, we have a very large printing bureau for doing general printing, but no one would say that it was a very great economy for the country.

Mr. SPENCER: But we do print a lot of Dominion notes ourselves. I would like to know what percentage we do print, and if it is found cheaper to do the work ourselves than to have it done outside.

Mr. ROBB: We just print the seal and signature. The work is done by contract.

Mr. SPENCER: We just do the finishing part of it.

Mr. ROBB: The seal and the signature.

Item agreed to.

Insurance—salaries, $95,515; contingencies, $59,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. ROBB: The number of positions required for 1929-30 is 40, an increase of two over last year. The increase of $1,635 is accounted for as follows: statutory increases, $1,305; new positions, actuarial assistant, $1,560; clerk, grade 2, $1,080; two clerks, grade 1, $720 each; less 2 positions reduced by $420 by appointment at minimum salary; two positions dropped, $2,750.

Item agreed to.

To provide for retiring allowances to former employees of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $17,500.

Mr. BENNETT: What are the particulars?

Mr. ROBB: These employees were retired in connection with the reorganization of the printing bureau in 1920. The number of annuitants on March 31, 1929, was 28.

Item agreed to.

Canadian National Safety League, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Who gets that money?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The National Safety League.

Mr. BENNETT: Where is the league and what is it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The late Sir John Gibson was president of it. I think its headquarters are in Hamilton.

Mr. COOTE: What purpose does this organization serve that it should receive a government grant?

Mr. ROBB: This item is under the Department of Labour, but we called it just to clear the slate as we go along. I think a good deal of the work of the National Safety League is to prevent accidents on railways. They have an organization in all the provinces.

Mr. BENNETT: How much went for salaries?

Mr. ROBB: Very little.

Mr. COOTE: It appears to me that it would be very much better to have the Minister of Labour explain the vote. The only work of the league that I have seen is the distribution of a calendar. It seems to me hardly worth while to pay out $10,000 for this purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let the item stand until the Minister of Labour is in his seat.

Item stands.

Grant to the Dominion Council of the Girl Guides, $6,000.

Mr. BROWN: I am only sorry, Mr. Chairman, that this vote cannot be made larger. The work the girl guides are doing is of first importance to Canada, and I think it worth while to place on record an incident that happened not very long ago in Winnipeg, where the girl guides were the means of saving life. Perhaps this may be of interest to the Canadian Press Association, because one of the girls was the daughter of a former member of the association. Three girls were playing on the street. Another girl hastened up to them, spoke very hurriedly, and they followed her. They found a man being suffocated in a garage. They pulled him out and sent one of their number for a doctor, and in the meantime they saved the man's life by the use of artificial respiration. The doctor was well pleased when he found what the girls had done. I believe those girls recently received public recognition of their service. I thought it well to delay the house to record such an incident, for it shows the very valuable work the girl guides and boy scouts are doing for Canada.

Mr. COOTE: Why do the girl guides get only $6,000 as against $15,000 voted to the boy scouts?

Mr. BENNETT: The boy scouts are much more numerous.

Mr. COOTE: It hardly seems fair to the girls.

Mr. ROBB: I think the girls are very well satisfied. The grant was first made in 1919-20 at $3,000. It was increased in 1928-29 to $6,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Are they satisfied?

Miss MACPHAIL: Is the Minister of Finance sure that the girls are satisfied with less than the boys are receiving, or is he guessing at it?

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps it is a guess.

Miss MACPHAIL: I think so. May I say a word about the girl guides? There are some features of the girl guides' training that to me smack a little too much of uniform and precision, but on the other hand I think they do very good work. Their work is largely coloured by the local leader. Last year some girl guides in the city of Toronto put on an international pageant, and for the first time the girls became interested in international life, which is now part of the life of the individual whether we wish it or not. These girl guides study nature at first hand, and they are taught life-saving methods. It is a splendid training, and I think the girls need it just as much as the boys. I should like the minister next year to increase this amount, because the girls are not satisfied with less than the boys are getting.

Item agreed to.

To provide for salaries and expenses of the Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation. Payments may be made notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act or regulations thereunder, $120,000.

Mr. BENNETT: I desire once more to enter a protest against this expenditure. The minister is doing nothing more after parliament meets and the budget speech is delivered than to submit to this tribunal matters that should be brought to the attention of parliament if they are of any value at all. It is a glorified commission to enable the minister to escape responsibility. I should like to know what factories the chairman visited during his term of office, referred to in the last report as being for the purpose of establishing "intimate relations." While the minister is at it, I may tell him that in Oshawa not long ago the chairman of that commission stated that he was now in communication with Australia and other countries in connection with

negotiations for closer trade relations. I desire the minister to indicate whether or not he has delegated to that gentleman the right on behalf of the government of Canada to discuss trade relations with Australia and other countries.

Mr. ROBB: Regarding the last observation of my hon. friend, this is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. BENNETT: Have you not seen his speech in that regard?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has kept me so busy here that I have not had time to read that speech. Does my hon. friend desire that I place on Hansard the information he asks for, or shall I read this statement?

Mr. BENNETT: I am quite content that the minister should put it on Hansard if the house agrees.

Mr. ROBB: I will hand it to Hansard.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Visits by Tariff Board to Industries during Fiscal Years 1927-28, 1928-29

Apart from numerous visits to agricultural areas throughout Canada, and interviews with representative jobbers and distributors from coast to coast—in connection with various references affecting agricultural products—the tariff advisory board has visited, during the two years mentioned, many industrial plants and organizations, most of them by request of the management. Such firms, plants or organizations visited and inspected by the board during the incumbency of the present chairman include the following:

*Aluminum Co. of Canada, Toronto, re aluminum-ware.
Automobile Dealers Assoc., Vancouver, re sale of used car.
*Barrie Tanning Co. Ltd., Barrie, re leather.
*Barrymore Cloth Co. Ltd., Toronto, re textiles.
*Bates & Innes Ltd., Carleton Place, re textiles.
*Beach Foundry Co. Ltd., Ottawa, re iron and steel.
Bienfait Briquetting Plant, Bienfait, re coal.
Big Lump Coal Co., Estevan, re coal.
*Brantford Cordage Co., Brantford, re twine and cordage.
Br. Columbia Cement Co., Bamberton Inlet, re cement.
Br. Columbia Refractories, Vancouver, re fire clay.
Br. Columbia Sugar Refining Co., Vancouver, re sugar.
Cadomin Collieries (met management in Edmonton), re coal.
Campbell Woollen Mills, Almonte, re textiles.
Canadian Collieries Ltd., Nanaimo, re coal.
*Canadian Cottons Ltd., Montreal, re textiles.
*Canadian Cottons Ltd., Hamilton, re textiles.
Canadian Cottons Ltd., Cornwall, re textiles.
*Canadian Dyers Ltd., Cobourg, re textiles.
*Canadian Graton & Knight Ltd., Montreal, re textiles.
*Canadian Woollens Ltd., Peterborough, re textiles.

Canmore Collieries Ltd (met management in Calgary), re coal.
*Carson, Hugh Co., Ottawa, re leather.
Coast Cement Co., Vancouver, re cement.
*Consumers Cordage Co., Montreal, re twine and cordage.
*Cosmos Canadian Ltd., Hamilton, re textiles.
Courtauld's Ltd., Cornwall, re textiles.
*Crean, Robert Co., Toronto, re hats and caps.
Crow's Nest Pass Coal Co. (met president in Vancouver), re coal.
*Demetre Sault & Ciriez, St. John's, P.Q., re textiles.
*Dominion Combing Mills, Trenton, re textiles.
*Dominion Foundries & Steel, Hamilton, re iron and steel.
*Dominion Linens Ltd., Guelph, re textiles.
Dominion Sugar Co. Ltd., Chatham, re sugar.
Dominion Sugar Co. Ltd., Wallaceburg, re sugar.
*Dominion Textiles Ltd., Verdun, re textiles.
*Dominion Textiles Ltd., Hochelaga, re textiles.
*Dominion Textiles Ltd., St. Anne's, re textiles.
*Dupont Textiles Ltd., Toronto, re textiles.
*Fernandez V., Toronto, re cigars and cigarettes.
*Forbes, R. & Co., Hespeler, re textiles.
Fuel Commissioner of Alberta, Edmonton, re coal.
*General Motors Ltd., Oshawa, re iron and steel.
*Hamilton Cottons Ltd., Hamilton, re textiles.
*Hamilton, W. B., Toronto, re boots and shoes.
*Hatch Mfgr. Co. Ltd., Whitby, re harness hardware.
*Hawthorne Woollen Mills, Carleton Place, re textiles.
*Hinde & Dauch Paper Co. of Canada, Trenton, re paper boxes.
*Horn Bros. Woollen Mills, Lindsay, re textiles.
*Imperial Tobacca Co., Montreal, re cigars and cigarettes.
*King Bros. Ltd., Whitby, re leather.
*Lang Tanning Co. Ltd., Kitchener, re leather.
*Leishman, W. H. & Co., Toronto, re textiles.
Lowery, Robt., Toronto, re harness hardware.
Luscar Collieries (met management in Edmonton), re coal.
MacDonald, J. A. & C. H. (met management in Vancouver), re building stone.
Marlboro Cement Co., Edmonton, re cement.
McClary Mfgr. Co., London, re enamelware.
Moffats Ltd., Weston, re parts of stoves.
Mountain Park Collieries (met management in Edmonton), re coal.
*Nashua Paper Co. Ltd., Peterborough, re wax paper.
*Ontario Steel Products, Oshawa, re iron and steel.
*Oriental Textiles Ltd., Oshawa, re textiles.
*Pattinson, Geo. & Co., Preston, re textiles.
*Phillips, W. E. & Co., Oshawa, re glass.
*Regent Knitting Mills, St. Jerome, re textiles.
*Richardson, C. & Co., St. Mary's re dairy supplies.
*Rolph-Clark-Stone Ltd., Toronto, re lithographed and printed matter.
*Rosamond Woollen Mills, Almonte, re textiles.

*Schnaufer, F. A. & Co., Toronto, re dressed furs.
*Sheet Metal Products Ltd., Toronto, re enamelware.
*Smith, Howard Paper Mills Ltd., Montreal, re pulp and paper.
*Sparks-Harrison Ltd., Hull, re textiles.
Souris Fuel Distributors, Winnipeg, re coal.
*Thorbourn Woollen Mills, Almonte, re textiles.
*Underhills, Ltd., Barrie, re boots and shoes.
*Western Clock Co., Peterborough.
*Wabasso Cotton Co. Ltd., Three Rivers, re textiles.
*Wilson, Andrew & Co., Toronto, re cigars and cigarettes.
Western Canadian Collieries (Brazeau Collieries) (met management in Lethbridge), re coal.
Western Fuel Co., Nanaimo, re coal.
*Wayagmack Paper Co., Three Rivers, re paper.
*York Knitting Mills, Toronto, re textiles.
During the past two years various officers in the employ of the board have visited the following plants:
Steel Co. of Canada, Hamilton.
Algoma Steel Corporation, Sault Ste. Marie.
British Empire Steel Corporation, Sydney.
Dominion Alloy Steel Corporation, Sarnia.
And industries located at the following points in the United States:
Pittsburg, Middletown, Cleveland, Ashland, Malone, Syracuse, and Buffalo.
*Visited by chairman—56.

Mr. BENNETT: Then I gather the minister is not familiar with the activities of the chairman of the board in regard to trade negotiations with other countries as mentioned by him in his speech?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sorry "My dear Moore" has not consulted his minister.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much in addition to the vote of $120,000 is provided for this tariff board? I notice in the public accounts there is an item of some $70,000 for experts. Will the minister tell us something about the item?

Mr. ROBB: The particulars I have here are as follows:

Expenditures for members of the board, $16,482.80.
Permanent staff, $20,954.83.
Temporary staff, $6,734.49.
Travelling expenses, $6,740.66.
Investigators, $5,899.98.
Per diem allowance, $3,520.

This is a per diem allowance I imagine for the investigators. The printing of the records runs up to almost $12,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is one item here that I am anxious to get particulars of. It is in the public accounts for 1928. "Expenses of advisers re tariff inquiry, $71,999." What is that?

Mr. ROBB: That would be the total of the account that I have just read. What is the amount?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The amount is $71,999. It is marked "Expenses of advisers re tariff inquiry."

Mr. BENNETT: Experts?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It does not say experts.

Mr. ROBB: That is for the expenses of the advisory board.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And it has risen from $71,000 in 1928 to $120,000 now.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. KELLNER: Can the minister give us a list of the changes made in the tariff on the advice of the board?

Mr. ROBB: That is rather a large order; perhaps my hon. friend will move for a return.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps the minister will give us a list of the changes he has made without their advice.

Mr. ROBB: That is another matter.

Mr. CANTLEY: I put a question on the order paper some weeks ago in regard to the advice tendered by these so-called tariff experts of the board. The minister said the question was an improper one but he promised to give me the information privately. When may I get it?

Mr. ROBB: I can give it to my hon. friend at one o'clock; part of it is in my office now.

Item agreed to.

Unforeseen expenses, expenditure thereof to be under order-in-council, on recommendation of the treasury board, and a detailed statement to be laid before parliament within fifteen days of next session, $80,000.

Mr. FRASER: How much of last year's vote was spent?

Mr. ROBB: This item is the usual provision for expenditures of an unforeseen character, payments made under authority of the governor general in council. Not very much was spent last year—$7,033.76. The previous year, 1927-28, the expenditure was $131,032.65. Sometimes it is more and sometimes less; there might be accidents.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to provide for grants to be made to the provinces of—
Nova Scotia, $875,000.
New Brunswick, $600,000.
Prince Edward Island, $125,000.
pending consideration of provincial subsidies.

Mr. QUINN: Is consideration being given to the final adjustment of subsidies to the maritime provinces?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. QUINN: When may we expect the final settlement?

Mr. ROBB: I cannot make any promise in that regard, but the matter is under consideration.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Montreal Association for the Blind, $5,000.

Mr. COOTE: Are there not other institues in Canada for taking care of the blind, and are they receiving government assistance?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. COOTE: Are they all treated alike so far as the government is concerned?

Mr. ROBB: Yes; they are fairly well satisfied now. There are two main organizations and at one time it was alleged that one of them was not receiving all that it should, but the matter has been adjusted and I have heard no further complaint.

Mr. CANTLEY: We have in Halifax an institution that cares for the blind in the three maritime provinces. What provision is made for it?

Mr. ROBB: I met the head of that institution when I was recently in Halifax and the only request he had to make was for a certain concession to sell newspapers in the post offices throughout the country; otherwise they are satisfied with the grant.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the expenses of work in the interest of fire prevention to be carried on by the Department of Insurance, $10,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is this for?

Mr. ROBB: This is for fire prevention services. The vote includes the salary of the fire prevention commissioner, Mr. J. Grove Smith, $4,920, and for clerical assistance. The expenses for salaries are: 1925-26, $6,120; 1928-29, $6,150. Travelling expenses in 1925-26 amounted to $1,155 and in 1928-29, $1,386. The total expenditure in 1925-26 was $9,683 and the total in 1928-29, $8,773.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: What does this officer do?

Mr. ROBB: I am bound to admit I have never been quite satisfied that he was earning his salary. He has been in the service for some years, having been finally given this position. We found him in the service when we came into office. He travels about, and my complaint is that he goes around after the fire is over and tells the people what they should do to prevent the next fire.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Does he report?

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: Yes, to the superintendent of insurance.

Mr. SPENCER: Does he work in conjunction with the fire insurance companies?

Mr. ROBB: No, he is in the Department of Insurance. He looks after inflammable materials, testing them out, and organizes fire prevention gatherings which meet every year.

Item agreed to.

Chief electoral officer—salaries and contingencies of office, $16,240.

Mr. SPENCER: This item calls for salaries and contingencies in connection with the chief electoral officer and on page 67, under vote 307, there is an item of $6,000 for "salary, chief electoral officer." What connection is there between these two items?

Mr. RINFRET: The salary of the chief electoral officer is statutory and does not come under this item. This vote is made up as follows: Assistant chief electoral officer, $3,120; chief electoral officer's secretary, $1,620; clerk-stenographer grade 3, $1,500; contingencies, amount to be expended depending on number of elections, $10,000. The position of assistant chief electoral officer is now vacant, but under the new act, which will greatly enlarge the scope of the work, it will be necesary to have the office filled.

Item agreed to.

Canada's contribution to the expenses of the League of Nations for 1929, including Secretariat, International Labour Organization and Permanent Court of International Justice, $171,781.53.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This item was previously before the committee but was held over at the request of an hon. member for information. If the house wishes I can give it; otherwise we can pass the item.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps the Prime Minister would put it on Hansard.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. This is the statement:

The covenant of the League of Nations originally provided that the expenses of the league should be apportioned among the members on the same basis as that adopted for the expenses of the Universal Postal Union. This was found to be inequitable and an amendment to the covenant was adopted in 1924 providing that the expenses should be borne in the proportion decided by the assembly. The basis to be adopted has been considered by committees of various assemblies. The question of the weight to be given to such factors as national revenue, population, trade returns depreciation of currency, was repeatedly considered. A scale of allocation was adopted by the assembly in 1926, and the ninth assembly voted to continue on that basis until 1932, when it will be reconsidered.

Present Scale of Allocation of the Expenses of the League

Country	Units	Country	Units
Abyssinia	2	Australia	27
Albania	1	Italy	60
Argentine	29	Japan	60
Austria	8	Latvia	3
Belgium	18	Liberia	1
Bolivia	4	Lithuania	4
Bulgaria	5	Luxemburg	1
Canada	35	Netherlands	23
Chile	14	New Zealand	10
China	46	Nicaragua	1
Colombia	6	Norway	9
(Costa Rica)	(1)	Panama	1
Cuba	9	Paraguay	1
Czechoslovakia	29	Persia	5
Denmark	12	Peru	9
Dominican Republic	1	Poland	32
Estonia	3	Portugal	6
Finland	10	Rumania	22
France	79	Salvador	1
Germany	79	Serb-Croat-Slovene State	20
Great Britain	105	Siam	9
Greece	7	Spain	40
Guatemala	1	South Africa (Union of)	15
Haiti	1	Sweden	18
Honduras	1	Switzerland	17
Hungary	8	Uruguay	7
India	56	Venezuela	5
Irish Free State	10		
			986

Budgets of League, 1919 to 1929

Year	Total budget	Canada's contributions	Per cent
1921	$4,101,250 00	$186,237 31	4·5409
1922	4,028,671 00	195,140 47	4·8437
1923	4,954,987 00	183,668 03	3·7067
1924	4,483,007 69	168,353 29 (less refund—$11,849 37)	3·7553
1925	4,373,020 63	163,356 38	3·7424
1926	4,424,542 39	165,271 06	3·7353
1927	4,729,738 17 less 270,135 60	150,777 13	3·3809
	4,459,602 57		
1928	4,888,244 35 less 270,134 66	155,241 26	3·3615
	4,618,109 69		
1929	5,214,815 96 less 345,501 21	171,481 53	3·5216
	4,869,314 75		

It will be noted that the total budget of the league has increased only from $4,101,250 in 1921 to $4,869,314 in 1929.

The budget for 1929 is divided as follows:

	Gold francs
I. Secretariat and Special Organizations	14,713,085
II. International Labour Organization	8,612,640
III. Permanent Court of International Justice	2,255,555
IV. Buildings at Geneva	1,445,000
Total	27,026,280

The increase in the total budget over 1928 is due mainly to opium investigation, the proposed conference on the codification of international law, and the special work of the transit organization, as well as to additional activities of the International Labour Office.

It will also be noted that the total amount paid by Canada is less than in 1921, and that her share of the total is now 3·5, as against 4·5 in 1921. The slight increase in the percentage in 1929 over 1928 (3·36) is due largely to reduction in the share borne by India, which was felt to be too large.

Item agreed to.

Government Contracts Supervision Committee, salaries, including L. R. LaFlèche, Secretary, at $6,000, and that of L. H. Beer, Salvage Officer, $5,000 telephones, telegrams, travelling expenses, stationery, etc., $21,200.

Mr. GARDINER: Is this committee functioning and doing any real work at all?

Mr. ROBB: The purchases for 1928-29 amounted to $414,089.17, and the salvage to $106,468.83. In addition to that, they attend to a good deal of the distribution within the service; one department might want some new typewriters, but instead of going out and buying them the purchasing commission may find them available in another department.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand the minister to say that the purchases made on behalf of the government amounted to $414,000. Can the minister give us the total purchases made by the different departments in Ottawa in addition to those made by this committee?

Mr. ROBB: No, I have not that information.

Mr. GARDINER: My information is that this committee has been practically set aside and that the various departments do their own purchasing without reference to this committee.

Mr. ROBB: There is no doubt but that the various departments have their own purchasing commissions, and always have had them. This commission was organized during the war, to attend to war purchases, but the departments have excellent purchasing commissions of their own, and perhaps we might be able to curtail some of this expenditure, although this commission has existed for many years and I think the purchasing is carried on quite economically under the tender system.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister's statement is not very satisfactory. He states that each of the departments has its own purchasing commission, and it seems to me that many of the departments purchase goods similar to those purchased by various other departments, and I think that could be done much more efficiently by a central organization such as this. I merely ask the minister to take that matter into consideration and see if it would not be possible to have our purchasing done in some better way.

Mr. COOTE: It seems to me a little hard to understand why we should pay $21,200 to keep this purchasing commission alive when each department has a purchasing commission of its own. I do not think the minister has given a satisfactory reason why this commission should be continued, and I wish he would enlighten the committee a little more.

Mr. ROBB: If the hon. gentleman will consider the various departments of this government which do business all over Canada, he will see that even if this purchasing were all under one department it could not be done for $21,000 or anything like that amount because we would require an additional staff to look after the work. My hon. friend will understand that if we do all this work under one board we must increase that board in order to take care of the increased work, but this commission has a supervisory control of the department and they are doing an excellent work in saving money to the country by way of salvage.

Mr. COOTE: Do they supervise the work of the purchasing commissions of the various departments?

Mr. ROBB: No, not necessarily.

Mr. COOTE: I would like to know just what contracts the committee supervise, if each department has a contract supervising committee of its own.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I always understood their chief work was salvage.

Mr. COOTE: Perhaps the minister can tell me whether they have ever supervised the purchase of any typewriters for the House of Commons?

Mr. ROBB: I think that is done through the printing bureau.

Mr. COOTE: It seems an extraordinary thing for the printing bureau to supervise the purchase of typewriters for the House of Commons; perhaps that is the reason why only two of the typewriters now in use in the stenographic service were new when they came here. I think it is very improper and almost scandalous that the typewriters in use in the stenographic service of the House of Commons should be all second-hand machines; apparently the departments get all the new machines and the old ones are sent here. I think the letters of the members of the House of Commons are just as important as the letters of any of the departments, and I would suggest to the minister that perhaps he might give this government contract supervision committee the job of purchasing some new typewriters for use in

the stenographic service here. It is scandalous that the stenographers serving the members of this house should have to use these old typewriters; I think it is time we had new machines.

Miss MACPHAIL: I would like the minister to instruct the commission to buy some silencers for the typewriters. It gives me a headache when I dictate to the typewriter for an hour or so and I do not know how the girls stand it with about ninety machines going in one room, only two or three of which are equipped with silencers. I think the staff should be put in smaller rooms or else silencers should be put on the machines.

Mr. CANTLEY: One-third of the typewriters in the stenographic service are antiques and another third are practically useless.

Mr. ROBB: All I can promise is to direct the attention of the proper officers to the representations which have been made; I will ask the board if they can salvage these typewriters and sell them to someone else, but I would suggest that hon. members do not run them down too much until we dispose of them.

Mr. COOTE: I would not like to see the government of this country take advantage of anyone, and I am sure that would be done if many of those typewriters were sold. A number of those machines were salvaged at the time of the fire; I could hardly credit that statement when it appeared in answer to a question which I placed on the order paper. I think it is time the internal economy committee of this house looked carefully into this matter.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the International Council of Nurses toward defraying expenses of their meeting to be held in Canada during 1929, $5,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Where is this conference to be held, and when?

Mr. ROBB: This is a world wide convention, and I believe it is meeting in Montreal.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the salary of Hon. J. C. Patterson, commissioner to investigate titles of Great Britain to lands in the Arctic seas, $2,400.

Mr. ROBB: The annuitant has died since the estimates were prepared.

Mr. RINFRET: I move that the item be dropped.

Motion agreed to.

Patent Record, $35,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Is there any revenue derived from this publication?

Mr. RINFRET: This is the usual vote asked for the publication of the Patent Record, which is issued under section 60 of the revised statutes. This is published every week and gives the name of the inventors and contains a description of each patent which has been issued during the week. It is sent to the libraries of Canada and distributed to members of parliament or to senators who desire to receive it. There is a subscription price of $10, and we have a certain number of subscribers, but this publication is more in the way of a public service.

Item agreed to.

Battlefields memorials, $170,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: When is it expected that these memorials will be completed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This item relates to the memorials at Quebec and elsewhere, and I imagine that the work will continue for years to come.

Item agreed to.

Expenses under the Canada Temperance Act, $10,000.

Mr. RINFRET: This vote is to provide for plebiscites under the Temperance Act. A plebiscite was held in the county of Brome, province of Quebec, and we expect to hold one in the city of Thetford Mines, and in the county of Compton, Que. We allow about $5,000 for each plebiscite.

Item agreed to.

Expenses under the Naturalization Act, $8,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the revenue derived under this act?

Mr. RINFRET: I would suggest that this item stand, as it comes under the estimates for the Secretary of State. As there are supplementary estimates covering the same item the matter could be discussed then.

Item stands.

To provide for payment of salaries and expenses in connection with the operation of the Canadian Farm Loan Act; any payment under this item to be by way of advance repayable to the consolidated revenue fund from the revenues of the Canadian Farm Loan Board as and when they accrue, $50,000.

Mr. GARDINER: What amount was expended under this item last year?

Mr. ROBB: There was $5,010.05 expended to March 31, 1929. I am not sure that this vote is required because interest is received from the capital advanced.

Mr. FRASER: When will loans be available under this act?

Mr. ROBB: They are available now as soon as the requirements of the act are complied with.

Mr. FRASER: Are they available in the province of British Columbia?

Mr. ROBB: I think that province has advanced farther than any other province.

Mr. FANSHER (East Lambton): In what provinces does this board operate at the present time?

Mr. ROBB: The provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island have not passed the legislation required by the act. The situation with respect to the other six provinces is as follows:

Alberta, provincial board appointed April 15, 1929.
British Columbia, provincial board appointed April 4, 1929.
Manitoba, arrangements not completed.
New Brunswick, provincial board appointed April 15, 1929, and will be ready to function about May 1, 1929.
Nova Scotia, provincial board appointed.

As soon as this comes before the board it will be passed.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the salary of the chief commissioner, and the per diem allowance for the other commissioners?

Mr. ROBB: The chief commissioner receives $8,000 per annum. Hon. E. C. Drury was appointed in January, 1929, and receives $25 per diem, with a minimum of $1,000 per year. Mr. Beaudry Leman was appointed on the same date at $25 per diem with a minimum of $1,000 per year. A living allowance of $15 per diem was authorized by order in council of January, 1929, for the commissioner and the other members.

Item agreed to.

National battlefields commission—to provide for acquisition of land for the main entrance to the Quebec battlefields park, $22,500.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Was not the right hon. the Prime Minister mistaken in saying that item No. 294 had to do with the Quebec memorials?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry, but I was wrong.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: How long is it expected it will take to complete the memorial at Vimy?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Possibly His Honour the Speaker could reply to that question.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The right hon. gentleman will remember that I visited the battlefields and the memorial of Vimy in October last year. The work has progressed satisfactorily, but the committee has had considerable trouble in obtaining the proper quality of granite. Various quarries in France, Belgium, England and Scotland were inspected, when an old quarry, dating from the days of the Roman empire, was discovered in Jugoslavia, and granite of a very fine grain is being taken from there to Vimy. The foundation for the monument has been completed, and the two majestic pylons are now under construction. The surroundings of the monument are completed and also the inscription of the names of the soldiers. From what I gathered at the last sitting of the commission, and from what I heard at Vimy when I was there last fall, I believe it will take about a year and a half from the present date to complete the monument. I must say that the commission was very fortunate in having Brigadier-General Hughes as an engineer. He discovered right in front of the memorial the trenches which were used alternately by the Germans and the Allies. He has completely reconstituted these trenches, so much so that every Sunday from all parts of France, Belgium, England and even Germany, many congregate there to see our monument and also to see those historic trenches, where on the walls can be read the names of the occupants whether they were Germans or British. I can assure the committee that it is a most impressive sight. I was told that no less than 4,000 to 5,000 visitors went there every Sunday during the summer and fall. As regards the beauty of the monument, it is admitted to-day by the Société des Architectes in France, that it will be the most imposing memorial on the battlefields of Europe.

Item agreed to.

Government of the Yukon Territory.
Salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the territory, including surveys, $64,700.
Grant to Local Council, $45,000.
Grant for maintenance and construction of roads, $73,000.
Grant to provide for the payment of bounty on wolves and coyotes under the provisions of an ordinance to be enacted by the commissioner-in-council, the sum to be paid not to exceed $30 each for wolves and $15 each for coyotes,

the pelts of the animals on which bounty is paid to be surrendered to the government, the proceeds of the sale of such pelts and any unexpended balance to be placed to the credit of the consolidated fund of Canada, $35,000.—Total, $217,700.

Mr. SPENCER: What is this?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The only change in this is the $35,000 provided for the purchase of pelts which we are buying direct. We need this money to pay for them, and we shall be recouped when we sell the skins. We have been doing this in connection with the wolf bounty and we are applying it in the Yukon this year.

Item agreed to.

Indians—British Columbia, $527,100.

Mr. SPENCER: Are the Indians increasing or decreasing in population throughout Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They are just about holding their own. According to the latest report, we have about 105,000 all told, in Canada.

Item agreed to.

Indians—general, $281,500.

Mr. GARDINER: What does the general vote include?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is pretty well outlined in the estimates. It includes:

Payments to Indians surrendering their lands under provisions of section 89 of the Indian Act which will afterwards be repaid from the avails of the land, $50,000.

Relief to destitute Indians in remote districts, $100,000.

To prevent the spread of tuberculosis, $97,000.

Printing and stationery, $8,000.

Grant to assist Indian trust fund account 310, suppression of liquor, $3,000.

Surveys, Ontario, Quebec, and Maritime provinces, $6,000.

To provide for expenses in connection with epidemics of small-pox and other diseases, $10,000.

To provide an amount to pay agents' fees in connection with registration of births, deaths and, marriages, $500.

General legal expenses, $7,000—Total, $281,500.

We are asking for an increase in the item concerning the prevention of the spread of tuberculosis, because tuberculosis is undoubtedly ravishing the Indians to a very great degree, and we are having complaints from many quarters.

Mr. COOTE: Would the administration of oil and gas rights or other minerals on Indian reserves come under this vote?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes. We have by order in council imposed on Indian lands regulations practically uniform with those prevailing on crown lands. That went into effect about a year ago. Formerly the regulations were not uniform.

Mr. COOTE: Are any leases granted on Indian reserves without reserving a royalty to the crown?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No; all leases issued provide for payment of royalty.

Mr. COOTE: But on Dominion government lands there is in most cases no royalty?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): On Dominion lands we are proposing to impose a royalty after five years and on Indian lands payment of royalty begins with production.

Mr. COOTE: Are there any engineers in the Indian department to see that the regulations are enforced?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The same group of officials look after all the oil regulations. We make them responsible for supervision of the drilling on the reservations, the same as on crown lands.

Mr. LUCAS: Will a royalty be imposed after five years?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, after a lease has been in existence and the well is producing, we begin to impose a royalty.

Mr. COOTE: In the past was a royalty not imposed right from the commencement of production of oil on Indian reserves? Am I mistaken in that?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I think my hon. friend is mistaken, because we were paying a subsidy in Ontario for oil production; we were not getting any royalty. That subsidy has been very largely discontinued.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the amount of the royalties proposed?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Speaking from memory, on Dominion lands the royalty begins at 2½ per cent and goes up to 5 per cent, but I will give that information when we are considering the Interior estimates.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister also look up particulars of the royalties which must be paid on oil found on Indian lands?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Indian education, including the construction of school buildings, $2,240,500.

Mr. FRASER: What new schools are proposed to be built in British Columbia under this vote, what will be the total cost of them, and where will they be located?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am sorry I have not my notes before me, but I will put that information on Hansard for my hon. friend.

Mr. MacLAREN: Would the minister give that information for all the provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): I have some questions to ask in regard to this item and I would ask that it stand.

Item stands.

Scientific Institutions

Expenses conected with the Dominion observatory at Ottawa, $71,550.
Expenses connected with the Dominion astrophysical observatory at Victoria, B.C., $23,300.

Mr. GEARY: Is anything to be done in regard to transferring other observatories in the Dominion to Ottawa?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No. There are just two, one at Victoria and one at Ottawa.

Mr. GEARY: Is there not a Dominion observatory in Toronto?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is in the meteorological service, and comes under the Marine department.

Item agreed to.

Topographical Surveys

Topographical and aerial surveys and maps for the development of hydro-electric, forested and mineralized areas and for aerial fire patrol; expenses of geographic board of Canada; classification of lands for settlement and forest reserves; traverse of northern rivers and lakes for administration of Northwest Territories; surveys for administration of Dominion parks and game reserves, miscellaneous legal surveys of Dominion lands; testing of standard measures and instrument repairs; plotting and printing of plans, etc., $430,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What aerial surveys are being made in Alberta this year?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We intend to complete surveying the area around Athabasca lake, and if the machines can be provided to do some surveying along the Peace river for the purpose of mapping that area with a view to opening it up for settlement.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. COOTE: How many survey parties will be engaged in this service in western Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am sorry I have not that information before me but I will get it for my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Administration of Justice:
Yukon Territory—miscellaneous expenditure, including living allowance of judge, salaries, and allowances of court officers, etc., $12,000.

Mr. CAHAN: Has the government come to any decision with regard to the increase of judges' salaries? It was discussed last session.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I am afraid it will have to be kept under consideration for some little while yet.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the government still considering the matter or has it been dropped?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The government is considering it, but, as my hon. friend understands, it would be impossible to bring it before the house this session.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do. But the matter was referred by the minister himself to a special committee last session, that committee reported in favour of an increase. We are now very near the end of another session. What is the prospect for next session, for instance? Judges' salaries in this country are entirely inadequate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are the judges to continue any longer to suffer on acount of the inactivity of the government?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is not quite fair about it. When I am convinced that parliament will support such an increase my hon. friend knows that I will not delay bringing the matter before the house; but I was given so strongly to understand that a measure for this purpose could not pass through parliament that I thought it better to wait until a better opportunity occurred. I still believe that judicial salaries are too low, and that this condition of affairs is not good for the administration of justice. It is all very well to say, as many hon. gentlemen do, that we are always able to find men to

accept judgeships, but the present salaries are not sufficient to attract to the high courts those who should be appointed. But I cannot do anything else now.

Mr. GUTHRIE: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that a Minister of Justice who entertains those views about judicial salaries is lacking in courage in not bringing forward a measure to remedy what he knows is an evil. He says he is afraid it would not pass through parliament. That was his fear last session as it is this session. This government is in office for the purpose of governing. Here is a glaring injustice, and yet the government is afraid to take the necessary steps to remedy it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let me tell my hon. friend that I am a democratic Minister of Justice and a democratic minister of the crown. I will never try to force a measure on parliament when I know parliament is opposed to it. Unfortunately that was the position last year. I hope that by a process of education the adverse majority will come to think the other way. I think they are wrong at the present, but as far as I am concerned, I repeat, I will not try to force through a measure which is not acceptable to the majority of parliament.

Mr. CAHAN: I trust the Minister of Justice will undertake the education of those who sit behind him, because I do not think he will find very much opposition from this side of the house—

Mr. GUTHRIE: Hear, hear.

Mr. CAHAN: —especially if the sentiment is at all like it was when the report of the committee came in. I do think the Minister of Justice is somewhat lacking in courage when he trusts to mere rumours rather than test the intelligent decision of parliament itself.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are not only rumours.

Mr. IRVINE: We are all in a twitter over here, Mr. Chairman, because we heard the minister talking of increases, and we do not know of whom he is speaking.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: May I ask the Minister of Justice if it is the intention of the department to superannuate judges of the superior courts when they have attained the age of seventy-five years? When a judge has attained that age I think he is entitled to a rest, and it is not fair to impose on him the obligation of sitting in court. If this could not be done without amending the British North America Act, is it the intention of the government to ask the opinion of the provinces in this respect?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As my hon. friend knows, a resolution for that purpose was moved last session or the session before by my hon. friend from Muskoka. At the time I said that unfortunately this was governed by the British North America Act. We could deal with the federal courts such as the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court, but the judges of the high courts in the provinces are appointed for life, and we would have to change the constitution. Several of the provincial representatives were not prepared to agree to our asking for an amendment of the British North America Act in that respect, and there the matter stands at present.

Mr. POULIOT: I should not like to be misunderstood in this connection, Mr. Chairman. I have a great respect for the bench, and I put my question because in court I heard a judge of over seventy-five years of age say he noticed that his memory was lacking.

Mr. CAHAN: There are some gentlemen very much younger than seventy-five years who apparently suffer from arrested intellectual development.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Whom has he reference to?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Perhaps the Minister of Justice would not find so much difficulty in getting parliament to consent to an increase of judicial salaries if there was some different method of selection. At the present time the positions are too often given as a reward for political services.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That tends to lower the standard of the judiciary, or at any rate its prestige. It has been frequently recommended that the bar associations of the various provinces should make the nominations for judicial positions and that the government should accept them. I am not sure whether that would be much of an improvement or not on the present practice, but I do say that just so long as judicial positions are the reward for political services—

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are not.

Mr. CAMPBELL: —it will be difficult to secure increases in judicial salaries because it is felt that we do not get the best men.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is wrong when he assumes that. I have already stated

in this house, and I will state it again, that the best way to hurt the chances of appointment of any gentleman to the bench is to attempt to bring political pressure to bear in his favour.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the minister appointed any from this side in the province of Ontario?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have been charged with having done so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, the charge is unfounded so far as my knowledge goes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have been told that I have appointed gentlemen a good deal more friendly to my hon. friend than to myself.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What provision is there for securing anything like uniformity in the sentences imposed for various crimes throughout the country? Is that matter left entirely to the discretion of the judges or is there any possibility of having some uniformity established?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. The only possible course would be to amend the various sections of the criminal code, fixing certain definite sentences for certain offences, which sentences would be invariable. But that would not be desirable. Some discretion must be left to the judges inasmuch as the circumstances vary, and we certainly cannot interfere with the courts in that regard.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is no supervision of any kind exercised by the department over the various judges?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not so far as their judicial functions are concerned.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Perhaps I might give an instance of what I have in mind, although I will not mention the names of any judges; it is the principle rather than the individual that concerns me. A certain justice, dismissing from the jury a man who had intimated that for conscientious reasons he could not serve in a trial involving capital punishment, remarked that a man who adopted that attitude was not a good Canadian citizen. He is reported thus:

> "You have no right to live under the British flag", said His Lordship. "As long as the law provides for capital punishment it must be obeyed. There is a constitutional method of changing the law but it is not for jurymen to alter it."

It does seem to me hardly the thing for a judge to take such a position when a man on conscientious grounds declares his unwillingness to serve on the jury in a particular case; this man had every right to decline to act on that jury. Is there no way by which judges may be checked in rather reckless statements of this sort?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend's principle is wrong; I would not agree with him. I consider the independence of the judiciary the best safeguard of society. If we could exercise some influence on judges, I believe that everyone would suffer in Canada. The law has seen to it that our judges shall be absolutely independent of any influence whatsoever, and were a judge to take that stand again I should support him.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I too wish the judges to be independent, but not arbitrary. Let me cite another instance which has been brought to my notice. A judge addressing a prisoner said:

> The jury have found you not guilty on evidence upon which a verdict of guilty might equally have been returned. For myself, I think that you fired the shot that killed. . . . and I think some steps will have to be taken. I will make my report accordingly, for I think you are not a safe man to be at large.

I do not know all the circumstances, but it seems to me very strange for the judge in this case to have swept aside the verdict of the jury. I am not a lawyer, but I regard it as an arbitrary act on the part of the judge when he undertakes to give his own opinion in this way, virtually disregarding the verdict of the jury. I should like to know whether there is any way of criticizing judges or of exercising some supervisory power, without of course, necessarily involving impeachment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the interests of all, I do not think that such control should be exercised. Not only has parliament decided that this shall not be done, but I am not quite sure even that my hon. friend is in order in thus criticizing the judge in that particular case. The rules of the house forbid such criticism. So far as I am concerned, I will certainly not express my personal views as to whether the judge was right or wrong in that respect.

Mr. EVANS: To emphasize the importance of the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Woodsworth), I cannot do better than give an instance that has come to my attention. In one case a car was stolen and afterwards left outside the city in a damaged condition for the owner to get it. The culprit, a lad of eighteen, was let out on suspended sentence, and during that suspension he committed four

other crimes. Altogether he was up for nine crimes, and during the course of his operations he secured booty to the extent of some $500, going so far as even to rob women; he did his looting at ladies' aid meetings and so forth. Nine offences were proved against him and still he was left at large on suspended sentence. He was also allowed to go into a neighbouring town to work, and apparently nothing could keep him in the right path. It seems to me that there is an utter discrimination in the dispensing of justice in the west to-day. I could mention cases to show that sentences have been unduly severe while in this particular instance I have cited it has been the very opposite.

Mr. LUCAS: When was the criminal code amended granting to agricultural fairs and certain religious bodies the privilege of running wheels of fortune and lotteries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was about three years ago. I remember that my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell)—and I must say I was surprised at this—was very strongly in favour of it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But you did not oppose it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was not contrary to my own principles but I thought it was contrary to those of my colleague. However, it passed the house without much opposition.

Mr. LUCAS: Has the minister had any recommendations in this regard from other organizations this year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. LUCAS: Has any action been taken with respect to these recommendations?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No; next year a bill will be introduced proposing many amendments to the criminal code, but we do not desire to take action in this regard at the present time, particularly in view of the fact that the Revised Statutes of Canada, covering provisions in the criminal code, have been in force now for only a year. Under the circumstances I thought it was better not to introduce any changes in the code during the present session.

Mr. LUCAS: I have received a good many complaints against this privilege granted to agricultural fairs.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Are they opposed to the privilege being granted only to the agricultural fairs or do they want it extended to themselves?

Mr. LUCAS: One or other.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what I thought.

Mr. LUCAS: One complaint is against the privilege being allowed to the agricultural fairs, and there is the other contention that if it be granted to those fairs then it should be extended to all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What does my hon. friend himself think?

Mr. LUCAS: I do not think it should be allowed at agricultural fairs. I do not believe that anything should be carried on at those fairs which is not permitted to be carried on anywhere else.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The views of the agricultural representatives in that respect certainly will receive consideration.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I should like to ask the minister what is the custom in the case of a vacant judgeship in one of the provinces; is an appointment made as a rule without much delay, or at times is the appointment delayed because of some doubt as to the necessity of having so many judges? I have a case in mind in my own province; I have had many requests from different gentlemen as to that appointment, and I understand that the appointment is not being made at present because there is some doubt as to whether there is enough work to necessitate the full complement of judges. I should like to know if that is the case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No doubt my hon. friend is referring to the vacancy in the Stettler district. The reason why this vacancy has not been filled is because I have received communications from the Attorney General of Alberta saying that it might be better not to fill the vacancy owing to the work not being heavy enough to justify it. I have communicated further with him and he rather suggests that this district should be looked after by one of the other judges and that more good would be done by the appointment of a permanent judge in another district which has no resident judge at present; I think that is the Peace River district. However, the matter stands there, and we will have to reach a decision on this question. I am making investigations of my own and I will try to meet the wishes of the authorities of the province.

Mr. SPENCER: When a judgeship becomes vacant does the minister consider the wishes of the provincial government in filling that vacancy or are the provincial governments consulted at all?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would not say that the appointments are subject to the provincial governments, but when there is a question as to the desirability of appointing a judge in a particular section of a province, the wishes of the provincial government are considered. The constitution has determined that the appointments should be made by the federal government, and we make them.

Mr. SPENCER: But supposing the provincial government should object to a certain judge being appointed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: How could they know who was to be appointed?

Mr. SPENCER: Supposing they did know and they objected to him and thought they had good reasons why he should not be appointed; would the Minister of Justice consider those reasons?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Every representation which might be made by individual members of the provincial government certainly would be considered, as well as representations by members on both sides of the house.

Item agreed to.

Penitentiaries—
Kingston, $464,312.
St. Vincent de Paul, $424,660.
Dorchester, $302,000.
Manitoba, $230,180.
British Columbia, $205,500.
Alberta, $3,120.
Saskatchewan, $266,580.
General, $1,400..—Total, $1,897,762.

Miss MACPHAIL: I understand there have been a number of prisoners taken from Kingston to Stony Mountain in recent years. I placed a question on the order paper but apparently I did not get the answer for the years in which I was interested. I should like to know how many prisoners were taken from Kingston to Stony Mountain in the years 1922, 1926 and 1929, and how long they were kept there.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that in 1922 there were 75 convicts transferred to Stony Mountain; in 1926 there were 80 and this year there were 48. These transfers are made when the population of some penitentiary has increased to such an extent that they cannot accommodate them.

Miss MACPHAIL: I understand they were sent out there to build an addition to the Stony Mountain penitentiary, and I wondered if there was any real reason why they should not stay at home and build an addition to Portsmouth penitentiary, from which they were transferred.

[Mr. Spencer.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend's information is not quite correct; they were not transferred to build an addition to Stony Mountain penitentiary but to do the ordinary work which is being done there. There was a good deal of vacant space at that penitentiary while Portsmouth penitentiary was crowded, and I might just add that it would be difficult to build an addition at Kingston on the space available there.

Miss MACPHAIL: The minister has not told me how long the prisoners were kept at Stony Mountain in 1922, 1926 and 1929?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Until the termination of their sentences.

Miss MACPHAIL: I think that is not quite fair to these men, if their homes were in Ontario and they were not particularly bad types of people. They are prevented from seeing their relatives at all, because very few people could journey to Stony Mountain to see them; they are really exiles from their own province, and unless there is some real reason why they were sent there, either for their own protection or for reasons of discipline, I cannot understand why this was done. Why cannot an addition be built to Portsmouth penitentiary? Is there no more land available?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is for the good administration of the penitentiary.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would like to inquire of the minister with regard to a case which has been recalled to my memory by the remarks of the hon. member for Southeast Grey. A crime was committed in Ontario and the man was convicted of manslaughter and sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment. This man was sent to Stony Mountain penitentiary, where I think he has been for three or four years. This man's home was in Guelph, where I live, and he has three or four small children who have never seen their father since he was convicted. I have had a letter from a gentleman who is a member of the parliament of Italy, which I have had translated by the Italian counsul general; this gentleman deals with the case very fully and asks if there is no provision under our law by which these children may be permitted to visit their father occasionally while he is in custody. He also asks why this man was sent to a prison so far away from the place where he lived or the place where the crime was committed. Would it not be pos-

sible to have that particular prisoner transferred to Kingston? If that was done, occasionally at least his children might see him, and that is all that is asked in this case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend will be good enough to send me the name of that prisoner certainly I will look into the matter and if it is possible to remedy the situation I will be pleased to do so.

Miss MACPHAIL: While that will look after this one man it will not do anything for the rest of these prisoners. I do not think the minister answered my question and stated why these people were sent to Stony Mountain. We used to think that these prisoners had no rights at all, but I think that is not the general opinion to-day, and I believe there should be something done to guard these men against being exiled from their own province for a term of years. What is the basis of selection of those who are to be sent from Portsmouth to Stony Mountain?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The officers of the penitentiary make the selection. They take into consideration the section of the province from which the man comes, the number of visitors he has been receiving and so forth. For instance, a man from western Ontario would not be very much farther from his home when he was in Stony Mountain than he would be at Kingston.

Miss MACPHAIL: In this regard the minister relies wholly upon the judgment of the officials of the penitentiary?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely my hon. friend would not ask me to go and make the selection myself?

Miss MACPHAIL: No, but if the minister relies upon the judgment of the officials of the penitentiary in this case, why does he not do it in connection with the recommendations which have been made by Brigadier General Hughes? He has made some very specific recommendations but the government will not do anything.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely, my hon. friend does not compare a matter of policy upon which a minister can pass with the matter of selecting convicts who shall be transferred?

Miss MACPHAIL: I would consider this a matter of policy, and I think there should be some very explicit reason why these men are transferred from one province to the other. If Ontario has more criminals than any other province, then we should build a bigger place.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Has my hon. friend received many complaints about convicts being transferred? I understand that Stony Mountain is a very fine penitentiary, and I am not sure that I would not prefer to be there rather than in Kingston.

Mr. MANION: Or here.

Miss MACPHAIL: I happen to have many friends among the convicts, and they have complained very bitterly about being transferred from Kingston to Stony Mountain. They claim that their sentence is made very much harder. Two or three of these men have become very good citizens and I am quite proud of them, but it was not an easy thing for them to be transferred. One young lad complained that he did not see any of his people for over two years; his sentence was made that much harder, and there is no reason why he should have been transferred.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This week we received a demand from the wife of a convict in Toronto that her husband be sent to Stony Mountain.

Miss MACPHAIL: I suppose she has good sense and wants to get him as far away as possible. I would like to mention the case of a prisoner who was sent from Portsmouth to Stony Mountain some time after 1925; I do not know the exact date, but he was sent to Stony Mountain and his first duties were indoor, assisting the schoolmaster and then in the tailor shop. He was then transferred and put at work in the quarry. This man wrote a letter to his mother and father in which he said:

> The warden has no use for me because I complained about my work being dangerous and threatened to notify the superintendent about it.

A short time after the parents received that letter they received news of their son's death. The letter was smuggled out by a prisoner who had served his term, but it is an authentic letter. The fact that he used the words which I have just put on Hansard, followed by his death, seems to me to be a very odd coincidence. The wife and parents of this man asked the Minister of Justice to make an investigation to see whether or not he was killed because of negligence. I have received a letter from his mother and from his wife, and the mother says:

> The condition of his body was shameful. He had not been embalmed.

The wife said the same thing, and in referring to the warden she also said:

I do not believe what he said because he said that the body was embalmed and we know it was not.

I think we should have information as to whether or not this man was put at dangerous work. The fact that he thought the work was dangerous and that he was killed shortly afterwards would need a careful explanation, and I would like to hear what the minister has to say about it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This was a very unfortunate accident, but no one in the penitentiary was responsible for it. The man had been working in the quarry for only three days.

Miss MACPHAIL: Yes, I know that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The accident was not caused through any defect in the machinery, and the coroner did not think it necessary to hold an investigation. This man, as well as the other convicts, had been warned not to push the stones with his hand when they were being raised by the derrick, and I have the statements of convicts, as well as of guards, to that effect. We were notified immediately by the warden of the penitentiary as to this accident and upon the request of the relatives in Toronto we instructed the warden to have the body embalmed and sent to Toronto. That was done, and it is certainly not according to the facts to state that the body was not properly embalmed, because not only have I the statement of the warden that it was, but we have paid the bill of the undertakers and the embalmers. We have a population in the penitentiaries of Canada of 2,809 and it is remarkable how few accidents happen. I think we can safely say that in no industrial plant anywhere do so few accidents occur as in the penitentiary. As I informed the hon. member, the authorities of the penitentiary sympathize with the family of the convict, but what took place is one of those things that cannot be avoided.

Miss MACPHAIL: I am not sure that proves anything in the world, because the warden certainly is not going to say that this was carelessness on his part, and I will guarantee that the guards and the prisoners dare not say so. As regards the sworn statement of the prisoner, if the warden is to blame, that statement would not be worth the trouble of writing it or the paper it was written on. These men are absolutely under his command and I am convinced, not from one source, but from many, that they would not dare say it was carelessness on his part. I am personally much more willing to take the word of the mother, the father and the wife —that is three people—of the prisoner that the body was in a most disgraceful condition, than I am to believe those who said that it was embalmed. The government may have paid for the embalming and it may never have been done. From another letter which I have under my hand and which was also smuggled out, there is a very significant statement by the man to the effect that if you compared Stony Mountain with Portsmouth, Portsmouth was heaven and one lived there like a king. That is the opinion of the whole gang of men who go from Portsmouth to Stony Mountain. But going back to this particular case, has the minister anyone else that he can quote as proving that the body was in good condition, other than the warden of Stony Mountain penitentiary whose statement does not prove anything?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The undertaker and embalmer did the work and were paid for it. What else can I do?

Mr. FORKE: I do not know anything about the particular case referred to, and I have no doubt of the sincerity of the hon. member for Southeast Grey; but I know that no other public servant in Manitoba bears a higher reputation than the warden of Stony Mountain penitentiary. I have heard again and again of the great improvements he has made since he assumed control of that penitentiary and I do not think you will hear a breath of suspicion in Manitoba against that warden.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There are two or three statements which are contained in the report of the superintendent of penitentiaries to which I should like to call attention. There is, I believe, a resident population of some 2,500 people, and the cost per capita is $1.50 per diem. I would simply point out that this involves a very heavy expenditure to the country at large, and that the actual cost of maintaining a criminal is much heavier than the cost of educating a child. It is much more expensive to keep those people in the penitentiary than to keep them from getting into it. I have been reading the record of one particular individual and the statement is made:

It might well be asked how such men as these came to be admitted to Canada.

I would refer that to the Minister of Immigration. When the superintendent of penitentiaries calls the attention of the country to the fact that we are bringing in very

undesirable immigrants, such cases ought to be carefully checked up and made the basis of very stringent regulations. Further on in the report this statement is made:

Another man about to be discharged wrote:—"When I came to prison I did not know anything. I was never given a chance, never was at school, could neither read nor write. I was not fitted for anything. I am going home with a fair education, am an expert blacksmith and also a good shoemaker. I have been taught both these trades in the penitentiary."

This is undoubtedly very satisfactory from the standpoint of the penitentiary, but I ask: Are we going to go along, year after year, spending $1.50 a day in training these people in blacksmithing and other trades when we refuse to help in anything like a scheme of technical education? I do not want to go into the question of technical education today except to point out that these matters are very closely related. If we deliberately refuse to train boys in their youth, we shall have to pay the bill later on in connection with the untrained men who go to the penitentiary. It seems to me again that these departments of our public life should be more closely correlated. Another paragraph in the report signed by General Hughes reads:

There should be some definite and properly organized endeavour, either by the Dominion or provincial governments, or both, to provide for the unfortunate dependents left behind when the wage-earner of a household is sentenced to prison. The leaving of a poor mother, frequently with several small children, without any means of support or chance of obtaining a livelihood, would seem a greater crime than very often is committed by the one who had been their provider. For long years the policy of "the innocent must suffer for the sins of the guilty" has ruled. Surely in the enlightened twentieth century this should not longer be regarded as a sufficient reason for leaving innocent mothers and children to starvation or worse.

Several years ago, after having debated this question during, I think, two distinct sessions, the house passed a resolution to the effect that payment should be made to the prisoners for work done in the penitentiary, and that in the case of married men, this amount should be turned over to their wives and children. The minister has apparently taken no action on that resolution. Again we ask: What about the responsibilities of the government to the house? The question was canvassed backwards and forwards very thoroughly; expert opinion was given as to what had been done and as to the beneficial results in other places. Nevertheless, year after year has passed and we have nothing done. I cannot conceive of a much more severe indictment of our present system than that from the superintendent when he says that the crime committed against the prisoner or his dependents is often much more serious than that which the prisoner himself has committed. We cannot very well pass over these things year after year and have nothing done. This very significant statement is the last one made by the superintendent:

The recommendations made in former years are again suggested.

I would like to ask why we appoint a superintendent, expect him to make reports and then fail to act upon them. The superintendent does not even give the recommendations again this year. He apparently feels it is hopeless to do so. They are not even put down in black and white. It would seem as if he was tired of making reports to the government, because the government passes over them. Most hon. members are not tremendously concerned over the penitentiary population. Most of us are trying to avoid this institution; we do not expect to go there. What do we care for a few criminals? The only opportunity we have in the house of discussing these matters is when we have the estimates before us, sometimes just a few hours before parliament prorogues. I would urge that the action of the bar associations and other bodies such as the Social Service Council, indicate that at least those who pay attention to this matter are heartily in sympathy with reforms along the line suggested by the superintendent of penitentiaries. It is due to the house that the Minister of Justice should tell us very definitely why he has not carried out the recommendations of the superintendent.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Good things cannot be done all at once. I have always stated that the first step I had in mind so far as prison reform was concerned was to segregate the young offenders in separate institutions. I was really expecting, although apparently in public life we cannot ever expect anything, to be congratulated this year by my hon. friends.

Miss MACPHAIL: I am going to do it. I have not spoken yet.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am glad to know that, but now I am afraid it may be said that I was fishing. I am receiving communications from organizations interested in penitentiary matters to the effect that the greatest step forward in penal legislation in Canada has been taken this year through our providing in the estimates for the building of two institutions for young offenders. I think that is the one thing which was primarily needed.

It is going to cost a good deal of money, but we are going to have the institutions, and even if I have only that to my credit during my administration of the Department of Justice I shall be proud of it.

As far as the other matter is concerned, we must first of all have productive work that will bring in some return before we can divide the profits. We must first have the profits. The work done in the penitentiaries has been increasing year by year. We have installed new machinery, and to-day instead of the convicts merely breaking stones, most of the prisoners in the penitentiraies are working at some productive work. For a large number of years, of course, organized labour was opposed to prison labour coming into competition with their own, but now they have reached the stage where, although they do not want the products of prison labour to come into competition with the products of industry in the country they are willing that the departments of the government should buy such articles as they require which can be obtained from the penitentiaries. We have already started doing that to a certain extent, but I must remind my hon. friends that I am not in control of all the departments, and there will be some educational process necessary before I can convince all my colleagues that the products of the penitentiaries will meet their requirements as well as the work which is being produced by the ordinary industries of the country.

I wish to say that in no country in the world are the prisoners paid anything before the expenses are met. The state certainly has the right to be reimbursed for the very large expenditure which is made to keep the penitentiaries working to maintain the prisoners in the penitentiaries. The only place I know of where anything is paid to the dependents of the convicts is in Minnesota. In some other places the system has been tried and abandoned periodically according to the changing views of the different governments coming into office. I have myself looked into the records of what is being paid in some of the penitentiaries, and I find that in most of them nothing is being paid. In others an amount is paid varying from 1½ cents—the rate paid in the big penal institutions in New York State—to 25 and even 50 cents a day. But as I stated, the expenses must first be met. When a convict is guilty of some offence against the regulations of the penitentiary a fine is imposed, and it is paid out of the little amount which may be to his credit. However, even if it is impossible to collect something which might go to the dependents, and I find many difficulties in the way, we might at least provide a little amount for the prisoner when he has finished serving his sentence and is thrown out on the world. As it is to-day, he goes out with a suit of clothes and five dollars in his pocket, and a ticket to the place where he came from when admitted to the penitentiary. I think myself that it would be a great thing if they had some little amount to start with, although I must admit that the opinions of responsible people in places where that has been tried are that in many cases within two days after they have left the penitentiary, the amount is spent.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What about the wife and children?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was speaking of giving something to the convicts when they are released. To do that it would be necessary to change our system, and that can be done only gradually. It is all right to urge that we must change the whole penitentiary system of Canada immediately. I agree with the principle. There is a word that has been assailed many times in this house, the word "chart"; this is a chart which I have before me in endeavouring to bring about that reform.

I said last year that I intended to visit all the penitenitiaries in the country in the fall, but unfortunately, as my leader was sent to the League of Nations at the request of everybody in Canada, I had to stay in Ottawa at the very time when I wanted to make that visit, but I shall certainly visit the penitentiaries this year. I wish to see them all and learn at first hand what the conditions are and what can be done. Though I am willing to do anything I can in order to facilitate what I may call the reform of the convicts, rather than adhering to the old idea of punishment, and punishment alone, we must not go to the opposite extreme. I would call the attention of my hon. friends, however, to the fact that the officers in the penitentiaries have to deal with all sorts of men. In the penitentiaries are some of the worst characters in the country. For instance, when complaints are made against the strictness of the discipline it must be borne in mind that the officers in those institutions are very often in jeopardy, and for their protection there must be strict discipline, although the convicts are to be treated kindly. I certainly admire the views of my hon.

friend from Southeast Grey, and I am willing to go as far as possible to meet them. I really believe by this new step in segregating young offenders from hardened criminals we have gone a long way in prison reform.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The minister has not said how he is providing for the wives and families during the incarceration of the breadwinners.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am not providing for them, I admit. We must not forget that our federal system is largely responsible for some of the difficulties that confront us. We are in charge of the penitentiaries, but the provinces are in charge of the gaols. Men sentenced to more than two years imprisonment come to our penitentiaries. In the United States each state is in control of all prisons. If we could do so we would look after the dependents of the convicts in our penitentiaries, but these are in a minority; there are more men imprisoned in the big gaols than in the penitentiaries. But apart from this, the administration of justice is in the hands of the provincial authorities, and we are taking charge of those who have been committed to the penitentiaries by the provincial courts, but it does not necessarily follow that the federal authorities should be charged with the duty of looking after the families of those convicts.

Mr. CAHAN: There are some who would be very glad to go to the penitentiaries if they were assured that the state would look after their families.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is that danger if we make our penitentiaries first class hotels and undertake to look after the families of the convicts. There are limitations in that regard which we should not overstep. Until the work of the convicts is remunerative to the extent of the expenses which the state must incur on their behalf, I certainly will not recommend paying anything to their dependents.

Mr. MacLAREN: What is the percentage of Canadian-born convicts?

Mr. LAPOINTE: These are the figures: from Canada, 1,589; from England and Wales, 197; from Scotland, 69; from Ireland, 35; from other British countries, 28—making altogether 1,918 British convicts out of a total of 2,500 in our penitentiaries. That was for last year.

Mr. MacLAREN: What percentage is British?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The figures are 1,918 out of 2,500. Since then the population has increased to about 3,000. As far as foreign countries are concerned, there are 220 convicts from the United States, 85 from Russia, 75 from Italy, 67 from Austria-Hungary, 53 from China, 22 from Roumania, and 120 from other foreign countries.

Mr. KELLNER: Under whose charge is prisoner George Edmund Jackson? It will be remembered that there was a controversy between the Alberta government and the Justice department with regard to this man.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have discussed the matter with the hon. member and he knows the position as well as I do.

Mr. BENNETT: It is a matter of public interest.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. KELLNER: At the time I spoke to the minister about it he said he was going to take further steps.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. I wired Premier Brownlee yesterday in answer to his wire.

Mr. KELLNER: I understood the minister was going to take some steps with a view to having the Justice department look after this man.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I told my hon. friend that owing to the telegram I had received from the Alberta authorities I was willing to reconsider the matter, and that I would wire the premier to send me the report of the medical experts which he had mentioned in his telegram to me.

Mr. BENNETT: Will the minister state briefly the facts of the case?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. Jackson was sentenced to death for murder. In the course of the trial the question of sanity was raised. Medical evidence was given, and the jury found him guilty.

Mr. BENNETT: And sane?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, guilty. Of course my hon. friend is entitled to his own conclusion. An appeal was made to the governor in council for clemency. Of course, my hon. friend knows that in discussing those matters I am restricted in the information that I can give to the public. There was a report from the trial judge, Mr. Justice Tweedie, and other representations which influenced the decision that was reached, that it was better for the ends of justice that the capital sentence should be commuted to imprisonment

for life. Under the law he was now sent from the prison in Alberta to the Prince Albert penitentiary in Saskatchewan, which serves for the two provinces, and some time after he had been admitted to the penitentiary the surgeon of that institution certified that he had had this inmate under close observation since he had been admitted and found him to be insane, and he expressed the opinion that the man was insane when admitted. There is a section of the Penitentiary Act which I think I should read now that this matter is under discussion. Section 53 of that act reads:

> If at any time within three months after the receipt at the penitentiary of any convict sentenced to imprisonment therein it is established to the satisfaction of the minister, either by the written certificate of the surgeon of such penitentiary or otherwise, that the convict is insane or imbecile and was insane or imbecile at the time when he was received at the penitentiary, the minister may, after giving reasonable notice of his intention to the attorney general of the province within which such insane or imbecile convict was convicted, by warrant under his hand, direct the removal of such insane or imbecile convict from the penitentiary to the jail or other place of confinement from which such insane or imbecile convict came to the penitentiary.

Another section of the act provides that when, in the case of a prisoner who has been sentenced to death, such sentence is commuted to imprisonment for life, he shall be admitted to the penitentiary as though the order in council granting the commutation were a judgment of the court. Upon the receipt of this written certificate of the surgeon that Jackson was insane, we notified the attorney general of Alberta, under the section I have just read, on October 12, 1928, well within the three months provided for by statute, acquainting him with these facts; and we requested him to advise us as to which of the mental diseases hospitals the man might be taken to. We did not get an answer for some time and then we were told that, Jackson having been found sane by the jury at the trial, we should not have acted as we had done under the section of the statute to which I have referred. In view of this attitude on the part of the attorney general of Alberta, I took upon myself to send an impartial medical expert from another province, Dr. MacNeill of the mental hospital of North Battleford. Dr. MacNeill is a well known authority, and he forwarded to us his report to the effect that the man was insane and that he could not understand how he had ever been sent to gaol. We again notified the authorities in Alberta and, upon their refusal to act, the officers of the penitentiary proceeded upon the warrant which had been issued, taking the man to the prison in Alberta from which he had come.

They still claim that the man is sane, and I received the day before yesterday a wire from Mr. Brownlee, in the absence of the attorney general, stating that they have had the man examined by four medical experts from Alberta, two from Edmonton, I believe, one from Calgary and one from some other place. These men say that the man is sane.

Mr. SPENCER: I believe that two were from Ponoka, one from Calgary and one from Edmonton.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That may be. However, I wired Mr. Brownlee that I was quite willing to reconsider the matter, asking him to be good enough to send me the reports of these medical experts. I do not know what decision will be reached, whether we shall send some other outsiders or simply accept the reports; it will depend on the nature of those reports. I may assure my hon. friend, however, that I wish to have no conflict with the province of Alberta in this matter. On the other hand, we must not create a precedent, charging the federal government with responsibility for men who are declared to be insane when they are sent to the penitentiary. Under these circumstances, I shall act in the best way possible.

Mr. JACOBS: Doesn't this go to show that what we consider insanity in other parts of Canada is looked upon as sanity in Alberta —with all due respect to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett).

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know that the hon. gentleman has thrown any illumination on this very disagreeable subject by the observation he has just made. The fact is that Jackson was left on the doorstep by the officer of the federal government, so far as I can ascertain from the public press; and the provincial authorities, regarding the man as sane, did not desire to lock him up. That is the position as indicated in the press of the country, and I say to the minister that it is rather a reflection on the administration of justice on the part of the federal authorities charged with responsibility for maintaining institutions for the custody of those whom the courts of law have sentenced. This man was sentenced to death; that sentence was commuted, I believe, to imprisonment for life, and he was taken to the Prince Albert penitentiary. And notwithstanding the fact that the experts had not been able to satisfy the jury on the plea of insanity and that he was

found guilty of murder, he was taken from that institution—my information is solely from the public press and it may be inaccurate—by an officer of the federal government, to Edmonton or Fort Saskatchewan, where he was left on the doorstep. He seems to be reasonably sane and there is no place to take him. Surely that is not proper administration of justice. I do not think the minister believes so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You think it would be proper administration to lock the door so that he could not get in?

Mr. BENNETT: There is where the conflict arose. The minister asks a very pertinent question—was it proper administration of justice on the part of the provincial authorities to lock the door? But they said quite frankly: "We cannot take an insane man to gaol," and therefore they locked the door—if that is what the minister means by locking the door; that is the only locking of doors I have heard of.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am advised by my officers that the man in whose charge he was sent waited for twenty-four hours before leaving him at the door of the gaol.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly, and just left him free.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will just read that part of the statute again:

> —the minister may, after giving reasonable notice of his intention to the attorney general of the province within which such insane or imbecile convict was convicted, by warrant under his hand, direct the removal of such insane or imbecile convict from the penitentiary to the gaol or other place of confinement from which such insane or imbecile convict came to the penitentiary.

That is what they did. I frankly admit that I knew all the facts only after this occurence had taken place, but under the law as it is they were justified in leaving the man at the place from which he came. The officials of the gaol knew he was there but refused to let him in.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, but I am sure the minister realizes the gravity of the situation. This man was convicted of murder, yet he was left on the doorstep under the warrant of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. JACOBS: What does the hon. gentleman mean when he says he was left on the doorstep?

Mr. BENNETT: Under a warrant from the Minister of Justice he was taken by an officer of the federal government to the gaol at Fort Saskatchewan, and when they would not take him in the officer left him on the doorstep and went away.

Mr. JACOBS: And the man insisted upon remaining on the doorstep?

Mr. BENNETT: We prefer to treat this as a serious matter, but in any event he did not remain there very long. The contention is that a murderer, who is now alleged to be insane, should not be in gaol, although the statute directs the minister, if he so desires, to send one of his officers with him by a warrant under his hand, to the gaol from which he came, and Fort Saskatchewan was the gaol in which he had been imprisoned. He was taken to the gaol and the keeper of the gaol said, "This is not an insane man at all, and I am not going to take him in."

Mr. LAPOINTE: He had no right to say that.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the story. Thereupon, after waiting for a while, the officer left this convicted murderer upon the premises and went away. Where is Jackson now?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand he is in custody somewhere.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so, and he is either sane or insane; if he is sane he should not be anywhere but in the penitentiary and if he is insane he should be in a mental hospital. In the meantime this terrible thing has happened, and I believe it is a sad commentary upon the administration of justice in this country. The minister has properly said if he had known the facts then as well as he did later he would not have taken this action, but as it was the federal officer travelled from Saskatchewan to Alberta and left his man at the gaol because the keeper of the gaol said he had no authority to take in a sane man who was convicted of murder.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He had no right to say that.

Mr. BENNETT: But that was what he did say, because the difference is as to the sanity or the insanity of the man; one group says he is insane and the other says he is sane. If he is sane he should be in the penitentiary and it was only through the exercise of clemency by the minister that he was not hanged, because he was sentenced to death. Now, because someone says he is insane, he is taken to Alberta and they say they will not take him because he is not insane.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But the law gives the discretion to the Minister of Justice and it does not matter whether they think he is sane or insane.

Mr. BENNETT: And the Minister of Justice decided that the man was insane, otherwise the warrant would not have been issued.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Minister of Justice has acted as the law says he should act, on the certificate of the physician.

Mr. BENNETT: The law says that if the prisoner is insane or an imbecile the minister may do so and so, and the minister has a certificate from one to the effect that the man is insane. On the other hand the authorities, who were conscious of the whole situation when the man was tried, say that is incorrect and the man is not insane. I do suggest, in the interests of the administration of justice, that there should be a disinterested person brought in to consider the question before we render the administration subject to unfair criticism and attack. The minister acted strictly in conformity with the terms of the statute, but I suggest that it would have been better to have had an independent opinion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I had the opinion of Doctor MacNeill, of North Battleford.

Mr. BENNETT: I heard the minister make that statement before, but I mean some opinion upon which the authorities of the province and the federal authorities would agree, so that there would be no question as to the determination of sanity because it is not a pleasant thing to think we are faced with that situation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope this will be settled satisfactorily to all concerned.

Mr. JACOBS: Have we not in Canada some institution in which the criminally insane can be placed? I understood that provision was made at Portsmouth penitentiary at Kingston for the criminally insane from different parts of the country.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I believe that was closed in 1915.

Mr. JACOBS: Was that because we have no criminally insane?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know.

Mr. JACOBS: Is there no place where these criminally insane can be treated?

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: When they are found insane later than three months after they have been admitted to the penitentiary they remain under our charge; if we have the accommodation we keep them in a separate ward, but when there is no such accommodation we arrange with the provinces, where they have hospitals which are suitable for that purpose, to look after them and we pay the provinces for keeping them in these asylums so long as they have not finished their sentences. When the sentences are served of course we deliver them back to the provinces from which they came and then they are under the care of the provinces.

Mr. JACOBS: Then I understand that if this man had been in the penitentiary longer than three months he would have been kept in the Prince Albert penitentiary?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, and probably we would have arranged with the province to look after him, but we would have had to pay the province.

Mr. KELLNER: I did not mention this matter with the idea of carrying on a discussion in favour of the provincial government, but I think some consideration should be given the people of Alberta in a case of this kind. The minister's statement of the case is not at all in line with my information; I am told that this man was never returned to the gaol at all and was never accepted by the gaoler but as a matter of fact was turned loose on the streets of Fort Saskatchewan.

I would like to review the case briefly. The woman who was murdered was named Nellie Pendleton; she had worked for the provincial government of Alberta for quite a number of years and later married this man Pendleton and went out on a farm north of Waskatenau, in Alberta. They had friends by the name of Jackson, and the father of the prisoner went to Pendleton and asked if he would take his boy on the farm. This was done, and the boy worked there for several months. One day Pendleton left him on the farm to do the chores and went back to his work of cutting the brush. The boy took an axe and killed this woman, stole all the money in the house and took a horse and rode it to Waskatenau, where he hired a car and drove to Edmonton. I do not believe those were the actions of an insane man. The following day Jackson was arrested as he left a moving picture theatre; after being tried he was sentenced to hang on June 6 of last year, and later the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment in the peni-

tentiary at Prince Albert. The minister said a moment ago that an order in council had the same authority as an order of the court, but the order in council said that this man was to be kept at Prince Albert penitentiary; there was nothing said about his being transferred to Alberta.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is the same as an order of the court.

Mr. KELLNER: Before his trial for murder this man was sent to an asylum in Alberta where four doctors examined him and stated that he was sane. He was tried and duly convicted, and later on a doctor at the penitentiary in Saskatchewan stated that he was insane, and the minister turns and ships him back to Alberta. The minister has the authority of four doctors who say that he was sane, and the authority of one doctor who said that he was insane.

In this connection, I would like to make a few remarks in regard to this expert witness nuisance. This matter is getting to be rather serious as I am sure that anyone reading the papers cannot help but see that when a man is accused of a really serious crime almost invariably he is defended on the ground of insanity. The prosecution seems to be able to go out and get any number of expert witnesses who will swear that the man is sane, and the defence can get an equal number of equally expert witnesses who will swear that he is insane. I think it is time that some notice was taken of this situation, as it looks to me as though each side are able to find witnesses who will say what they want them to say.

Mr. BENNETT: That is so, and always has been the case.

Mr. KELLNER: The minister is setting the statements of four doctors against the statement of one. I understand that a controversy developed a little later on between the department and the province of Alberta as to who should take care of this prisoner, whose ward he was to be. During the month of May a guard from the Prince Albert penitentiary brought the prisoner over to the gaol at Fort Saskatchewan and told the warden at the jail that he wanted him to take the prisoner. The warden refused and said that he had no instructions to do so, and the guard took the prisoner into Edmonton. The guard returned later on and told the warden at the jail that he had the prisoner and that he was to take him. The warden tried to find out with whom the guard had been in consultation while he was in Edmonton, but the guard refused to give him that information. The warden went out to a telephone booth to call up the provincial authorities, I presume to get their instructions as to what action he should take, and when he returned he met the guard and noticed that the prisoner was not present. He asked the guard where the prisoner was and was told that he had been left on the doorstep. The warden looked down the street and he saw the prisoner walking along by the memorial hall. I am sure that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) will know just what distance the memorial hall is from the gaol. The prisoner was wearing a blue suit of clothes and could not be distinguished from any other young man on the street.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend has a report about the facts I would like him to send it to me. Is my hon. friend merely reciting something which he has been told?

Mr. KELLNER: That information has been supplied to me and I am sure the minister will accept it as a report.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh no, not when I have a report from the officers as to what happened.

Mr. KELLNER: The report from the officers does not agree with my information?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, it does not.

Mr. KELLNER: The information I have is that the prisoner was later arrested and put in the lock-up in Fort Saskatchewan, and as far as I know he is there yet. There should be no trouble in verifying that information, and the minister could find out whether he was delivered and accepted by the warden at the gaol, or whether he was turned loose on the street. When a controversy of this kind develops between the Dominion and the provincial governments the people of this country have a right to assume that it will be conducted in a high, honest and firm manner. If my information, which the minister questions, is correct, this action of taking a prisoner over to Fort Saskatchewan and dumping him on the doorstep was that of a bully, and not the action of someone who was trying to act fairly in a matter of this kind. If the information which I have received is not correct I will be very glad to retract these statements, but I have every confidence that it is correct.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would not like to review again the case, but I am not sure whether or not my hon. friend is suggesting that the sentence of the man should have been commuted. In matters of this kind I, unfortunately, have to play a very large part.

The question of capital punishment has been discussed in the house and if I am not mistaken even my hon. friend was opposed to that. I believe in it, but I believe that every safeguard and precaution should be taken and when we had a report from the trial judge and from the medical men who gave evidence at the trial stating that the man was subnormal, I must admit that not only did I hesitate, but I would rather have resigned my position than send that man to the gallows.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: Whether this man was insane or sane, the fact is that he was left on the doorstep of the gaol in Fort Saskatchewan. Not long ago we had a murderer in western Canada known as the strangler. Suppose this man had been a murderer of that type and had been left on the doorstep of this gaol and in the interval had committed half a dozen murders, what a terrible thing it would have been. Fort Saskatchewan happens to be in my constituency and I want to register my protest against the authorities, whether they be provincial or federal, causing so much consternation in the minds of my constituents.

Miss MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, before I make a few remarks in regard to some reforms which I would like to see carried out in the penitentiaries, I would like to go back for a moment to the case we have spoken of, of the man who was killed last August at Stony Mountain. I would like the minister to do something further in ascertaining the facts of that man's death. If the minister desires to disregard the evidence of the wife and the parents, he can ascertain from the undertaker in Toronto the true condition of the body when it arrived. I think there should be an investigation into the cause of that man's death. Personally I would not accept the warden's story unless I could be very sure it was not prejudiced. I do not like to say this about any warden, but this is not the first thing I have heard about the warden of Stony Mountain penitentiary, and the matter should be investigated. If the minister intends to visit all the penitentiaries this year—and I hope he may be back with us when the house meets again—he may look into the matter and he may find out more about it than he knows at the moment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I suppose my hon. friend does not suggest that I am favouring that warden on account of political partisanship?

Miss MACPHAIL: As a matter of fact I feel that the warden got his position because he was a brother of a certain eminent man in Canada. I do not think there is much doubt about that. He was certainly not trained for this particular work. I suppose that is why he got the position, but that does not mean he would not be a good warden.

Mr. BENNETT: I think he had training in Dorchester penitentiary before he went to Stony Mountain.

Miss MACPHAIL: We have not a warden at all who is trained; we have no trained official in any penitentiary in Canada except those trained by experience. The officials are not particularly fitted for the work and I do not think they are very carefully chosen, because if one inquires into their history, one has reason to think it was not their qualifications that caused them to be appointed to their particular positions. I should like the minister, if he has not done so already, to read Crimes against Criminals by Robert Ingersoll. It is one of the finest of the small books that I have read on this subject.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend agree with everything that Robert Ingersoll wrote?

Miss MACPHAIL: I agree with a good deal of his common sense.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What about the other sense?

Mr. JACOBS: The Minister of Justice could not read it. It is on the expurgated list.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope the hon. member will not ask me to make my confession about it.

Miss MACPHAIL: I admire Robert Ingersoll's courage. He said what he thought and that is more than many people do. As an hon. member reminds me, he shows his sympathy with humanity very clearly in his Crimes against Criminals. It is far ahead of our time and it must have been even further ahead of his.

There are only two things to think of regarding prisoners. One is the protection of society, and the other is the reclaiming of the prisoner. The idea of vengeance is being eliminated in practice, but still the old act we have is based on it. I should like to see a pretty thorough reform of our penitentiaries. To begin with I congratulate the Minister of Justice on carrying out the third recommendation of W. S. Hughes, the superintendent, in having the young offenders segregated. The recommendations are nine in number, and before I finish, I hope to put them on Hansard. While the chart spoken

of by the Minister of Justice of giving the prisoners work and the possibility of paying for that work after they have looked after their own keep, is splendid, and apparently the Minister of Justice has looked at it at some time, because he knows it exists—it reminds me a good deal of the chart of the Liberal party, that wonderful chart of Liberalism, to which the Prime Minister so often refers. I am sure it is treasured somewhere, but it is hidden so carefully I am afraid it is not often looked at and very seldom toward. I am afraid the Minister of Justice has not done much; in fact, I cannot see that he has done anything and I would like to see that he has more work for the prisoners in the penitentiaries and is progressing towards the time when they will be paid for that work. It came up in the house the other day that the uniforms for our permanent force in Canada were made by special manufacturing establishments of their own. At the time I said, and I now repeat, that I can see no reason why the industries within the penitentiaries should not make these uniforms. I have seen suits of street clothes made by the tailor shops in the penitentiaries and they were beautiful suits. That is a matter which the minister might well look into. If all the uniforms of the permanent force were made in the penitentiaries, this would add very much to the work they are already doing. They make mail bags and, while I know that we discussed the matter, I am not sure whether they make the brooms that are used in the government service. The minister will know whether they do nor not. They make a good many articles, but I see no reason why they should not make as much as they have time to. Certainly the cost of their own maintenance should first be met, but if the time ever comes when they produce more, the result of that should go to keep their dependents. The house passed a resolution to this effect some years ago and we should take steps to carry it out. Just thinking about it will not get us very far.

One thing more I want to suggest is that the government of such an institution is very much like an absolute monarchy. In other words, the warden is practically in control of the whole institution. There could be a more democratic form of government than that worked out.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What does my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. JACOBS: That the prisoners should elect a warden every year amongst themselves.

Miss MACPHAIL: I would suggest that the other officials should have a part of the responsibility with the warden. There should be a board of governors composed of the warden, some of the guards and the very best behaved prisoners, the prisoners being chosen from amongst themselves. I think if the inmates were treated as an isolated community and all the rules that work well in the community of the world were used there, this would produce better results than we have, because I know by my own nature, when anyone sets out to make me do things, it is a great deal harder than if they worked with me, to get the thing done, and I think everybody else is the same.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No; the hon. member is good and those others are not.

Miss MACPHAIL: I do not even think that; I have a better judgment than that. I think there could be a more democratic system of government. The minister still thinks I am wrong, but the matter should at least be thoroughly investigated. Along with that, some special training should be given to the wardens of the penitentiaries. They should be men who understand psychology, who know something about hunman nature. They should be men who are missionaries in the finest sense of the word, and whose great task is to reclaim these men and send them back to society in harmony with their fellowmen. They should be students of the whole subject. We have not that type of men in the penitentiaries of Canada because we have not thought until now it was necessary to have them, but if we are going to inaugurate new policies we shall certainly have to do so through the same men with new ideas or through other men with new ideas.

As regards education, I should like the Minister of Justice to tell me whether it is true that only forty minutes a day during the dinner hour are allowed to the men who are attempting to study. Is that correct?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Miss MACPHAIL: How much time are they given?

Mr. LAPOINTE: From six to nine o'clock at night, apart from the forty minutes.

Miss MACPHAIL: Is that in their own cells or in the schoolrooms?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the cells.

Miss MACPHAIL: I am afraid that is not the same thing. Shut in a cell with a book by themselves is certainly not the same thing as meeting as free men in a room with

good school teachers. The former is not what I would call education. Reading in their cells I would not call education. You may get education out of it, but it is not education by the prison authorities.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There were 55,000 examination sheets distributed to these men to work on at night.

Miss MACPHAIL: That is a bit better.

Mr. JACOBS: May I remind the hon. member for Southeast Grey that Pilgrim's Progress was written in a cell and it is pretty good literature yet.

Miss MACPHAIL: That is true, but sometimes we think that the pilgrim has not made much progress on that account. I would ask the minister if there is a waiting list or can all prisoners become students in these institutions.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Every one of them.

Miss MACPHAIL: I am very glad to hear that. I do think that every facility should be offered by the institution for these men to better their education. I suppose that examinations are necessary, but I sometimes wonder whether we are not examination mad. But at least it is an advance over a few years ago.

One other thing. I think there should be an adjustment board to look after the man or woman when he is ready for release from the penitentiary. It should be composed, I think, of an official of the government of the institution, and outside civilians. The Red Cross has been built up by people who were not paid for doing it but who loved humanity sufficiently to give to give their time in its service. I think the same idea could be carried out with an adjustment board for each penitentiary. I have been very interested in half a dozen cases. Suppose a person has been in the penitentiary for five years and then comes out; there is no one to help adjust him to life again. They have this little bit of money, $5, and a suit of clothes, which I do not suppose is a very good suit, although it may be, and a railway ticket to take them back where they came from. If any of us had been confined to this house for five years with no opportunity of getting out, and were turned out at the end of that time under such conditions, we might find a great deal of difficulty in adjusting ourselves. I think the superintendent would bear me out, if he could speak on the floor of the house, that it frequently happens that shortly after his release and before he gets to work again, reestablishes himself, and is absorbed again as a human being into the human family, when everybody's hand is against him, the former prisoner becomes a repeater. That conditions in the world are not too good was proved by the words of the Minister of Justice today. It was a sad indictment of civilization to say that if the penitentiaries were made too comfortable and if the prisoners' dependents were looked after by the government, people would deliberately get into the penitentiaries. I cannot believe that people would deliberately give up their freedom for a period of years unless conditions were very bad outside.

I want to put on Hansard the recommendations of the superintendent of penitentiaries, W. S. Hughes, one of which is being carried out this year by the Minister of Justice. The recommendations are as follows:

1. The providing of institutions for the segregation and classification of all inmates is again strongly recommended.
2. The reopening of the criminal mental disease hospital.

The need for that is shown by the Jackson case.

3. The segregation of habitual criminals.
4. The furnishing of more work for the inmates by the government.
5. Payment of wages to well-behaved inmates for work well performed.
6. The securing of situations for inmates prior to discharge.

That is what I mean by an adjustment board. It is simply putting it in another way.

7. The training of officers before being permitted to take charge of inmates.
8. The empowering of those in charge of penitentiary administration with authority to administer and discipline on similar basis to that of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

I am not sure that I agree with the latter recommendation.

9. Change in the method of purchasing supplies. This essential in order to attain success in the manufacture of goods in the penitentiaries.

There is not any use at all in the superintendent of penitentiaries recommending to us again and again what he out of his experience has learned unless we are willing to take his expert advice and try a little more rapidly than we have been doing to carry out his recommendations. I am glad that we are taking this one step, but one step in ten years is a slow walk, and I hope that we shall speed it up a bit.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I should like to supplement the remarks made by the hon. member for Southeast Grey. I was at one time organizer of the city relief department of the city of Calgary. Nothing was more distressing than to have released convicts come to

me, and I had several of them. I said to them, "Why do you come to me for work or assistance?" This was the answer I got: "Wherever I go for work, just as soon as they find that I have been a convict, I am discharged." In other words, not only do we need an adjustment board to help the convict reestablish himself as a useful citizen, but even so-called Christian society absolutely refuses to give these men a second chance. I have had convicts apply to me to do even pick and shovel work for the city of Calgary although they were fitted for a much better class of work, just because of a slip they had made in life—and who has not made a slip? Possibly some of us might have been in gaol if the law had taken its course.

Miss MACPHAIL: If we were not politicians.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I have sometimes had to send these men out of the city to places where they were not known in order to get work for them. Society itself is in need of a readjustment of its ideas with respect to these men. I do not know exactly what to suggest, but I do say that we are not giving these men a chance when they are able and willing to work and would make good citizens, so long as Christian society refuses to give them a second chance.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does the minister know why certain boots made lately in the penitentiary for the police force were rejected and sold on the market?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Some defects made the boots unacceptable by the officers of the police force. Only a few of them were rejected, not many.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): For some years I have been bringing to the attention of the minister, without much success, a matter in which I am interested. About three years ago the officials of the penitentiaries were brought under the Civil Service Act. They were allowed to become members of the civil service by paying a certain amount into the superannuation fund on account of their past service. That became a very heavy burden upon a few of them, some seven or eight, who had been working in the penitentiary for twenty-two to twenty-five years. The department and the superintendent and others may say to these men, "You have had your choice. In the first place you were not guaranteed the gratuity which has been allowed in the past for twenty-five or twenty-six years' good service. It was granted conditionally. You were not entitled to it." Secondly, they may say, "You were granted the privilege of paying in the amount due on account of your past service." That is the attitude taken by the department, but I think those men who have served for twenty-three, twenty-four, or twenty-five years should be treated a little differently; that some part of the gratuity should be allowed them to reimburse what they have had to pay in. There are not many affected, and I think the government could well afford to treat those who have served that length of time by recognizing the principle that the gratuity has to a certain extent been earned. Say to these men: "We will accept you in the civil service and allow you a certain part of the gratuity." Now, I am going to bring this matter up until something is done, for I believe these men have a good case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My friend knows that after all I have done something. Prior to 1924 not only those three but others were not entitled to what he is claiming for these men. Something similar happened a couple of years ago when I introduced a pension law for the mounted police officers. Unfortunately the line has to be drawn somewhere, and these men are not within the law as it is. I know my hon. friend has been very insistent and is doing his best for them, but I must admit that I have not found it possible to meet his wishes. It would require legislation.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Well, I think that is what we are here for.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): We are called legislators, whether we are or not. When a legitimate case is brought forward it should be dealt with. You have a precedent in the case of one man who was given a gratuity of $2,500 or $2,600 and then went back into the service.

Miss MACPHAIL: I want to know something about shackling to the bar. Where convicts are so dealt with, are their arms above their head, by their side, or where?

Mr. LAPOINTE: "Shackled to the bar" means that the convict is placed in his cell and his arms tied to the gate of the cell at the waist line. It happens that some of the convicts refuse to work, and if they are found physically fit they are forced to stand up in their cell instead of being given a chance to sleep while others are working. As soon as they express their willingness to work they are

unshackled. It is only during working hours that they are so treated. I do not think there is anything very cruel about the treatment. It is merely a way of dealing with the convicts when they refuse to work.

Miss MACPHAIL: If they change their mind and want to work are they allowed to do so?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, yes, we are pleased to send them to work.

Miss MACPHAIL: That might be a good thing to apply to people outside the penitentiaries.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, even to members of parliament.

Miss MACPHAIL: What is meant by "paddling"?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Spanking with a small leather strap. It is not at all a nine-tails-cat.

An hon. MEMBER: A cat-o'-nine-tails.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I put it the other way round.

Mr. MANION: You put the tails on the wrong end.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend knows what I mean. It is a small leather strap about eighteen inches long. It is applied to convicts under very extraordinary circumstances when they have been rebellious or guilty of beastly action, and it is done on the warden's orders. There is nothing cruel about it; it is rather the humiliation that hurts.

Mr. JACOBS: My hon. friend as a former school teacher ought not to require an explanation of what spanking means.

Miss MACPHAIL: I never found it did very much good. I found other ways worked very much better. I think it is degrading both to the prisoner and to the official who spanks him. It must put the guard in an awkward position with regard to the prisoner, and I should think it would make the prisoner rebellious. It does not look very good to me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I agree it is not a pleasant thing for either. I do not like it myself,—

Mr. CHAPLIN: When did they do it to you?

Mr. LAPOINTE: —but the wardens are very often placed in a very difficult situation, and really I think we ought to give them discretion in these matters.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why not blindfold them both?

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: Apart from that, may I say to my hon. friend that conditions in our penitentiaries are not so bad as they are sometimes painted. Many reforms have been put into effect, and statistics show that only eight per cent of first offenders ever come back to the penitentiaries. Ladies and gentlemen from other countries, especially from the United States, have visited our penitentiaries, and I think we have reason to be proud of what they have stated as a result of their inspection. There are not many penitentiaries better managed than our own. Of course a good deal more can be done, and I assure my hon. friend that all her remarks are taken in very good spirit, and I will try, even quicker than she seems to expect, to meet at least some of her wishes—not all. I am free to admit that I do not agree with some of her recommendations, because I do not believe it would be in the interests of the administration of justice to adopt them.

Item agreed to.

Penitentiaries—to provide for the purchase of preferred class penitentiary site, and to begin erection of buildings, $150,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Last session I proposed to the minister that in addition to getting this building and segregating these cases there should be also some examination of the boys to ascertain what started them on their criminal career. As I pointed out last year, there are some eight thousand juvenile delinquents in the Dominion of whom forty-six have now reached the penitentiary, some at the age of fifteen, others seventeen and eighteen. In my opinion there should be an investigation into the causes leading to this state of affairs; such an investigation could very well be made in the penitentiaries. The causes that have led to these forty-six boys finding themselves in the penitentiary would probably explain the delinquency of others. I hope that the minister will look into the matter. Now that this building is to be put up some steps should be taken in the direction I suggest. Last year I also pointed out the fallacy which prevails that these juvenile delinquents are for the most part foreigners; the fact is that they are Canadian born. I pointed out that delinquency had increased from 64 to 66 per cent, these delinquents having occurred amongst boys who had not reached the higher stage of education. Surely something can be done in the way of investigating into the causes that have led to their condition.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Under this vote providing for the purchase of a penitentiary site, the minister might give us some information as to location and cost.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No decision has been reached, but the site will be in the vicinity of the present Kingston penitentiary.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems a lot of money to pay for a site alone—$150,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And also to begin the erection of the building.

Mr. CHAPLIN: This is only to begin the erection of the building; it does not provide for anything further. How much will it cost?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know what the site will cost. I must have the authority of parliament, and I shall need the money. My hon. friend seems to think it is a lot of money; that is what my colleagues tell me every time I try to give effect to the will of parliament. I am glad my hon. friend from Southeast Grey is present; she will realize that it is not so easy to get what we want.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the estimated expenditure on the building?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We expect the site to cost about $60,000 or $75,000, and the balance is to begin the erection of the building. To complete construction we shall have to ask parliament for a further sum; it might cost $200,000 or $300,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Surely the minister does not mean to tell us that he is starting out to buy a site on which to put up a building without knowing how far he is going or where the whole thing will end. There must be some plans for the building; he must know pretty well what it will cost. The minister should take the committee into his confidence and let us know, as far as he can, exactly what he has determined on as to the cost of the building and the cost of the site. He knows very well; he is not starting in the dark with this undertaking. His officers have given him this information and he should have it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member will understand that this is not an ordinary public building for which a vote of parliament is asked; it is a building which will be erected by the inmates of the penitentiary. It is difficult to say exactly how much it will cost, for that very reason, that the work will not be carried on under ordinary circumstances. It will depend on how much work we shall be able to put on the building the first year, and so on. I really cannot tell how much it will cost, but I want the building.

Item agreed to.

78594—230½

Penitentiaries—to provide for the purchase of Lussier estate and other properties at St. Vincent de Paul, $450,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much land is there in this estate?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are 327 acres, and apart from the Lussier estate there are properties just in front of the penitentiary and which have been asked for by the officers of the penitentiaries branch for years. They are absolutely needed. I cannot say exactly what amount will be involved because if necessary we shall have to expropriate and pay a reasonable price.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Has any agreement been reached with respect to this 327 acres? Is there a price, or does the minister intend to expropriate, leaving the price to be determined by the court?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We cannot do anything before the money is voted by parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is not carried. The minister knows whether he will expropriate the property or not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know how much I shall have to pay; it will depend upon the judgment of the court.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is what I asked. Does the minister intend to put the matter before the court? Does he intend to expropriate and allow the court to decide what the property is worth? Is that the proposition?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Probably, if it is impossible to come to a reasonable agreement. I shall have the superintendent and the officers of the penitentiary investigate, and if the reports were to the effect that we could secure better prices otherwise than by expropriation, I am not sure that we should not act upon such advice.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Has any offer been made for the property?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: A price has been named?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As regards the Lussier estate, I understand that an offer was made years ago; the matter has been long pending.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I have a reason for asking these questions. Only yesterday or the day before we saw something similar in connection with the Department of Agriculture, and I have been wondering whether the same thing will be repeated here.

Mr. LAPOINTE: When Inspector Fatt was acting warden at St. Vincent de Paul the property was offered for $100,000 but no action was taken.

Item agreed to.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, $3,040,725.25.

Pay of force (including salaries of two constables, Ellesmere island district, at $2.25 per diem, to insure department against loss through death), $1,279,772.75.

Maintenance (including billeting, travelling expenses, forage, fuel and light, clothing, repairs and renewals, horses, ammunition, stationery, etc., medical, hospital, etc., transportation and freight, building repairs and renewals, contingencies and criminal investigations, $1,625,452.50.

To compensate members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for injuries received whilst in the performance of duty, $10,000.

To assist in enforcement of federal statutes, (expenditure chargeable to this vote shall be in connection with such federal police duties as may be defined by the governor in council upon recommendation of the Minister of Justice), $75,000.

To provide for special services in connection with the enforcement of the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, $50,000.

To compensate Wm. Pinsky for medical attendance on his child who was fatally wounded by police dogs, at Fort Resolution, $500.—Total, $3,040,725.25.

Mr. COOTE: Would it not be possible—certainly it would be much better—to list each one of the items separately under this vote? It is not satisfactory to the committee to deal with this vote in its present form. When the estimates are prepared next year it would be better, I submit, to have each item listed separately.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend may be right; we have merely followed the usual practice.

Mr. COOTE: Yes, but we are following a lot of bad practices in this house. In some cases whole pages are included under one vote and very often the chairman or somebody else says, "carried," before the committee has had an opportunity to look over the different items comprising the vote. I repeat, it would be much better if these items were listed separately; if that were done members of the committee would have a better chance of looking over the items to see whether or not they are necessary.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Some two or three weeks ago I asked a question with regard to the activities of the mounted police and the information which they were securing with regard to various bodies, especially the communist organization. The minister stated that it was not possible for him to give the information as to the activities of that body.

[Mr. Chaplin.]

I would point out to the minister that this is definitely a political body; my own organization in Winnipeg has had to fight this party in municipal and also in federal elections, and as a matter of fact at present we have one communist member of the Winnipeg city council. I should like to ask the minister why the Liberals should have exclusive knowledge concerning the activities of such political bodies as these. If anyone is to have privileges of this kind I think all political parties should have the opportunity of learning what are the actual aims and activities of the communist organization.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is wrong; the Liberals have no knowledge of that kind.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then the government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No; the Minister of Justice has that knowledge, but he does not have it as a Liberal.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I presume it is quite possible that some of the information in the possession of the Minister of Justice might seep through to the Minister of Justice as a member of the cabinet or as a member of the Liberal party. We are told that this is a revolutionary body and I understand that certain spies are maintained who become members of that party. A few years ago I knew of cases where these spies actually incited disorder. That seems to me a very questionable practice. I know that in certain labour meetings when a man advocates disorder other members of that body are against him; he is suspected to be a stool-pigeon, and probably in the employ of the government. It is an intolerable situation if the government, through its spy system in this way, lends itself to the activities of agents provocateurs. If these people are really dangerous it is only right that the minister should let the country know the extent of the danger. So far as I am concerned I think this is a case of a bogy man held in reserve, to be trotted out occasionally by the reactionary elements in the community. I do not see that we are helping the cause of good government in Canada by maintaining a secret police system which is constantly spying on certain groups.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As my hon. friend knows, that is not the purpose of the mounted police; they are located at different places throughout the country to enforce the federal statutes, and if in the course of their activities, as my hon. friend calls them, while they are doing their work something happens which

they think they should report to their superintendent as concerning the peace and order of the country, I do not think there is anythink wrong if they do so. I do not think there is ground for complaint that any persons have been persecuted or troubled in this way, at least since I have been in control of the mounted police. If my hon. friend has instances to quote in which he believes that even these communists, with whom I know he does not sympathize and with whom I have no sympathy, have been unfairly treated, I should be only too glad to have him give me that information.

Mr. EVANS: There is one matter which I think comes under this vote, which I should like to bring up now. Recently the premier of Saskatchewan stated that it was up to the federal authorities to initiate the prosecution of Harry Bronfman, that the onus was upon the federal government and not upon the provincial government at all. Again I would like to ask why this was not done, following the recommendation of the royal commission?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think I have already explained this matter, but I have no objection to saying again that the Minister of National Revenue, as has been stated, sent to the Department of Justice the documents and the record with regard to this special case as well as those concerning many other cases. The offence charged had been committed in 1920. On the facts a prosecution might be entered, although the evidence was contradictory, with three witnesses on one side and three on the other. The offence was under the Customs Act, for having attempted to bribe officers in order to prevent them from stopping trucks which were coming from the United States to Canada, not for the purpose of smuggling goods into Canada but rather for the purpose of smuggling liquor from Canada into the United States. There is a provision in the Customs Act which compels any such trucks or motor cars to report to the Canadian customs when they enter Canada, and when that is not done the car is liable to seizure. The Customs Act provides also that any attempt to bribe a customs officer for the purpose of preventing him from doing his duty is an indictable offence subject to a penalty of fine and imprisonment. However, under another section of that act the prosecution must be instituted within three years after the commission of the offence. In this case the offence, as I have stated, was committed in 1920 and came to the notice of the Minister of National Revenue only as a result of the investigation of 1927, seven years afterwards. Therefore the law officers came to the conclusion that this man should not be prosecuted under the provisions of the act, because of the statute of limitations. That is all.

Mr. EVANS: Then the case must have been outlawed when that recommendation was made ?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am responsible only for the Department of Justice; I had nothing to do with that recommendation.

Mr. JACOBS: I might tell my hon. friend that the case was outlawed three years before the investigation by the commission.

Mr. EVANS: Why was that used as an excuse for not prosecuting for over twelve months?

Mr. LAPOINTE: When the files of the Department of National Revenue were sent to the Department of Justice we gave instructions to have the man Knowles interviewed immediately in order to obtain his version of the affair. It was reported that he was ill at the time and could not see the counsel whom we had appointed for that purpose, and I suppose that is why it was stated that the delay was due to his illness. That had nothing to do with the legal side of the case; the matter was thoroughly investigated and it was decided that we could not prosecute.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler) showed me a letter from the Department of Justice in which doubt was expressed as to whether or not a conviction could be secured against Bronfman. I did not understand that letter to say that the door was closed; the letter intimated that an action could be taken for bribery under the common law.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The officers of the department found that a prosecution could not be instituted under the Customs Act and they tried to bring it in under the common law where the statute of limitations would not apply. Under ordinary circumstances prosecutions may be instituted either under the statutes or under the common law, but the officers of the department came to the conclusion that when the statute stated definitely that there was a limitation of three years then we could not prosecute, and I agreed with that finding. If the Minister of National Revenue had desired to follow the line of least resistance a charge could have been laid, but it would be almost immoral to lay a charge against a man when it was felt that he could not be convicted.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I think it is unfair for the minister to say that the man could not be convicted. The letter which I saw simply expressed the legal opinion that it was extremely improbable that a conviction could be obtained.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The remarks which I have made are my own conclusions.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not think the minister has any right to make such a final decision. My complaint is that the offender was given the benefit of the doubt in this case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I think the law should have had the benefit of the doubt. There is a great deal of suspicion from one end to the other of this country that because this man was wealthy and was pretty close to the Liberal party he has been—

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is most unfair.

Mr. CAMPBELL: —able to commit an offence and go free. That fact has been one of the contributing factors to the defeat of the government in Saskatchewan; the Saskatchewan government was not able to explain the non-prosecution of this man.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If that is the reason for the defeat of the government my hon. friend should not boast about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I said that it was one of the contributing factors, and I think I am doing good service to the minister and to his party by suggesting that this thing be cleared up. Many people in Saskatchewan believe that this man has been unduly protected. Very serious charges were made in the campaign—I cannot quote them as facts, but they were made by distinguished members of the bar who have been elected as representatives of the people of Saskatchewan—regarding contributions to campaign funds, and all that kind of thing. It is absurd to take the position that where there is any doubt the offender shall be given the benefit of that doubt; I think the law should have the benefit. The suspicion will always remain that because this man was wealthy and had a close association with the Liberal party he was immune to prosecution.

Item agreed to.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Pay of force—further amount required including an amount to provide for the pay of Inspector James Taylor from September 1st to 15th, 1928, inclusive, $2,800.83.

Maintenance—further amount required, including an amount to provide for ration allowance of Inspector James Taylor from September 1st to 15th, 1928, inclusive, $60,016.80.

Mr. BENNETT: I think this would be a good time to ask the minister what has been done in connection with the death of Bilodeau. It has been alleged that he was murdered and his wife is claiming compensation, but so far as I know, nothing has been received up to the present time. I should like to have a public statement from the minister as to the present status of this matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A claim was made for compensation but, as my hon. friend knows, it was necessary that it be sent to the Department of External Affairs. They have communicated with Washington but the United States has refused to do anything in the matter. It is for the provincial government to decide as to the prosecution of the man, but I have been told that those who should have facilitated this prosecution have been rather inclined to take no action. Nothing new has developed in the matter.

Mr. BENNETT: I am advised that the government of this country paid a claim for the death of an American citizen under somewhat similar circumstances. This man was killed on the border some two or three years ago, and a claim was made through the American government, which was paid by the Canadian authorities.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will inquire into the matter.

Mr. BENNETT: I will get the particulars during the evening recess.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Department of the Interior—Scientific Institutions—International Boundaries — Expenses connected with the survey and demarcation of international boundaries, $35,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Is there any more of this work to be done before it is completed?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is going on continuously. It is a joint commission of the two governments and from year to year they make fresh markings and keep the lines properly marked and up to date.

Item agreed to.

Geological Survey—For explorations, surveys and investigations, wages of explorers, topographers and others, $230,000.

For publication of English and French editions of reports, maps, illustrations, etc., $55,000.

For maintenance of offices and museum, expenses of special exhibitions pertaining to natural resources, purchase of books of reference, miscellaneous assistance and contingencies, $60,000.

For museum equipment, $15,000.

For purchase of specimens, $3,000.—Total, $363,000.

Mr. SHORT: I see that last year $205,000 was voted for explorations, surveys and investigations, and so forth. How much of that was spent?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Practically all of it. It covers the payments of the various parties who are in the field on geological survey work.

Mr. FRASER: Has the department more parties in the field this year?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have three more parties this year to go into northern Manitoba.

Item agreed to.

Indians—Indian education, including the construction of school buildings, $2,240,500.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I was to give some information to hon. gentlemen about the new schools to be built for Indian educational work, and where they are to be located. They are as follows:

Blue Quills, Alberta, $50,000.
St. Bruno's, Alberta, $20,000.
Wabasca, Alberta, $15,000.
Providence, Northwest territories, $15,000.
St. George's, British Columbia, $10,000.
Alert Bay, British Columbia, $70,000.
Cecilia Jeffrey, Ontario (to finish), $15,000.
Brandon, Manitoba (new school), $160,000.
Birtle, Manitoba (new school), $80,000.
Beauval, Saskatchewan, $25,000.
Old Sun, Alberta, $40,000.
George Gordons, Touchwood Hills, Saskatchewan, $90,000.

This is a school which we have to reconstruct.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): The minister mentioned a new school at Punnichy. Was there an investigation into the cause of the fire?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There was an investigation, but it was very difficult to establish the cause of that fire. It was supposed to have started from a cigarette, but that has not been proven. We have not been able to ascertain the exact cause.

Mr. MacLAREN: How many schools are there for Indians in New Brunswick?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I do not think we have any boarding schools in New Brunswick.. As my hon. friend knows, we built one in Nova Scotia about a year ago. We have any number or day schools in the eastern provinces.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Is this an enlargement of the previous school at Punnichy?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It will accommodate the same number of pupils, but it will be a little more modern than the old school.

Item agreed to.

Government of the Northwest Territories—Salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the territories, including the erection of buildings, investigation work, schools, hospitals, relief to destitute, maintenance of prisoners and insane patients, administration of the North West Game Act and the Wood Buffalo park, etc., $190,000.

Arctic exploration and administration of Eskimo affairs, salaries and contingencies, equipment and supplies; relief to destitute; schools; hospitals and medical services; erection of buildings; maintenance of prisoners and insane patients; education; travelling expenses, etc., $190,000.

Expenses connected with the purchase, herding and maintenance of reindeer for the N.W.T. including wages, building of corrals, etc., $50,000.

To provide for the payment for beaver pelts purchased as a relief measure, from certain Indians and half-breeds in the Mackenzie district, under authority of P.C. 2146, dated 28th November, 1928; also for the transportation of same and incidental and unforeseen expenses connected with the sale thereof, $135,000.

To provide for the revision of the North West Territories Act and ordinances, $6,000.—Total, $571,000.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Have we passed item 222 in regard to Indians in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories, covering implements, tools, field and garden seeds, and so forth?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We passed all those items this morning. I have no objection if the hon. member wants to say something about the matter.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): What provision is being made for the settlement of outstanding Indian accounts for seed grain, tools, live stock and other supplies which have not yet been paid for? I have had this brought to my attention in the last three or four years. Promises were made by one of the Indian agents in Saskatchewan that these matters would be looked into. Orders were given to farmers, merchants, lumber dealers and others for live stock, seed grain and materials which were supposed to be paid for by the Indian agent or by the department. What provision is being made for the payment of these accounts, some of which run into very large sums of money? As we all know, seed grain and similar commodities are sold for cash. Some of these goods, it seems to me, were obtained on false pretences if these accounts are not going to be paid.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): During the period of the war when greater production

was being urged on the farmers of Canada undoubtedly a great deal of grain, horses, cattle and implements were purchased for the Indians on the reserves. Unfortunately I have been selected to clean up the mess. I have been forced to this conclusion, that in every case where the creditor is able to produce an order we are in duty bound to pay the account. We have paid all that it was possible to pay out of the band funds available. I was in hopes that these accounts had been pretty nearly all cleaned up, except those still in dispute as to whether the transaction took place. One of the principles we insist upon is that we will not recognize now, and we have not for the past two years, any transaction with an Indian unless the creditor can produce an order signed by the agent. In every case where he is able to produce such an order we are prepared to settle, and in some cases where the evidence is clear that the transaction actually took place and that the creditor has given value for the claim, we will try to make an adjustment.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Some of these orders are not in the possession of those who delivered the goods on the orders. They met the principal of that institution either at Regina or elsewhere in Saskatchewan and produced their orders and were asked to leave them with the commissioner. These orders have not been returned to them, and in many cases payment has not been made on them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): As my hon. friend is in one section of Saskatchewan that is particularly bad in that respect, I would ask him if he would be good enough whenever he comes across a case of that kind to forward me the particulars and we will have a special investigation and see if we cannot make an adjustment.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): I am very pleased to have that word from the minister because I have frequently taken this up with the department and there seemed to be no way in which a settlement could be made. I might also point out that a settlement has been made of some of these accounts on a percentage basis, part of the account being paid and the balance running on for some two or three or four years. Would the minister's statement apply to these cases also?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Certainly. It applies to all unpaid accounts.

Mr. FRASER: Can the minister tell us something about this $50,000 for a herd of reindeer?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): To make it as brief and as comprehensive as possible, the previous experiment in Canada in Baffin's land ended somewhat disastrously because the reindeer were not put on proper feeding ground. We have therefore had Porsild Brothers, who have been trained in the investigation of feeding ground for reindeer, make an investigation.

Mr. FRASER: Have they made a report?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. FRASER: Is it printed?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have it available in the department.

Mr. FRASER: Will it be printed and distributed?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes. We sent Porsild Brothers into Alaska and into the far northwest territory among the Eskimos along Coronation gulf and they spent a year and a half in there and reported that there is a splendid feeding ground for reindeer in that locality. We propose buying reindeer delivered in that locality.

I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I gather from conversations with the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite that hon. members would be agreeable to sitting until midnight to-night, and I would therefore move:

That this house shall not be adjourned at eleven o'clock to-day.

Mr. EVANS: I would ask the Prime Minister if he will set the time for adjournment for 12 o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I indicated that we would sit until midnight.

Mr. EVANS: Is that in the motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will give my word.

Mr. EVANS: That is all right.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I object to the motion, Mr. Speaker. Many of us have been in this building since half past eight this morning and we have put in all the time that we should

be asked to do. There are many important estimates still to come up, we have complaints to register, and we must be on the job almost every moment of the time. I do not feel that it is fair to ask us to sit any longer than we have been sitting.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Do I understand that the motion to sit beyond eleven was carried? Is not unanimous consent and notice necessary?

Mr. SPEAKER: No notice is necessary under standing order 45. when it concerns the time of meeting or adjournment of the house. Standing order 45 reads:

> Forty eight hours' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, or for placing a question on the order paper, but this rule shall not apply to bills after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of meeting or adjournment of the house.

NATURAL RESOURCES OF MANITOBA

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to table the report of the royal commission on the transfer of the natural resources of Manitoba.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Government of the northwest territories, $571,000.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): The hon. member for Cariboo asked a question before we rose at six o'clock but the offices were closed and I was unable to get the information. The question had reference to the reindeer transaction. I shall be glad to give him the information on another item in the supplementaries.

Mr. BENNETT: Only one observation I have to make and that is as to the destitution of the Eskimos in remote sections of the country. I brought the matter to the attention of the government last year, and I may say that the Rev. W. G. Walton, with whom the minister has been in communication, is very anxious that it shall receive consideration by parliament. His view is that a large number of people are suffering privation and practically starvation by reason of the lack of food, and that they might have their condition greatly improved if provision were made for reindeer. Before we rose at six o'clock the minister had not made any general statement as to the intention of the government in that regard and perhaps he will do so now, especially in view of the fact that there is some talk of establishing a beaver farm in a distant section of the country. The transportation difficulties would be considerable, having regard to the point of location and the distance between such a farm and the Eskimos. This reverend gentleman is of the opinion that if reindeer were introduced and looked after these people would not run the risk of starvation.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have that very much in mind. The missionary is stationed on the east coast of Hudson bay and the bands in that vicinity have experienced considerable difficulty. This year we are sending an officer to an island up there—I have forgotten the name—where application has been made for a beaver farm. He will investigate the possibilities and we hope we shall be able to provide sufficient food for these people. It is expected eventuallly to give the Eskimo families a certain number of reindeer to provide them with meat, clothing and milk. With regard to the introduction of reindeer into the east of the delta of the Mackenzie river I shall be glad to give information later on in connection with the supplementaries as to what we are paying. We propose to have them driven across from Alaska and landed in Canada before we pay for them.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the Eskimo population of Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Between seven and seven and a half thousand.

Mr. BENNETT: What has been the decrease in recent years?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is difficult to say; there is no authentic method of ascertaining the number. Mounted police are now stationed on the east coast and this year we are establishing a post in Coronation gulf, so that we ought to have shortly a better census of the Eskimo population.

Mr. BENNETT: Of this total of $571,000, how much is for salaries? I am told that the real fact is that most of it goes that way.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, it is not all for salaries.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say all, but the major portion.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is very expensive sending officers there.

Mr. BENNETT: I suggest to the minister that he drop the item of $6,000 providing for the revision of the Northwest Territories Act and ordinances. In view of what we know about the number of officials, especially lawyers, connected with the Department of the Interior, surely the minister has in the department a sufficient number of men to revise the ordinances and put them into reasonable form without having $6,000 voted to provide a job for someone. I put that to him straight; that is all there is to it.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am willing to drop it; there are two lawyers in the department.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I move that the vote be reduced by $6,000.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FRASER: In connection with the item of $135,000 to provide for the payment for beaver pelts, the minister might tell us how he fixes the price.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is a closed season for beaver applicable to all hunters and trappers in the northwest territories, but we found that this created a great hardship on the Indian population, and we have arranged to allow the Indians to take beaver. We propose that they shall bring the pelts to the mounted police who are stationed in the territory and turn them over at a fixed sum. We sell the skins to recoup ourselves, and in this way we keep close tab on the taking of beaver in the territory so that none but Indians shall trap them.

Mr. FRASER: How do you fix the price to the Indian?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It varies between $12 and $25, the latter price being paid for large prime beaver.

Mr. FRASER: A beaver at the present time is worth about $40.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. FRASER: So that the department makes the difference between $25 and $40.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It will require more than that to recoup us for bringing out the skins and selling them, and that it really more than the Hudson's Bay Company, Revillon Freres and other companies are paying for them.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. BENNETT: I should think the right thing would be to send them to the fur auction and have them sold off.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They are all sold at public auction.

Mr. McRAE: I would like to ask the minister what protection is afforded in the case of these buffalo straying out of the park. The buffalo come to Fort Vermilion and frighten the people very much, and they want to know if it is all right to shoot the buffalo in self-defence.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am afraid it is not; if they will report them to our wardens they will try to drive them back to the park.

Mr. EVANS: I should like to know if some such arrangements as that made with regard to the beaver skins can be made with regard to the buffalo hides?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The buffalo are slaughtered at the Wainwright park; those slaughtered in the north will have to be killed under permit, and the government will retain the hides.

Mr. FRASER: The purchase of beaver is prohibited in the territory?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Only Indians are allowed to take beaver.

Mr. FRASER: What do you do about the white trappers?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is prohibited.

Mr. FRASER: You have had no experience in the bootlegging of beaver skins?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This is the first season the prohibition has been in effect.

Mr. FRASER: We had prohibited season in British Columbia at one time, and the government got into a great deal of trouble in regard to the bootlegging of beaver skins. I think therefore that the minister is inviting quite a bit of trouble.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I quite appreciate that fact. There has been a closed season in the province of Alberta and, as you know, most of the skins go up the Mackenzie river and through Edmonton. There has been a closed season in effect in Saskatchewan also, and we thought it well, in order to preserve the beaver, to establish a closed season in the territories in order to have a uniform law throughout the whole area. Unfortunately, however, we have had a very serious condition prevailing in connection with

our Indians and we were forced to allow them to take beaver, largely to provide food. Last year they had a bad epidemic along the Mackenzie river; we know we lost three hundred Indians through disease and they were unable to make any provision for the winter, so we were forced to lift the embargo as far as the Indians were concerned. We are trying to prevent any beaver being taken out of the territory except those coming through the hands of the mounted police, so we will know whether there is any bootlegging.

Mr. FRASER: What protection have you in case a white trapper takes a certain amount of beaver skins and turns them over to an Indian to dispose of?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The heads of families are restricted to ten beavers, but the situation described by my hon. friend might arise and it would be very difficult to detect. However, we have that restriction and we can only do our best to see that it is enforced.

Mr. GARDINER: And no other company is permitted to buy these skins at all?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Mr. BENNETT: What was the cause of the death of these Indians?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There was a very severe epidemic of influenza.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Has the minister any reason to believe that the Eskimo population is either increasing or decreasing?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We must admit that we have very little authentic information as to the Eskimos, but so far as we know there are about seven thousand of them in that country all told. As we extend the mounted police posts in the Eskimo district we will get a better idea of the size of the population, but as far as we know they are not decreasing.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is anything being done by the government to educate the Eskimos?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, the same system is in effect with regard to Eskimos as we have in force with regard to Indians; the church schools are among the Eskimos, although not to a very great extent as yet. At the mouth of the Mackenzie river, at Herschel island and at the delta there is a Roman Catholic school as well as an Anglican school, which was established many years ago, and a school is being established to the north of Hudson bay, at Chesterfield inlet. They get a grant from the government, and the work is carried on by these two churches.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I suppose the pupils are boarded at these schools?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, and they have day schools as well, carried on in tents located where the Eskimos are fishing in the summer season; but as in the Indian work, much better results can be obtained by boarding schools.

Mr. CAMPBELL: With regard to the Eskimos, I have understood from many articles I have read that there has been rather a lowering in their standard of living; as the game is killed off they have to resort to other methods in order to keep themselves alive. They have lost some of their primitive arts in connection with the making of clothing, the packing of foods and the use of the bow and arrow, and this has entailed additional hardship upon the Eskimo population. I wonder if the minister could tell us if he has any information upon that point.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We are told by our own officers who visit the Arctic that the arming of the Eskimo perhaps has not been altogether a good thing. Formerly when he missed a seal that seal was left alive, but now when he shoots a seal it often reaches a hole in the ice through which it gets back to the water and of course is not recoverable. The Eskimo is perhaps a little bit more clever than the ordinary northern Indian. He becomes an expert shot; he is a persistent hunter; he follows the game and builds his own home wherever night overtakes him, but in spite of that he may experience just a little more difficulty in obtaining a livelihood, and of course it is not good for him to attempt to live on the food of the white man, which usually brings illness. On the whole, the Eskimo is a very apt pupil; he learns quickly; he is of a mechanical turn of mind and will adapt himself to new conditions very rapidly, I think much more so than his Indian brother.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Some of the explorers, Stefanson among them, have emphasized the importance of the musk-ox, yet we have been told that in many districts in the north the musk-ox has been killed off entirely by the Eskimos, who do not seem to realize what it means to themselves. They seem to believe that because the game comes from some far off land it will come again in the future. Has anything been done by the government in this regard?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That idea is quite prevalent amongst the Eskimos, because they lead a nomadic life. The game in the north, as well as in the southern and western parts of the country, seems to enjoy periods of fairly large production; then they move to other sections, their numbers are greatly diminished and they have an off season. I think that has engendered in the minds of the Eskimos the idea that perhaps these animals will come back, but there is ample evidence that the musk-ox has been much farther south than we find it now. There is a considerable herd of musk-ox on Ellesmere island but it was found that large parties were coming across from Greenland and slaughtering the animals. We have established posts there to stop that kind of thing, and although we have no definite information we believe that the herds are increasing.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What is being done to educate the Eskimo as to the necessity of conserving the game?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That has been the main idea of introducing the reindeer. The history of Greenland under the administration of the Danish government shows that the reindeer has been the salvation of the northern peoples in that country. We propose to introduce the reindeer into our northern territories so that the Eskimo may be supplied with food and clothing as the farmer on the prairie obtains like supplies from his sheep or cattle, and we believe in that way the Eskimo will be taught the necessity of preserving game. As a rule the Eskimo and the Indian do not slaughter the game. It is the white man who is the vandal and who destroys the wild animals; he takes all the pelts he can gather without any thought as to reproduction.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is that Wood buffalo park on the bank of the Mackenzie river?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, on the Slave river.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Could the minister give us the number of buffalo in that park, and how they are getting along?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They must be increasing because the hon. member for North Vancouver has just asked me if we are going to provide any protection to those animals which stray out into the settled areas around Fort Vermilion. This park is not fenced, but as far as we can learn from the reports of the herders the 6,000 animals which were taken from Wainwright are doing very well. The original herd consisted of 1,500 heads, very large and robust animals, and the importation from Wainwright seemed to take up with them very acceptably.

Mr. CAMPBELL: They are not being domesticated at all?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Mr. CAMPBELL: They are not fenced up?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Lands and Parks—Salaries of the Dominion lands outside service, $680,000.

Dominion lands contingencies, etc., $205,000.

Amount required to pay the fees of the board of examiners for D.L.S. of the secretary and of the sub-examiners and for travelling expenses, stationery, printing, rent of room and furniture, etc. (The fees of Messrs. F. H. Peters, W. M. Tobey and Harry B. Parry, members of the board, and J. A. Cote, secretary, are to be paid out of this sum), $2,000.

To assist in publishing the transactions of the association of Dominion land surveyors, $125.

Protection of timber, tree culture, inspection and management of forest reserves, surveys of forest resources and research in forestry and forest products, etc., $1,574,313.

Grant to Canadian forestry association, $4,000.

For investigation of water and power resources, including the Dominion hydrometric survey ond for the administration of the Dominion Water-Power, Irrigation and Reclamation acts, $500,000.

To cover professional assistance engaged by the governor in council to assist the departmental officers who are advising re international and boundary waterway questions, $15,000.

Amount required to meet expenses of Lake of the Woods Control Board, $10,000.

To provide for the expenses connected with Canadian national parks, historic sites, care of indigents in the parks, etc., and to reimburse the provincial government for the salaries of police magistrates at Banff and at Jasper, $1,358,000.

Administration of the Migratory Birds Convention Act, $58,825.

To provide for the construction of the Golden-Revelstoke highway (revote), $150,000.

Engraving, lithographing, printing and preparation of maps, plans, reports and kindred publications of the Dominion, including salaries and necessary materials for same, etc., $271,960.

Costs of litigation and legal expenses, $20,000.

Ordnance, admiralty and railway lands:—salaries and expenses, $28,270.

Grant to Alpine Club of Canada, $1,000.

To pay Mrs. E. S. Forbes a compassionate allowance equal to one-half of the salary of her husband, payable monthly, $1,050.

Amount required to pay salaries and expenses connected with seed grain and relief collections and half of expenses of seed grain and relief adjustment board, etc., $47,460.

To provide for expenses connected with the supervisory mining engineer's office due chiefly to the recent mining activities in northern Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan, $104,565.

To provide for the expenses connected with the commission appointed, under the Inquiries Act, to report on the question of the administration and control of the natural resources of the province of Manitoba, including services of accountants, engineers, technical advisers, clerks, reporters and assistants, etc., $35,000.—Total, $5,066,568.

Mr. EVANS: Would the minister advise the committee as to the present status of the negotiations for the return to the provinces of their natural resources? About this time last year the Prime Minister stated that the question would be dealt with after the close of the last session. Since that time a conference has been held and we understand the bases have been arrived at upon which the natural resources are to be returned.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): A conference was held since the close of last session and, as my hon. friend knows, a commission was appointed in regard to the province of Manitoba, the report of which was laid upon the table of the house to-day by the Prime Minister. During the discussion at that conference the province of Saskatchewan made it plain that as far as they were concerned they were not prepared to acquiesce in the return of the natural resources unless they were guaranteed the full subsidy when it would be earned. The Prime Minister offered the present subsidy to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, but it was to terminate with that amount; that is, for all time to come the present subsidy would be paid without any increase. As I have said, in the case of Saskatchewan the Premier felt that they should have the full subsidy. The Premier of Alberta asked for time to consider the matter, and so far as I know he has not decided to accept this proposition, although I would not say that it has been rejected absolutely.

Mr. MacLAREN: Does that item of contingencies cover an amount for the Fort Howe park?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, an amount of $10,000 is being provided.

Mr. GARDINER: Are homesteaders being permitted to go in and settle any distance from the railway in the Peace River district?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They are not prohibited from settling wherever they desire; if the land is surveyed and open for homesteading, we take the application.

Mr. GARDINER: Does not the minister think that that is a rather poor policy in view of the fact that we may be called upon to provide railway transportation at a future date?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There was a time in my life when I felt that homesteading should be prohibited beyond thirty miles from a railway, but having been so intimately in contact with these matters I have come to realize that people cannot be stopped from going into such areas. If we made a reserved area they would simply go in and squat, and we would have the difficulty of adjusting the squatters' claims. A large number of people are going down the Peace river, between Keg river and Fort Vermilion, to take up land. My hon. friend knows that they will be very many miles from a railway, but we are being asked to make further surveys in that territory.

Mr. LUCAS: Will the minister give an explanation of the increase of $50,000 in salaries?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have been forced to employ additional homestead inspectors in order to keep up with the demand. Last year was one of the heaviest years in registration of homesteads we have had since I came to the department, and it was found necessary to employ fifty-three additional clerks.

Mr. LUCAS: Would the minister give the number of homesteads taken up last year?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I shall be glad to answer any other questions while that information is being looked up.

Mr. LUCAS: And also the number of abandoned homesteads.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I can tell my hon. friend at once that I will not be able to give him that information.

Mr. FRASER: Would the minister give the committee some information as to the vote of $150,000 which is being provided for the construction of the Golden-Revelstoke highway? How much money was spent on that last year and under what arrangement with the British Columbia government is the road being constructed?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): As my hon. friend knows, there was a proposal to construct the highway on the grade of the Canadian Pacific through Glacier park, but after we had investigated the matter we came to

the conclusion that this would be a very dangerous highway, very difficult to maintain and costly to build. It was estimated that the cost would be in the neighbourhood of $800,000. In all probability we would not be able to use it until the end of June or the beginning of July, on account of snow, and in the summer season there would be difficulty with slides. When the matter was discussed with the British Columbia government, they informed us that they proposed to build the road up the Columbia.

Mr. FRASER: Around the big bend.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Not all the way, but part of the way around to meet the requirements of settlement going in there. We came to the conclusion that although the mileage would be considerably longer, the highway in that section would be much safer, and we offered to contribute the $750,000 it would cost us to build through the park. That would be our contribution towards the construction of the road from Revelstoke to Golden.

Mr. FRASER: How many miles?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am speaking from memory, but I think it is over 150 miles.

Mr. FRASER: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We were to pay on a fifty-fifty basis until our $750,000 was exhausted, and they were to undertake to complete the road. Since the provincial government has changed, I have had a discussion with the provincial Minister of Public Works and some of the other members of the government including the premier himself. It was suggested that the new government were not very keen to go on with the proposition. Later on, however, they decided to continue the work and we are providing the money in order to be able to pay our share. We have paid nothing so far.

Mr. FRASER: But work was done last year.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, but we have not paid anything to date.

Mr. McRAE: Has there been any proposal from the British Columbia government to turn over their parks, particularly Garibaldi, to the federal government?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Mr. Cory is in British Columbia dealing with the whole matter of the railway belt and the Peace River block. Some suggestions have come, I believe, from outside parties, and not directly through the British Columbia government. I am not able to state that they have officially suggested our taking over any of their parks, but I have heard this from other sources.

Mr. McRAE: I am very much in favour of that being done. The park administration is so satisfactory that I think better results would ensue if that course were followed.

Mr. ESLING: All the agreements between the federal government and the provincial government regarding the construction of the Revelstoke highway are completed, are they not? I mean to say that the situation at present is that it is optional with the provincial government to proceed.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is the fact.

Mr. ESLING: No further agreements need be consummated?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No. The British Columbia government are undertaking the construction. We agree up to an amount of $750,000 to contribute fifty-fifty on the construction work as it proceeds.

Mr. ESLING: That is in lieu of what it would cost the government to build, had they elected to do so, the road through Glacier park.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is quite right.

Mr. GARDINER: When was this agreement entered into?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): About two years ago, or just before last season's construction work.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister explain how it is that a special privilege is handed out to British Columbia and not to the other provinces, in view of the Prime Minister's statement in the earlier part of the session?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The national highway would traverse our park, Glacier park.

Mr. GARDINER: I see.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We are contributing only the amount of money it would have cost us to build through the park and to have a very dangerous highway. We are contributing that to the provincial government in order that the detour may be made around the river.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the minister taking into consideration the tremendous waste of gas in the Turner valley, and are any steps being taken to conserve that gas?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If my hon. friend will look at Hansard, he will find that I gave a statement in that connection in answer to my hon. friend from Red Deer.

Mr. KENNEDY: In regard to the item:

To pay Mrs. E. S. Forbes a compassionate allowance equal to one-half of the salary of her husband.

Will the minister explain what this is for?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): She is the wife of an ex-secretary to the Minister of the Interior. It was claimed that her husband contracted an illness that affected him mentally and he is an inmate of a mental institution as a result of illness contracted while he was in the employ of the government. For some years Mrs. Forbes has been receiving this allowance.

Mr. GARDINER: Could the minister give the committee any information as to how the compromise with regard to seed grain liens is proceeding?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We are getting many settlements from the committee in charge of that work. I am asking in the supplementaries, as my hon. friend knows, for $47,000 to meet our obligation in Saskatchewan.

Mr. GARDINER: I merely bring to the attention of the minister complaints by many people who are trying to secure a settlement, that the negotiations are too prolonged, and that they cannot get any information from the board in regard to their claims. If the minister will at some time look into the matter and see if he cannot speed up the work, it will be much appreciated.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I judge from the number of settlements that are coming through that the committee is accomplishing a great deal. It is possible that they cannot overtake the work.

Mr. KENNEDY: There was considerable agitation for a highway connecting Jasper park with the province of British Columbia. Is anything being done with regard to that?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It will not be a serious matter to connect the detour by the Columbia river with the entrance to Jasper on the west side. We intend to build down on the abandoned grade to the outskirts of the park. We will possibly do something with regard to that this summer, although our main work this year will be to connect up the eastern entrance with the Edmonton highway.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Has the minister made a statement to the committee in regard to the reorganization of the land branches of the department? I noticed in the press some days ago an announcement which, if it correct, will give me some satisfaction. It is to the effect that the department is organizing its land branches into one branch. Does the minister care to make a statement in that connection?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The statement given out covers the whole arrangement. They are reorganized. Unfortunately, they were a long time in reorganizing and in consequence, the staff of the Dominion Lands branch was delayed perhaps a year or eighteen months longer than it should have been in receiving adjustments, but the organization has taken place just as announced.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I understand the minister intends to effect economies by that reorganization. In what manner will the economies be effected? Will it be by reduction of staff or what?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There will be a reduction of staff, although not to any considerable degree, but the main economy will be effected in better supervision and in the fact that the work will be handled much more expeditiously than it was formerly. My complaint was that we had too many branches.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is no doubt about that. Of all the departments of government, the Department of the Interior, for some reason unknown to me, has always appeared to me to be somewhat top heavy with organization, all sorts of heads everywhere. I notice, for example, that the cost of the total land work done, the outside work, was $440,000 in round figures, and the total cost of the inside service at headquarters was $530,000. I do not know whether it is fair—I am not going to be unfair—to draw any particular conclusions from these figures, but when they were brought to my attention they startled me. The headquarters staff cost $86,492 per year more than the outside service; in other words, the actual activities of the department cost less than the administrative end. It seemed to be a pretty heavy item, and I do sincerely hope that the reorganization of the lands branch as announced by

the minister will have the effect of cutting down the spread between those two services. That deals with the land service only.

As to the general service in the Department of the Interior, I find that the Ottawa service alone cost in 1913-14 in round figures $1,031,000, and the outside service $811,000, and in 1927-28 the Ottawa service cost $2,609,000 and the outside service $1,389,000. The striking feature about this is the enormous increase, an increase of over 100 per cent since 1913-14, since when a great deal of the activities of the department have been curtailed, at least in the lands branch.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): They have increased.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I take it that the land settlement or homesteading is very much less now than it was prior to 1911, 1912 and 1913. I wonder if the minister could give us a brief explanation of why there has been an increase of over 100 per cent since 1913-14.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I have not the homesteading figures of 1913 before me, but I may say for the information of my hon. friend that last year was one of the heaviest years in homesteading in the history of the department, 7,233 entries being granted. That in itself means a tremendous amount of bookkeeping. In addition, all our survey parties are paid from Ottawa; they are not charged to the outside service, so one does not get a proper conception if it is assumed that because a surveyor is out in the field he is being paid from the outside service. He is a permanent officer at Ottawa. That is the chief of the party himself. The labourers, of course, who are employed for a few months out in the field are charged to the outside service. The homestead inspectors and the clerks in the land offices in the three prairie provinces are the only staff of any moment that we have in the outside service, but all the records are kept here, and when my hon. friend remembers that we keep a record of all the grazing lands, mining leaseholds, and water-powers in the three prairie provinces he will readily understand that it requires a very large staff to keep an accurate account of every transaction that passes through the Department of the Interior. I know there is a belief that all that work is done in the outside land offices, but that is not the fact. All the records are kept here and full information concerning every transaction can be obtained from the office at Ottawa. The rentals are all passed in here and the accounting is all done here, and that, of course, necessitates a very large staff in Ottawa. Our forestry activities are also all directed from Ottawa; that work has grown tremendously in recent years, and must increase if we are to protect the forests.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is no question that there are certain branches that have increased, mines and forests particularly. On the other hand, there has been a tremendous and sometimes unexplainable increase in the personnel, salaries and costs. When will the reorganization now being undertaken by the minister be completed?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is completed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): When will it be in operation?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It has been in operation for some little time. I cannot give the exact date it went into effect.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do hope that it will bring the results that are expected of it. I recollect taking this matter up with the minister four years ago, and he promised at that time in response to a letter from myself that he would undertake this work at once. I am not blaming him in the least, but I think the delay in bringing about that reorganization calls for an explanation of some kind. But I do not want that now as the reorganization is under way. Does not the minister think it is, after all, somewhat belated in view of the probable transfer of the natural resources to the prairie provinces next session?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I cannot speak as to its being belated. All I can say is that it does take a considerable time to get the reorganization put into effect. I frankly am unable to explain the reason for the delay. Some of these delays are very vexatious, and particularly vexatious to this staff.

Mr. GARDINER: Now that the reorganization has taken place, can the minister give any idea as to its value as compared with the old organization?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I do not quite understand the purport of my hon. friend's question. We certainly would not have entered on the reorganization if we had not thought it would be valuable to the staff and from the point of view of the service rendered.

Mr. GARDINER: Are we getting any better service on account of the reorganization?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I have not heard any complaints of the service being delayed, and we have a department in which it is very important that speedy answers be given to requests and letters. We do a tremendous business through the mails, and of necessity replies must be made promptly.

Mr. GARDINER: I take it that the minister was of the opinion that a reorganization was absolutely essential. He states now that it has been in effect for some time, and I am asking whether there is any improvement under the reorganization as compared with the old organization, and if so, in what respects.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The complete reorganization went into effect only on the 1st of April last. One thing I do insist upon is prompt action on the part of the staff, and I think we are getting that; at least, I am not getting any complaints about the service, and if the service were delayed I would be sure to hear of it. Moreover, I think that the reorganization has short-circuited a lot of the work. There are not so many people required to examine documents that are going out to the public. All these documents, of course, must be accurate. That is very important where so much is dependent on the treatment of the many leases, affecting large numbers of people, that pass through our hands annually.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are any of the highly paid supervisory positions being done away with as a result of the reorganization?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Some of them will disappear upon the retirement of the present incumbents, and quite a number of them are just about due to take their retirement.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am very glad to hear that statement, because in the report of the special committee on the civil service, at page 25, dealing with this particular subject that we are discussing, it is stated:

> It is too early to estimate with any accuracy the probable saving which will result, but a considerable reduction can be made by the following:
> 1. The elimination of several highly-paid supervisory positions.
> 2. The pooling of all office services, e.g., stenography, typing and filing.
> 3. The retirement of as many employees as are eligible, and the abolition of the positions thus vacated.

I suppose all this has been taken into consideration.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: I take it that this million and a half expenditure has to do with looking after the timber in the prairie provinces and the Peace River block?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, by far the major portion of the expenditure has to do with the area mentioned by my hon. friend. We do spend some money in endeavouring to get a coordinated effort throughout all the provinces, but of course we have no jurisdiction in the provinces owning their resources.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): I see $1,358,000 is to be expended on Canadian national parks, historic sites, and so forth. How is this divided between the provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The three national parks on which we make our largest expenditure are located in the Rocky mountains. The historic sites are scattered all over the Dominion. The largest expenditure in that connection would be in eastern Canada. I may as well give my hon. friend particulars of these expenditures:

Rocky mountains park, $352,350.
Jasper park, $269,220.
Buffalo park, $61,300.
Yoho park, $87,345.
Glacier park, $15,720.
Waterton lakes park, $65,965.
Mount Revelstoke park, $15,750.
Elk island park, $27,935.
Kootenay park, $77,800.
Prince Albert park, $90,000.
Publicity, $65,000.
Head office, $78,210.
Historic sites, $42,000.
Fort Anne park, $4,500.
St. Lawrence islands park, $7,000.
Point Pelee park, $8,000.
Antelope reserve, $2,000.
Vidal's point park, $500.
Field engineering, $47,200.
Fort Howe, $10,000.
Beausoleil islands, $30,205.—Total, $1,358,000.

The last item is for the purchase of islands in the Georgian bay district which we intend to establish as a park.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How much is spent in Quebec on historic sites?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is not in my department. We have spent some money for the purchase of lands at Louisburg. We will have to make a considerable expenditure to restore that historic site.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): What is the appropriation for Louisburg this year?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have no appropriation except for engineering and the preparation of a plan. With respect to

Louisburg and some of the older historic sites, the government hopes either to enlarge the work of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board or to create a new board to take over that work in its entirety and give it more authority to deal with the restoration of these historic sites in eastern Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How much money was expended last year to take over the properties in Louisburg?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I think in the neighbourhood of $23,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Who took charge of the payment of this money?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Mr. Wardle, the chief engineer of national parks, was sent down to make a valuation of the properties and secure voluntary options. Someone was engaged by the justice department to examine the title.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): How much money was spent on legal expenses?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend will have to get that information from the Justice department.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Could the minister say through whose hands this money went?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Mr. FRASER: Would it be apropos at the present time for the minister to tell us what stage the negotiations have reached in regard to the transfer of the Peace River block and the railway belt in British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The proposed arrangements have not been submitted to our government, but Doctor Scott, the deputy superintendent general of Indian Affairs, has been to British Columbia, and any little differences have been smoothed out. Mr. Cory, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, is now in British Columbia discussing details of the park lands, water-powers, and matters of that kind, to see how near we can come to a settlement.

Mr. FRASER: Have there been any negotiations in regard to the taking over of Mount Robson park in connection with the transfer of lands or anything of the kind?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We are asking for an addition west of Mount Assiniboine.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

We are now asking for the Mount Robson territory as an addition to Jasper park. We hope in these negotiations to secure those areas and make them additional to the park.

Mr. FRASER: A moment or two ago the minister mentioned something about a highway through Jasper park to connect Edmonton with the British Columbia boundary. You are constructing that road?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. FRASER: Do you propose to get to the British Columbia boundary with that road this year?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I doubt it. It is not very expensive construction, but we are bending all our energies to connect with the road to Edmonton. Is my hon. friend familiar with the situation?

Mr. FRASER: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): At present we have built up to Lucerne. It is a question of taking off the ties and spreading the gravel in spots down to Red Water junction, which is practically the boundary of the park. We have not made any surveys, but are told by people who claim to know that it will not be a difficult matter to connect up the road around the big bend with the western entrance to Jasper park.

Mr. FRASER: That is what I wanted to know. Provided you get control of Mount Robson park, do you propose to extend your highway into British Columbia until you come to the boundary of the Mount Robson park in British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Quite right.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Can the minister give me details of the expenditure in Louisburg, especially as regards the taking over of the land last season? Would it also be possible for him to give me the name of the legal men who were engaged in handling the transfers of land?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I will get that information for my hon. friend when the supplementary estimates are going through. Perhaps my hon. friend will then mention the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): The reason that I ask for the information is that I cannot understand how my political opponent was given the opportunity of doing this work. I know he did the work in this town, an old

historic site which is in my constituency; and every legal transaction that has taken place has gone through the hands of my political opponent. I want the information in regard to it.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend wants the amounts paid him for the service.

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond): Not only the amounts paid him, but what was paid to each individual. I want the whole thing complete. Of course, we shall have to wait another year before it appears in the Auditor General's Report, but I should like to have it this summer.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I will give the information when the supplementaries are under consideration.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): There is an increase of $94,565 in the vote for expenses connected with the supervisory mining engineer's office, due chiefly to recent mining activities in northern Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan. Will the minister explain this?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We have had to increase the expenditures considerably owing to the opening up of new mining areas. This has necessitated the establishment of recording offices as well as the sending of officers into the territory to investigate disputes. This is the chief reason for the increase, together with certain additional services which will be required in the oil fields both in southern Saskatchewan and in Alberta. In these provinces there has been a greatly increased mining activity which calls for additional expenditures.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Under what item does the geological survey come? That is not included in this vote?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is charged to the Department of the Interior. The geological survey vote is merely for the purpose of sending parties out on geological work in the way of investigation.

Mr. LUCAS: There is an item of $47,460 for salaries and expenses connected with seed grain and relief collections. Was any money paid for seed grain relief last year?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is no change in this vote; the vote has been standing ever since the relief was granted. There is still $6,000,000 outstanding. As regards a portion of it, I am doubtful whether we shall be able to collect; but of necessity we must keep notifying those who have not paid and also keep the accounts up to date. The vote is the same as last year's.

Mr. LUCAS: I understood the Minister of Finance a year ago to say that something like $2,000,000 was being provided for this item, and I know that applications came from my district asking for cancellations. There were men who had these sums charged up against them and when they moved out of the southern district up to farms in northern Alberta these charges were still against them and they were being pressed. I understood that if they had a proper case to submit to the adjustment board the charges would be cancelled.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is true, and they are going through almost every day.

Mr. LUCAS: What amounts have been cancelled?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Last year some $50,000 was cancelled in connection with seed grain indebtedness. This was done on the order of the board.

Mr. LUCAS: What board recommends these adjustments?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): In Alberta the board comprises Mr. Fream, chairman, Mr. Matheson, our inspector, and another gentleman. It is representative of both governments.

Mr. LUCAS: That board recommends to the department?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. LUCAS: What amount was collected last year?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They did not do any collecting. I cannot give the amounts that have accrued but I can give the amount cancelled in the way of loans held against these properties by the federal government.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister stated that the cancellations amounted last year to $50,000. What did that service cost?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): So far as we are concerned, our officers are under regular salary, so that there is no cost to us. I do not know what the cost to the Alberta government is, but Mr. Fream is an officer of that government. There are no outside officials employed on the work.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I wish to direct the attention of the minister to some very pointed complaints I have had in connection with the sale of section 26, township 32, range 32, west of the first meridian. This is a piece of land which only recently was used for pasture by the Keeseekoose Indians; as a matter of fact, it has been used by them for many years. Many parties in the past, year after year, have been applying to the department for an opportunity to purchase that land, but the department has always replied that the land was not for sale. In various letters I have on file it is stated that due notice would be given when the land should be put up for sale.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Was that Indian land?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Would my hon. friend mind leaving it until we come to the supplementaries for the Indian department?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Those will not be up to-night?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Item agreed to.

SECRETARY OF STATE

Public printing and stationery—printing, binding, etc., the annual statutes, $12,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: I understand that the printing of the British North America Act comes under the department of the Secretary of State. Is that the case?

Mr. RINFRET: There is another item which covers parliamentary documents, if that is what my hon. friend has reference to.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is it a fact that the printing of the British North America Act comes under this department?

Mr. RINFRET: Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: Then I wish to point out that the books containing that act contain nothing more than the British North America Act and its amendments; they do not include the London agreement of 1866. As the minister knows, that agreement was arrived at by the duly accredited representatives of the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, who assembled in London in 1866, and the agreement was similar in many particulars to the Quebec agreement which was concluded a year or two previous. I desire to point out that the London agreement is a highly important document in connection with the formation of this Dominion, but one can only find it occasionally in print; it can be found only in the old blue books of the time of confederation. Its value lies in the fact that it was the very basis of the British North America Act. I believe that it has not only historical value but that it is an important document in connection with the constitution of this country, and I would suggest to the minister that when the British North America Act is again published the London agreement be included in the same volume, partly for purposes of comparison and partly for purpose of reference, since the British North America Act might be looked upon as the enabling act with regard to the London agreement, which was arrived at by the representatives of the provinces.

I do not think I have ever asked the minister for anything before, and this is really not a personal request but concerns a matter which interests many people in this country I would like to ask the minister to include the London agreement in the next issue of the British North America Act. The minister has nodded his head, but that will not appear in Hansard, and it would be more satisfactory to have his verbal assent.

Mr. RINFRET: I think the suggestion is an excellent one and I will certainly consider it when the next publication is being made; in other words, my answer is yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: How far did the minister say he would go?

Mr. RINFRET: I said I quite agreed with my hon. friend.

Mr. MacLAREN: I understand the minister agrees to do as I have requested?

Mr. RINFRET: Yes, decidedly so.

Mr. WARD: I might suggest that when the minister publishes a new issue of the British North America Act it might be well to print enough extra copies to place one in the possession of each member of the house.

Mr. RINFRET: That is another very good suggestion, with which I quite agree.

Item agreed to.

Plant—new, $42,544.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister explain what this new plant consists of?

Mr. RINFRET: Although this amount is rather larger than the vote last year, the amount placed in the estimates last year was less than the usual amount necessary for this work.

Item agreed to.

Expenses under the Naturalization Act, $8,000.

Mr. RINFRET: When this item was up this morning an hon. member asked me as to the distribution of the fees paid by applicants. I may state that a fee of $5 is required from each applicant, which fee is paid to the clerk of the court before which the application is made. In the larger centres, such as Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, there is a special regulation under which, if the total amount collected is more than $2,000, the balance is turned over to the department. In that branch we also have a little revenue from other sources, such as certified copies of former certificates of naturalization and also certificates granted by the Secretary of State under certain sections of the act which do not call for appearance in court. The total amount thus collected by the department in the fiscal year 1928-29 was $6,966. This amount, of course, was turned over to the Receiver General and cannot be credited to this item.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There is a question I should like to ask under this item, and I might say I brought to the attention of the department a case which illustrates my point. A judge in my own city sent in a report with regard to certain applications for naturalization, in which he stated that the applicants had not a sufficient knowledge of English. It appears that the people were somewhat flustered at coming before a judge, and later on there was another hearing after which the judge declared that these people had a sufficiently good knowledge of English to enable them to become naturalized. Both reports were sent to the department but as yet the naturalization papers have not been issued. Notwithstanding the fact that it was the same authority which stated in the second place that the people had a sufficient knowledge of English, the department still takes the view that the first report must be adhered to. It seems to me that when we invite immigrants to this country we should admit them to citizenship as soon as they can qualify. These people took the trouble to make applications, and they learned English; why have certificates been refused under these circumstances?

Mr. RINFRET: I have looked into a number of cases similar to the one mentioned by the hon. member. He is not quite right when he says that although a second report was made the department is adhering to the first one. When the famous bill concerning naturalization was before the house last year, I think I explained that although an applicant may come before the court we also conduct an inquiry through the mounted police and the other means at the disposal of the department. In certain cases the report of the court is favourable while that of our inspectors is in the other direction, and it is within the discretion of the minister either to grant or to refuse the certificate. We do not act against the report of the court, but we do not always follow that recommendation, as sometimes we are not as easily satisfied as the tribunal has been. There is no finality to our decision, as the intervention of an influential person will induce us to renew our investigation in an effort to find out whether or not we have been misinformed.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I should like to draw the minister's attention to what seems to me to be somewhat of an anomaly in the Naturalization Act. I have in my hand a file covering the case of Mr. H. Stuckenberg, who is living at the present time at Kandahar, in Saskatchewan. Mr. Stuckenberg was a Danish citizen but had lived in Canada for a number of years. He enlisted in the army at the outbreak of the war and took the oath of allegiance at that time. Apparently that destroyed his Danish citizenship, because when he attempted to obtain a passport to visit his native country he found that he was not a Danish citizen, and he also discovered that he was not a Canadian citizen. Here is a man who took upon himself the supreme obligation of citizenship; he enlisted in the army and served throughout the whole war. I have discussed this case with the deputy minister and it has been pointed out to me that under the present legislation this man is not a citizen. Of course the minister can reply that he should make application for naturalization in the ordinary way, but this man thinks that that would be humiliating, and I agree with him. He does not feel that he should be forced to appear before the clerk of the court, pay about ten or fifteen dollars in lawyers' fees and other expenses, and go through all the formality of becoming a Canadian citizen. I suggest to the minister that some change should be made in the act which would admit a man of that type to citizenship.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He was accepted as a citizen for one purpose.

Mr. CAMPBELL: He was accepted as a citizen and as a soldier, and yet to-day we deny him citizenship.

Mr. JACOBS: Has he voted in any of the elections?

Mr. CAMPBELL: He is not eligible to vote; if he did he would be liable under the criminal code.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension. Under our present act naturalization depends upon two things; (a) residence and (b) character, habits and reputation. Service under the colours does not constitute residence because a man may become a soldier and yet not be a citizen. Taking the oath of allegiance merely means that he takes it to serve in that capacity. The difficulty in meeting the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is that this is an imperial act in the sense that in granting a certificate of naturalization we do not confer Canadian citizenship; we confer British citizenship which is good the world over. If we amend our statute it must be amended in all the overseas dominions and in Great Britain as well, because we have adopted a uniformity of qualification in order to confer a uniform citizenship. I have had to deal with more than one case of a similar nature, and there seems to be a misunderstanding on the part of those who took the oath of allegiance; it is an oath to serve the country in the capacity of a soldier, and not an oath of citizenship or naturalization, which involves a further inquiry upon which the granting of the certificate is predicated.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I quite understand that the man is not a citizen under the present act.

Mr. BENNETT: He would not be eligible in any part of the world.

Mr. CAMPBELL: He has been in the country a sufficient length of time, and he could qualify.

Mr. BENNETT: Then he should do that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I was suggesting to the minister that it might be possible to amend the act.

Mr. RINFRET: I think the hon. member will give me credit for attempting to amend the act in certain respects, but the leader of the opposition stated the case very well when he said that there were certain things which would not come within the power of this parliament. As we confer British naturalization we have to abide by certain conditions which exist throughout the empire and which are decided upon at every imperial conference.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Let me remind the minister of a phase of this matter which I have discussed many times before. There are in my constituency many people of foreign birth—and this would apply all over Canada—who find it very inconvenient to go to the judicial centres and appear before a judge to make their application for naturalization. On many branch lines there is only a tri-weekly service, and it means a week away from home. Many of these settlers are very poor; the $25 to $30 it would cost them means a great deal, and many people are going without naturalization simply because they cannot afford it. I have suggested both to the minister and to his deputy that arrangements should be made so that the judges could hear these cases when they are sitting at local points. The deputy minister promised me that something would be done, and in some cases this arrangement has been made. In my own village of Pelly, where the judge sits once a year, there have been a few cases dealt with in this way, but at other times this procedure is not carried out. In most cases the judges refuse to deal with the applicants at that local point, and the people living in the local district where the judge comes once, twice or sometimes three times a year, have to go to all the trouble and expense of travelling to the judicial centre, and this means a considerable expense. The Under Secretary of State pointed out to me that this could be arranged only by cooperation with the provincial authorities. Apparently no provision is made for extra expenses of the judges when this would entail remaining over in the district for another day. I want to suggest to the minister that this matter be further discussed with the provincial authorities. There is no reason in the world why proper arrangements could not be made so that these cases could be dealt with at every local point, thus saving these people all the delay, trouble and expense of going to the judicial centre.

Mr. RINFRET: My hon. friend is aware, as I reminded him a moment ago, that the best way to deal with the situation he has depicted would have been for both houses of parliament to adopt a bill which I introduced last year to do away altogether with appearance before a court. This house assented to the bill by a somewhat large majority, but it failed to pass the other house, and therefore the amendment which we sought and for which I fought rather energetically, did not become law. We do not have any power over the judges, as my hon. friend will appreciate. The act provides that the applicant shall go before a tribunal, and we are powerless to compel either the clerk of the court or the judge himself to deal with the cases sooner or in some other manner than that which the judge himself determines. We are doing everything in our power by negotiation and conciliation to expedite the work of the appli-

cants, but I am sure my hon. friend will realize that as a department, as long as the act remains as it is, unamended, we are travelling under a handicap.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It seems to me it is rather a poor excuse for the minister to attribute the present condition in this respect to the fact that these houses of parliament did not pass the amendment which he brought in last year. The fact remains that that amendment did not pass and is not law. I am asking the minister to do what he can to deal with the situation as it exists to-day. This difficulty has been going on for years and I can hardly agree with the minister's statement that he is powerless; that he has no control over the judges. I have discussed the matter with the Under Secretary of State and he has not given me that impression. It seems to me it is a matter that can be simply and easily arranged between the federal and the provincial governments. It is a matter, I understand, simply of slight extra amount being paid towards judge's expenses, because in some of these instances it means that the judge is compelled to remain over an extra day.

Mr. RINFRET: On that point, I am sure my hon. friend is aware that we are not at liberty to allow judges any proportion of the fees. The federal law is clear that judges cannot receive any compensation beyond their salaries as judges.

Mr. CAMPBELL: There is no question of fees or other remuneration involved. This is merely a matter of extra expense that the judge would incur if he were obliged to remain over an extra day or two. That should be an easy matter to arrange between the federal and provincial governments. If the minister would discuss the question with the Under Secretary of State, I am sure the latter would point out how it could be done.

Mr. RINFRET: I will give the matter my very best attention.

Mr. WARD: I am not sure whether this is the proper place to suggest amendments to the Naturalization Act, but I should like to suggest a modification of that law, which, as it stands at present, compels all new Canadians to have a working knowledge, so to speak, of the English or the French language before being permitted to become naturalized Canadian citizens. In this connection we should take into consideration the fact that a large number of new Canadians come to Canada in middle life with no knowledge of either English or French, but immediately become good Canadian citizens and endeavour to educate their families. In fact I have in my constituency many families where the parents cannot speak a word of English but where some of the children have taken the highest honours in the universities. New Canadians who are endeavouring to live up to all the laws of Canadian society, who are just as good citizens as those who speak our languages, should not be debarred from becoming Canadian citizens because they cannot speak the English or the French language. A grave injustice has been done to many new Canadians by the fact that under the circumstances under which they were placed in this country, they cannot become naturalized citizens. We all know that the policy of settlement, whether it was right or wrong, has isolated those people in the west. For instance, one district will be German, another Austrian, another something else, and they have principalities of their own with no opportunity of learning the English language. Persons who come here from other lands in middle life, therefore, and who are anxious to become good Canadians, should not be debarred from securing naturalization simply because they cannot speak the English or the French language.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: My attention was called to one particular incident that may give point to what has just been said. An elderly Icelandic woman came to this country some years ago and moved up country between lake Manitoba and lake Winnipeg. She lived a hard life under those pioneering conditions, brought up her family there, contributed as much as she possibly could to the upbuilding of this country. She was in every way an intelligent woman, but she had no opportunity, in that isolated life, of learning another language. The question of old age pensions came up. She is in every way qualified by residence, age and so forth to be the recipient of an old age pension, but she is not naturalized, and under the existing act there seems to be no way by which she can obtain naturalization. It is altogether unfair that she should be deprived of the old age pension simply because of a condition of that character.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): The hon. member for Mackenzie has, I believe, made a very able speech in support of a little more consideration for those of foreign birth who come to this country desirous of becoming citizens and who, because of circumstances, are unable to appear before a judge and demonstrate their ability to speak English. I

notice, however, in last year's Hansard that when the bill to provide this very thing was before the house, my hon. friend himself voted to give the bill the six months' hoist.

Mr. BENNETT: That was because of the other provisions in it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: As I know the hon. member is a little overwrought, I will excuse him for his language to-night. He has just returned from the country where he ran up against some difficulties and he is not just normal or he would not make the error he has made. I was not dealing with that question at all. I had my own reasons for opposing the change in the Naturalization Act. I believe it could be dealt with better by judges than by politicians.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Now the judges are dealing with it, the hon. member does not like it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Many people in the west who want to get naturalization papers, would prefer to have their cases dealt with by judges rather than by politicians. If they happen to oppose the political party in power they might have a good deal of difficulty in securing naturalization papers. The question I dealt with had nothing at all to do with the question raised by the hon. member for Weyburn. It is a very important question and one with which I hope the minister will deal, because if dealt with it would save these people a great deal of money and facilitate the securing of naturalization.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I understand the hon. gentleman's explanation. He says that last year these people might have wanted votes to assist the party in power but the party being now out of power in Saskatchewan, there is no longer any necessity for killing the bill, and he would like to have it passed.

Mr. BENNETT: They have only been defeated; they are not yet out of power.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: How much English is required of the applicant for naturalization? If the judge happens to be hard-boiled he may require the applicant to speak Oxford English, and if the applicant does not know Oxford English his application may be refused.

Mr. RINFRET: I do not see what answer I can make to that. So long as the act remains as it is, the applicant must go before the judge, and the judge use his own discretion.

[Mr. E. J. Young.]

Mr. SPENCER: How much revenue was received last year from naturalization certificates?

Mr. RINFRET: I gave that information when my hon. friend was not in the chamber. He will find it in Hansard to-morrow.

Item agreed to.

Department of Labour — Annuities Act, $75,000.

Mr. ADSHEAD: How many annuities have been taken out since the act came into force?

Mr. HEENAN: 10,264.

Mr. SPENCER: Are these annuities being taken up pretty well by the public?

Mr. HEENAN: Last year there was an increase of over 150 per cent, and this year there has been an increase of 11.19 per cent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the average amount of the annuity taken out?

Mr. HEENAN: About $356.

Item agreed to.

Combines Investigation Act, $25,000.

Mr. ADSHEAD: In connection with the investigation that was held last year into the fruit industry, the minister told us that he had received a portion of the fines, $50,000. Has any more been paid?

Mr. HEENAN: The whole $200,000 has been paid in this year.

Mr. BENNETT: Any part of it remitted?

Mr. HEENAN: We remitted the expenses of the British Columbia government, which were $10,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Were any of the fines remitted?

Mr. HEENAN: No. We remitted only what the British Columbia government stated were their expenses in connection with it. No part of the fines was remitted.

Mr. BENNETT: The fines went into consolidated revenue?

Mr. HEENAN: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Conciliation and Labour Act, $55,000.

Mr. POULIOT: Is the Labour Gazette published under this item?

Mr. HEENAN: Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: Although average earnings are lower in Montreal and in Quebec

than in other sister cities, as was established on March 3rd of this year by Mr. Gerald H. Brown, Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, before the select standing committee on industrial and international relations, as will be seen from report No. 3, page 40, the cost of living is as high as and probably higher in the province of Quebec than in other provinces on account of the numerous large families, and the admirable Canadian mothers should be praised the more for bringing up their children well, when it is such a hard task for them to manage the home on the pay envelope they receive.

By virtue of chapter 94 of the Quebec revised statutes, 1925, section 4:

The functions, powers and duties of the minister (of Public Works and Labour) shall be the following:

4. He institutes and controls inquiries into important industrial questions, and may collect useful facts and statistics relating thereto, and may transmit the same to the Quebec Bureau of Statistics.

In l'Annuaire Statistique de Quebec, 1928 (the Quebec Year Book, 1928) at page 394, there is the following statement, which I have translated:

The labour statistics are collected by the bureau of statistics with the help of uniform forms mailed to all associations of the province. Out of 454 labour groups called to answer the sheet of questions, only 245 sent back their report.

Therefore, the Minister of Labour of the province of Quebec can plead his ignorance of labour conditions in the province notwithstanding the fact that there are other reliable sources of information which are open to the public. But even if so many labour unions had not answered his queries, why did not the Minister of Labour of the government of Quebec take advantage of the statute to send some officers of his department to collect those statistics on the spot so as to be better informed on the situation of labour within the province? Are we to conclude that the mailing of questionnaires to the labour unions was simply a matter of departmental routine, and that he personally took no more interest in the matter?

As it would take too long to discuss the rates of wages in all trades, let us for instance, study the conditions prevailing in nine particular trades which affect thousands upon thousands of people in the province of Quebec. The figures will speak for themselves. They are taken from the Labour Gazette, founded 29 years ago, by the right hon. the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), when he was Deputy Minister of Labour, and who has always taken a great interest in labour questions and showed himself to be devoted to the welfare of the people. Not only are minimum wages in Quebec city lower than in any other big city in the Dominion, but the maximum wages in Montreal are below the average wages in fourteen other big Canadian cities. Are not the artisans of the province of Quebec entitled to be paid the same salary as their brethren in other big Canadian cities? The figures that I shall quote were taken from the Labour Gazette of January, 1929, and I have made the calculations myself. The figures are as follows:

—	Minimum Wages in Quebec City	Minimum Wages in other Canadian Cities*	Maximum Wages in Montreal	Average of Wages in Canadian Cities	Maximum Wages in other Canadian Cities*
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Bricklayers	0 90	0 90 Halifax	1 12½	1 20	1 45 Windsor
Carpenters	0 45	0 60 St. John, N.B.	0 75	0 86	1 05 Winnipeg
Electricians	0 45	0 55 St. John, N.B.	0 75	0 86	1 25 Windsor
Painters	0 47	0 60 St. John, N.B.	0 70	0 76	0 90 Edmonton
Plasterers	0 85	0 90 Halifax	1 12½	1 16	1 50 Windsor
Sheet metal workers	0 45	0 60 St. John, N.B.	0 75	0 87	1 06¼ Vancouver
Stonecutters	0 60	0 80 St. John, N.B.	0 90	1 03	1 37½ Windsor
Plumbers	0 45	0 65 St. John, N.B.	0 85	0 98	1 12½ Toronto
Manual labour	0 35	0 30 St. John, N.B.	0 45	0 46	0 65 Toronto

*Halifax, St. John, N.B., Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, Victoria.

It is rather difficult to give an exact figure for the average of wages. For instance, in Regina the minimum wages for manual labour are forty cents and the maximum sixty. How many men work at forty cents and how many at sixty would take a long time to ascertain through an investigation in all the important cities of the Dominion. In the above quoted book the minimum and maximum wages for manual labour are given for twelve out of

fourteen cities, but the Labour Gazette gives the average rate in each city for the eight other trades in 99 cases out of 112. So one can easily find the average of wages in all these cities by adding the wages for each trade in the fourteen above-mentioned cities and dividing each total by fourteen. In the cities where for the trades the minimum and maximum wages are shown, the approximate average wages can be established with the above reservation by adding one-half of the difference between both to the minimum wages.

The following tradesmen, who get the maximum wages in Montreal, receive so much less than the average of wages paid in fourteen big Canadian cities, according to calculations made by figures taken from the supplement to the Labour Gazette, January 1929.

Tradesmen	Day less (8 hours)	Week less (6 days)	Year less (52 weeks)
1. Bricklayers.	.60	3.60	187.20
2. Carpenters.	.88	5.28	274.56
3. Electricians.	.88	5.28	274.56
4. Painters.	.48	2.88	149.76
5. Plasterers.	.28	1.68	87.36
6. Sheet metal workers .	1.84	11.04	574.08
7. Stone cutters. . . .	....	....	.....
8. Plumbers.	1.44	8.64	449.28
9. Manual labour. . . .	.08	0.48	24.96

The following tradesmen, who get the minimum wages in Quebec City, where the Premier and the Minister of Labour of Quebec live, receive so much less than the average of wages paid in fourteen big Canadian cities, according to calculations made by figures taken from the supplement to the Labour Gazette, January 1929.

Tradesmen	Day less (8 hours)	Week less (6 days)	Year less (52 weeks)
1. Bricklayers.	$2.40	$14.40	$ 748.80
2. Carpenters.	3.44	20.64	1,073.28
3. Electricians. . . .	3.44	20.64	1,073 28
4. Painters.	2.32	13.92	723.84
5. Plasterers.	2.48	16.88	877.76
6. Sheet metal workers	4.24	25.44	1,322.88
7. Stone cutters. . . .	2.20	13.20	686.40
8. Plumbers.	4.64	27.84	1,447.68
9. Manual labour. . .	.88	5.28	274.56

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the hon. member read that latter item again? I can hardly understand it.

Mr. POULIOT: Manual labour, less per day, 88 cents; less per week, $5.88; less per year, $274.56. Those are the minimum wages paid in Quebec as compared with the average of wages in fourteen big Canadian cities. Those figures are astounding. The average earnings are lower not only in Quebec city, but even in Montreal, than in other big Canadian cities, and that although the cost of living is as high as and probably higher than, in the province of Quebec.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: I understand that the question of minimum wages comes within the jurisdiction of the provinces. Would it not be more effective for the hon. member to read his statement to the Premier of Quebec?

Mr. POULIOT: The point is that these people are not interested in the matter because they do not even get the statistics which they are supposed to be given according to the law. I wish to put my point of view to the Minister of Labour and to disclose the situation as it is, because I want him to give some relief in this matter. I hope the house will be indulgent enough to listen to me for a few minutes longer because it is in the interests of these people that I am now speaking.

Mr. CHAPLIN: You are making a statement to Quebec now, aren't you?

Mr. POULIOT: I am not making a statement to Quebec but about Quebec and I contend that some relief should be provided. Although these statistics are rather dull when they are read in this way, I can assure my hon. friends opposite that they will find them more interesting when they come to read them in Hansard to-morrow. What I am stating to-night affects not only one man but thousands upon thousands of families in Quebec.

First, the average earnings are lower not only in Quebec City but even in Montreal than in any other large Canadian city—and that, although the cost of living is as high as and probably higher in the province of Quebec than in other provinces on account of numerous large familes.

Secondly, the Quebec and Montreal manufacturers do not sell their products any cheaper than those of other provinces.

Thirdly, therefore, the difference between the wages in Montreal and Quebec and those in other large Canadian cities means a loss to labour and additional and illegitimate gains to capital in our province. What is the use of inviting big firms to open new plants in the province of Quebec if the artisans who will work there are underpaid.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. POULIOT: Surely.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Two, as a matter of fact. Is he aware that the Premier of Quebec was in an adjoining city, not far from here, this afternoon? Does he not think that he should have Mr. Taschereau paged in order that that gentleman might have the benefit of the interesting and important address he is making?

Mr. POULIOT: The dinner which is being given in Hull is not a joint affair; that is the first point. And in the second place I may say that I expected that the estimates of the Minister of Labour would come before the house on Monday of last week, and if they have come on to-night it is not my fault; it is an act of Providence.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Well, why should not my hon. friend take advantage of that act of Providence and have Mr. Taschereau here? I believe that most governments are interested in the matter.

Mr. POULIOT: Unfortunately there is no radio in this house so that my speech cannot be heard in Hull to-night. Now it is rather hard to expect a supporter of the provincial government to move a vote of censure against that government; but how could it be explained that matters of such great importance have not been brought before the Quebec legislature by any member of the provincial opposition, not even by the Conservative members of Montreal? What is this or that piece of their criticism compared to the welfare and comfort of so many large families?

Taking the official report of the Dominion-provincial conference held in 1927, I find that the Premier of Quebec is reported thus:

> Premier Taschereau, of Quebec, declared at the outset that he was not asking for anything at all for his province. He was surprised that after all the conferences which had been held, and after sixty years of partnership, there should still be so much friction between the provinces and the Dominion as to their respective domains. To have a happy and prosperous Canada there must be happy and prosperous provinces, and the latter could do more for Canada than could the federal authorities. The provinces were more in contact with the people, educating them, building their roads, and looking after their health. The provinces enacted compensation laws in favour of workmen and had control of the judicial machinery.

"He was not asking for anything at all for his province!" What about federal subsidies to the provinces for highways and so many other purposes, including public works and so forth? What about his own request, on behalf of his Siamese brother, Sir Herbert Holt, for the disappearance of the income tax, against the recommendations of the labour congress? What about his own requests of millions to dredge the St. Charles river and to build Canadian National railway terminals at Quebec?

"The provinces would do more for Canada than would the federal authorities." What about the reduction of the debt of this country and the general reduction of the burden of taxation, the extension of our domestic and foreign trade, the settlement of labour troubles, the wonderful work done by federal research experts and civil servants, the policy of this government in regard to imperial matters, and so forth? I quote from the Montreal Gazette of January 10, 1928:

> In introducing a large delegation of the trades and labour congress of Canada, Mr. Tom Moore, the chairman, took occasion to compliment the (federal) government upon its labour legislation. He particularly approved the government's old age pension scheme and asked that any changes which the government might see fit to introduce which would make easier the acceptance of the measure by some of the provinces would be welcomed. The government was also commended for its enactment of the Trade Mark and Designs Act, which now enables the labour organizations to register and probably protect their union labels, etc.
>
> The congress also noted with satisfaction the treaty of the Canadian National Steamships giving effect to their recommendations for the carrying on of the West Indies service by a government owned line in cooperation with the Canadian National Railways; the act amending the Workmen's Compensation Act respecting government employees; amendments to the income tax; the acts encouraging the use of Canadian mined coal and others.

"He was not asking anything at all for his province!" Such a proud declaration does not prevent the federal government from taking every possible means to help our province, as well as the sister provinces, against his will. But although the artisan who receives fair wages does not require so badly the help of the state as the one who is insufficiently paid, although the artisans of the province of Quebec are the least remunerated in the Dominion, and although the five sister provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario have already accepted the old age pension scheme, he for instance even refusees any assistance from the federal government in that connection.

I am happy to congratulate the Minister of Labour upon having gone yesterday to

Toronto by airplane to sign the old age pension contract with the representatives of the provincial government of Ontario.

In that momentous gathering of the official representatives of the federal and provincial governments, speaking on behalf of his province, he said that he was not asking for anything at all for his province. Was that declaration criticized by the provincial opposition? No; it was approved by them. I have as much personal regard for Mr. Sauve, the leader of the Quebec opposition, as for Mr. Taschereau, and I do not understand how he would have unreservedly praised the attitude of the Quebec premier at the Dominion-provincial conference. In fact, two months afterwards, he concluded his speech on the address with these words:

> The Prime Minister at this conference took a part which honoured his province, his government and his race. I say this to render justice to him, even at the risk of drawing upon myself reproaches and not figuring in the least that the Prime Minister will long remember my expression of sentiment.

This is from The Gazette, Montreal, January, 13, 1928.

It is to be noted that Mr. Sauve has never been censured by his followers for such a declaration.

Evidently no blame can be put on the federal authorities for the difficulties and low wages of labour in the province of Quebec. As the situation of labour is satisfactory in most of the other provinces, why is it not so in Quebec? What is the local cause of such unfair treatment? Why does capital enjoy there such excessive earnings at the expense of labour? The astonishing and appalling figures that have been given call for immediate relief and for the kind consideration of the best friend of labour amongst labour men in this country. I mean our active and competent Minister of Labour (Mr. Heenan), who himself comes from the ranks of labour.

May I quote some clippings from the press in regard to the activities of the Minister of Labour since he has been in office? The following is from the Toronto Star, as quoted by the Ottawa Citizen, June, 29, 1927:

> Canada's act making an attempt at conciliation before the declaration of a strike or lock-out was torpedoed by a verdict of the privy council. The damage thus done may not be serious if the Dominion always has a Minister of Labour as earnest and as persistent as Peter Heenan in seeking to maintain industrial peace.

Then in the Brockville Recorder of November 10, 1927, I find the following:

> Following other triumphs in the settlement of labour troubles, he has been successful in bringing peace in the Toronto building trades and has thus earned the gratitude and the congratulations of the mayor of that city, no small achievement for any member of any Liberal ministry.

Then, in the Sydney Record of November 25, 1927, appeared this statement:

> He is useful and successful because he knows the labour problems from the labour point of view and because, at the same time, he has an equipment of mind and character which makes him fair and reasonable in dealing with capital.

Again from the Sydney Record:

> They (Premier Rhodes and his ministers) haven't brought about a satisfactory settlement of the present coal wage dispute, and if settlement comes it will be as a result of the intervention of Hon. Peter Heenan, federal Minister of Labour, who had to come into the case because of the failure of Hon. G. S. Harrington to bring the operators and miners to terms.

Then I quote from the Halifax Citizen of December 2, 1927:

> He is a labour man and appears to be a real live wire with the right idea of getting into personal touch with labour all over Canada. His splendid work for old age pensions, his services in the Toronto strike, and his visit to the industrial centres of Nova Scotia, all give promise of better service from the department in the future.

Then I quote from the Oshawa Daily Times of March 31, 1928:

> In our opinion great credit is due to the Minister of Labour for coming to Oshawa in person and lending his good offices to bring about a settlement of the strike. His arrival here yesterday was, in our opinion, most opportune, and his wise counsel and fair dealing was, we believe, appreciated by both parties to the controversy. The people of Oshawa will have a higher opinion of Peter Heenan as a result of his visit here this week.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would like to know to what clipping agency my hon. friend subscribes in order to secure all these extracts.

Mr. POULIOT: There are many newspapers to which I personally subscribe, and I hardly think my hon. friends will object to these articles. Now I quote from The Beaver of November 1, 1928:

> When the Spruce Falls Pulp Company, controlled by American capital, obtained their timber limits they contracted to employ Canadian workmen. When they had a dispute with their men a few days ago, they replaced several by American workers. Hon. Peter Heenan immediately took the matter up personally. The men are to go back to work and a representative of the Labour Department will be on the ground to ensure absolute fairness. Our national Minister of Labour is alert and efficient in guarding the interests of the Canadian worker.

Then I quote from the Saskatoon Star of May 25, 1929:

Peace In Industry

Another factor in recent years has been the skill of Hon. Peter Heenan, the Dominion Minister of Labour, in conciliating workers and employees who fall out over wages, working conditions and recognition of unions. The latest illustration of Mr. Heenan's capacity as an arbiter of such disputes is his settlement of the plumbers' and steamfitters' strike in Toronto. This strike, according to the Toronto Globe, was peculiarly difficult to handle but the minister did the trick by calling a round table conference of the parties to the dispute. Once again, the Globe remarks, he lived up to his name as "Peter the Peacemaker".

Then I quote from the Fort William Times Journal of December 9, 1927:

He has seen the labour situation from the workers' side. . . . As an experienced labour man, he knows that trouble is best dealt with when it is caught in the bud, instead of being left to ripen to the full fruit. Hence comes his desire to leave behind him the reputation, as Minister of Labour, of having prevented more strikes than he settled.

Now I quote from the Port Arthur Chronicle of the same date:

It is Mr. Heenan's job to take a large share in making conditions contentful for the wage earners of the Dominion. . . . No Minister of Labour has applied himself to the work of the department over which he presides more assiduously than he.

My last quotation is from the Hamilton Labour World of May 30, 1929:

As Minister of Labour for the Dominion, Hon. Peter Heenan has made a name for himself in the settling of differences between employer and employee. The old arbitration board is a thing of the past, as has been manifested in the confidence placed in the ability of this stalwart to negotiate.

Strikes received short shift when the Hon. Mr. Heenan steps in, and he has established a record in early settlements when he gets into action. When everything fails, the human dynamo takes hold to show both sides where they are wrong. His slogan is, "Let nothing retard industry where reason should prevail."

The long years at the throttle give him an experience which could not be duplicated, for there he had courage, conviction and ability. The workers of Canada may justly be proud of their representative in the Dominion parliament, and they are.

Since by virtue of the act respecting his department the Minister of Labour "shall institute and conduct inquiries into important industrial questions, upon which adequate information may not at present be available", would it be possible for him to intervene in this case for the relief of the artisans of the province of Quebec?

I have just one further quotation to make; it is from the Brockville Recorder of December 9, 1927:

At a luncheon at Glace Bay in December, 1927, Mr. Heenan said to the representatives of the United Mine Workers of Cape Breton, "I want you to feel that I am a public servant, and if you need me, just press the button and I will come."

This is my point, Mr. Chairman: The products of Quebec are not sold at a lower price than the same products are sold by Ontario manufacturers, but the employees in Quebec are paid much less. That means a lost to labour and an undue surplus of profit to the manufacturer. This is a very bad situation, and it is the reason why I thought it proper to-night, although we are at the close of the session, to ask the Minister of Labour to investigate that situation in the interests of the workers of that province.

Mr. MANION: There is a matter which I wish to take up with the Minister of Labour; I refer to the recent appointment, I understand on the recommendation of the minister, of Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith as a delegate from Canada to the League of Nations. Before I continue my remarks I should like the minister to give us a statement of the reasons for appointing this lady to this position.

Mr. HEENAN: I wonder if the hon. member would not bring this up under the proper item?

Mr. MANION: There does not seem to be a proper item. I have looked them all over, and perhaps the minister might consider the question now since I must catch a train to-night.

Mr. HEENAN: Very well. I have been asked by the National Council of Women to send a lady delegate to the League of Nations each year to represent the women of Canada. Last year we sent over Mrs. Rogers of Winnipeg.

Mr. BENNETT: A Liberal.

Mr. HEENAN: You may know; I do not.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, you should know, and you do know.

Mr. HEENAN: I think I might be as good a judge of the ladies as my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT: Get away from all that guff and get down to business; you do know.

Mr. MANION: Is that all the minister has to say?

Mr. HEENAN: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not all; we will get more later on.

Mr. MANION: I do not know the lady at all, but I know something of her political record and I know something of her activities

since her appointment to this position. Of course there is no objection to a lady who is a Liberal being appointed to the position, any more than there would be objection to a lady who was a Conservative or a lady who represented the Progressive party or any other party, but this lady has a political record which is distinctly partisan. Not only was her previous political record so distinctly partisan, but since she received this appointment it has continued to be very partisan. I think the minister is to be criticized for not stopping her political activities after this appointment was made. This lady was president of the Liberal Association at British Columbia; she then became a member of the local legislature; she became a minister without portfolio; then she lost the confidence of the people of British Columbia to such an extent that she had to change her riding, and she was defeated in the new riding. She then came to Ottawa and was appointed president of the ladies' Liberal federation of Canada—I think that is the name, but I am not sure. There is nothing wrong with all that, except that she had lost the confidence of the people of British Columbia and, therefore, I doubt if she has the confidence of the ladies of Canada. After having been appointed to this position she certainly lost the confidence of half the ladies of this country, those who are Conservatives, because she passed from one end of the country to the other making political speeches; she showed the bad taste of making political speeches after she had been given this appointment by the Minister of Labour.

After all, the League of Nations is an organization which we all wish to see succeed. It is non-political in every way and is an organization which all right-minded people desire to be of the greatest use to the world. A large proportion of the people of Canada have the desire to see the League of Nations successful, because it is an organization for the purpose of spreading peace throughout the world. That being the case, how can the Minister of Labour or the government expect a lady with such partisan political leanings to represent truly the women of Canada? How can they expect the women of all political persuasions in this country to take any interest in the League of Nations when a woman is appointed who has shown so much political partisanship after her appointment? She travelled one end of the country to the other making political speeches, and although I cannot prove my statement I have no doubt that she travelled at the expense of the government. I object, not as a Conservative, but as a Canadian, to any representative of ours travelling under the aegis of the League of Nations and making political speeches. I object to her or any other representative of the people of Canada at the League of Nations making a political football out of that organization. I would like to get, and I think the committee should get from the Minister of Labour the absolute assurance that when this lady comes back her political activities will be stopped while she is more or less in the pay of the people of Canada, because the government of this country is not a political party; the government represents the people of the country while it is in power, and she should be instructed by the Minister of Labour or by the government to keep away from any political partisanship when she is speaking to the people on the question of the League of Nations, until her appointment expires. Let her stick to the League of Nations and keep away from politics.

Mr. HEENAN: Without discussing at the moment whether or not we should select a lady or any other person because of political leanings, I would say to my hon. friend that Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith has not travelled through Canada at the expense of the government making political speeches. Mrs. Smith is receiving only her expenses, the same as any other delegate to the International Labour Conference receives.

Mr. MANION: Her home is in Vancouver; she would have her expenses paid as far as Ottawa, and on her way down here she was making political speeches.

Mr. HEENAN: That is not right.

Mr. BENNETT: She made one in this city.

Mr. HEENAN: She attended a meeting here in the city.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister seems to forget the fact that this delegate selected by this government is a resident of Vancouver and she has been making political speeches and organizing the Liberal women of the country ever since she was appointed president of the Liberal Women's Association at Ottawa in convention assembled. All that is very praiseworthy, so far as the Liberal party is concerned; they have the right to select Mrs. Smith or anyone else they desire, but having selected her I submit that she should not continue to act as a partisan and at the same time represent Canada at the League of Nations. By selecting the head of the Liberal women of this country and

sending her to the League of Nations as our representative the government is placing half the women of this country who are Conservatives at a disadvantage when she comes back and utilizes her position to advance the interests of her party. She did that before she left and she promised that she was going to speak to them when she returned. Is that fair, is that right, is that just, or is that promoting the cause of peace? Is that advancing the interests of the League of Nations? Is it fair to the people of this country who have endeavoured to keep the League of Nations out of politics to select such a woman as a delegate? If it was the desire of the government to select a public woman, surely we had one in our own midst in this very parliament whom we might have sent to the League of Nations. If it was right to select Mrs. Rogers from Winnipeg, who was a Liberal member of the legislature, and Mrs. Smith, who has been defeated for office more than once, why should we not select one of our own members, the first woman we have had in our parliament? I am sure that there would have been no objection raised, as this member does not occupy a position which is connected with either of the two older political parties of the country.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): She never makes any political speeches?

Mr. BENNETT: The voice of Weyburn has spoken. That being so, I do say to the Minister of Labour that in all fairness to the people of this country and to the women of this country who are not all of one political faith, he has not treated them fairly and he has not treated the League of Nations fairly by selecting the head of a great political organization, the Liberal Women's Association of Canada, to represent the women of Canada at the League of Nations. When she returns the Conservative women are going to stay away from her meetings because she will be a political propagandist and it is not fair and right to ask women to attend who have taken an active interest in the work of the League of Nations. When the right hon. the Prime Minister returned from the League of Nations we all attended a banquet given in his honour because he was the head of the government of this country, but when Mrs. Smith returns a condition will be created which will preclude many women from taking an active interest in the work of the League of Nations.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely my hon. friend is not serious?

Mr. BENNETT: I am very serious.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The government is not supposed to select neutrals as delegates to the League of Nations. There are very few people of that classification in Canada, and this is the first time such a doctrine has been propounded. I have been to the Leauge of Nations, and I was not a neutral then and I am not now.

Mr. BENNETT: But the hon. minister represented the government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: When I was there I saw many lady delegates. There was a member from the British House of Commons, a supporter of the government of the day, and I am sure that she had been making speeches in her own country. A delegate to the International Labour Conference or to the League of Nations is not a civil servant—far from it. People would not undertake such work if they had to renounce their right to their own opinions upon public affairs. The men or women who are qualified to represent this country are those who have views of their own upon the public affairs of Canada. This lady has occupied very high positions in her own province and elsewhere. I remember when I came to parliament twenty-five years ago, Mrs. Smith was holding in Ottawa meetings which women and men of all political persuasions attended, when she was advocating the doctrine of suffrage for women. She has been one of the pioneers in the country in getting the vote for women. She has been interested in social and public matters all her life. Does the fact that she happens to have been elected president of the Liberal women of Canada disqualify her from being appointed to represent Canada on a body dealing with social matters, such as the International Labour Conference? She is not disqualified and she has the right to make speeches on public affairs in Canada. She is not an employee of this government.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then why all this storm? Mrs. Smith has just as much right to air her views as my hon. friend has or I have, and this does not in any way disqualify her from representing the country at an international conference. I think it is a reflection on the women of Canada that they should be told that they cannot speak their minds on public matters, that if they do they must stay at home, that they can have no place in the representation of the country. My hon. friends are absolutely wrong in regard to the matter. Mrs. Smith has the right

to do what she has done, and I congratulate the Minister of Labour on having appointed a lady who will bring credit to her country at the International Labour Conference.

Mr. MANION: With all due respect, I differ entirely from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know my hon. friend does.

Mr. MANION: I know I do, and that is something I am proud of. I absolutely differ from him in this, that I believe no woman who is having her expenses paid from her home to the League of Nations, has the right to air her political views when she is representing all the women of this country. The only reflection made on the women of Canada has been made by the Minister of Justice in saying that she can do so. I would urge the same thing if she were airing Conservative views under the same circumstances. Nobody is taking issue with Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith's politics.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mrs. Smith.

Mr. MANION: I said Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I did not hear it.

Mr. MANION: I submit that Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith, when she was appointed to represent the people of Canada and being paid her expenses by all the people of this country, should have the good taste, even if the Minister of Justice does not have it, to agree to keep away from politics for the two or three months she is representing the people of Canada. When she returns and ceases to represent the people of this country, she can talk her politics and nobody can object to that. But when she is representing a whole people, she has no right to make herself a political partisan and represent only a few of them.

Miss MACPHAIL: I really think that a person who is appointed to go to the League of Nations represents all the people in a rather peculiar sense. I think it is quite right to say "Mary Ellen Smith," but if the Minister of Justice prefers "Mrs. Smith," I am quite willing to say that. If it was government money that helped Mrs. Smith to travel across Canada; if it was government money that paid her expenses to come here, she had no right to make political speeches as she did. I should like to ask the leader of the opposition and also the Minister of Labour who, I think, divided the women into half Liberals and half Conservatives, how they arrive at that. They are not quite half Liberals and half Conservatives, I am very happy to say. I am a little fearful that women have been driven into the old parties without really digesting what it is all about. I am still hoping that some day they may know. May I make this suggestion? I made it in private to the government, or at least to the Prime Minister in 1926. It would be a very fine thing if we started to send parliamentary representatives to the League of Nations, and I at that time suggested Sir George Foster, because I thought he had done such splendid work for peace. This was not to the labour end of the league, but to the assembly. It is the people of Canada who are represented there and we should pretty soon get away from the idea of always having partisan representatives, and representing only one party in the house. We are pretty much in agreement; there is not much quarrel amongst us on the subject, and the government, if it wanted to do so, might see that such a man as Sir George Foster, for instance, was honoured by being sent as a representative of the Canadian parliament. I believe he is attending the league in any case whether he has been sent by the country or not. That is all I have to say on the matter. I quite agree with the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Fort William; they are quite right in contending that the women of Canada will more or less resent the fact that all the appointments have been strictly partisan. Nobody can deny that. The appointments of the women have been as strictly partisan as those of the men.

Mr. HEENAN: I can hardly let this pass without saying a few words. My esteemed friend from Southeast Grey is not quite fair in the matter because, being the only lady member of the house, she could very well have answered the leader of the opposition when he said that the lady member of the house might have been sent. The lady member herself could have answered that suggestion. I do not care to answer it.

Miss MACPHAIL: May I do so? I could have been the representative sent, but as all the other women were partisans, I feared to accept the offer because I did not want to be thought a partisan.

Mr. HEENAN: Hon. members will see now by direct evidence that we tried to get away from being partisans so far as the ladies were concerned. Seeing that the political aspect of the ladies has been mentioned, I understand there is a Miss Carmichael from Nova Scotia who was appointed on one delegation. Hon. gentlemen opposite will know her politics much better than I do.

Mr. BENNETT: She is a very strong Liberal. Go on with the next one.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Head of the organization.

Mr. HEENAN: Thank heaven she is a strong Liberal, because she is a very smart woman. She is from the maritimes. Then we had Mrs. Thorburn from Ottawa.

Mr. BENNETT: Another Liberal.

Mr. HEENAN: That shows that she is a lady of good judgment.

Mr. BENNETT: President of the local Liberal Association.

Mr. HEENAN: Then we had a lady from the middle west, Mrs. Rogers.

Mr. BENNETT: A Liberal member of a legislature.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is the objection to a woman being a Liberal?

Mr. MANION: We were not objecting to the woman being a Liberal, but to her airing her Liberal views while representing the whole people of the country.

Mr. HEENAN: Hon. members can see that we have selected ladies who have been prominent in the public life of the country, who have been elected by the people as their representatives. My hon. friend from Fort William has narrowed down his objections now to the point where these ladies ought not to make speeches.

Mr. MANION: I did not narrow down my objections at all. Those have been my objections from the beginning. I have made no other objections.

Mr. HEENAN: I said: He has narrowed them down.

Mr. MANION: I did not narrow them down.

Mr. HEENAN: I said: He has narrowed them down from the time he first rose to his feet, because he went on to say that she had lost the confidence of the people of British Columbia—

Mr. MANION: So she did.

Mr. HEENAN: —that she had lost the confidence of the women of this country. Then when the hon. member for Southeast Grey agreed with him in regard to the travelling expenses, he said: That is the whole objection.

Mr. MANION: That is the whole objection, too. I was simply giving her record in a general way before I gave my objection. My objection was to her talking politics while she was representing the people of Canada and having her expenses paid by the people of Canada.

Mr. HEENAN: I will give the other side of the record. Unfortunately the lady is a widow and has no one to defend her. I am surprised that hon. members in any part of this house would take advantage—

An hon. MEMBER: Of a widow.

Mr. HEENAN: —of a lady who has done more for social legislation than any other woman in this country, whose husband was president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, who has been elected several times to the British Columbia legislature, who has been a member of the British Columbia government, and who has been head of nearly every ladies' organization of which she has been a member. I wonder if hon. gentlemen would say that she has lost the confidence of the women of this country when only a few days ago a resolution was passed by the National Council of Women thanking the government for appointing Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith to be a delegate to the International Labour Conference.

Mr. MANION: She lost the confidence of her constituents when she was defeated. That is all I said.

Mr. HEENAN: Has every member on the other side lost the confidence of the people because he was defeated at some time or other?

Mr. MANION: He has lost the confidence of his constituents if he is defeated.

Mr. HEENAN: Mrs. Smith is an ex-regent, Municipal Chapter, I.O.D.E.; past president, Women's Canadian Club; past president Women's Forum (Women's Ratepayers' Association of Vancouver); past regent of Primary Chapter, I.O.D.E.; member of the Suffrage League of Canada, having as its object the passing of protective legislation and the fostering of same. Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith was one lady, like Mrs. Rogers of Winnipeg, who stood on the floor of the legislature and advocated and fought for the passing of legislation in their respective provinces pertaining to old age pensions. I have here a long list of the activities in which Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith has been engaged.

An hon. MEMBER: Read it all.

Mr. HEENAN: It is too long. Just within the last two or three days, while she has been overseas and since she has been engaged in these political activities, the Na-

tional Council of Women passed a resolution thanking the government for appointing Mrs. Smith to represent the women of Canada. Consequently I do not think it is fair that hon. gentlemen, a body of men, should stand up in this house and try to discredit Canada's delegate to the conference while she is over there.

Mr. MANION: Nobody is trying to discredit her.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly the hon. member for Fort William, whether it is any worse for Mrs. Smith to be airing her political views while she holds this position than for an hon. member to air his political views while he is a member of the Ontario liquor control board.

Mr. POULIOT: I like to hear the hon. member for Fort William, who always makes nice speeches. He made nice speeches for his party in this house when he was a liquor commissioner for the province of Ontario, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MANION: What has that to do with the League of Nations?

Mr. POULIOT: I do not blame him for doing that, but he was in exactly the same position as Mrs. Smith. I would ask the Minister of Labour if he could intervene for the relief of the Quebec labour men.

Mr. KAISER: I would like to say a word in reply to the request made of the hon. Minister of Labour—"Can you do something for the labouring men of Quebec and other parts of Canada?" I understand that it is the business of the minister and his department to supervise contracts in which public money is being spent in Canada, that it is their business to see that a fair wage clause is inserted in those contracts. I think it is also their business to see that the work that is done under these contracts, and which is paid for out of the public treasury, should be given to the people of Canada. We do not need to go outside the city of Ottawa to see a very striking example of work being given to people outside of this country. We spent a tremendous sum of money to build in Ottawa a very fine hotel. I went through it the other day for the first time and I was delighted with it. I was quite charmed with the totem poles I saw there, and I saluted those pagan gods. I was charmed with the gurgling waters of the fountain. With another member of parliament I proceeded to examine the furniture that was there, and the only furniture that I could examine at all thoroughly was the chairs—the rest were all too big to examine. We turned the chairs upside down and we observed on them a remarkable motto. The first word of the motto was "Made". I could not see very well with the glasses I was wearing, and for a moment I thought that the motto read "Made in Kincardine." I thought I had something on the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but on looking at it a little more closely I discovered that the words were "Made in Czechoslovakia." Does the Minister of Labour know that money is being spent out of the public treasury of this country in that way? Does he take any interest in those contracts at all? I would suggest that when the next election comes around the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Trade and Commerce march around under a banner on which are the words "Made in Czechoslovakia" and that they sing a duet to the workingmen of Canada as they salute their banner, singing, "O, Canada, I stand on guard for thee."

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask the minister to tell the committee if he can intervene on behalf of the Quebec labour men.

Mr. HEENAN: I think my hon. friend from Temiscouata will appreciate that the government has very little to do with contracts between labour and employers except when there are disputes, but as this matter has been brought up under the conciliation vote I would suggest that if my hon. friend and the Premier of Quebec cannot settle their disagreement I shall be glad to appoint a board of conciliation to arbitrate between the two. So far as the government of Quebec is concerned, I do know this, that of late they have been coming up to date. They have recently passed a minimum wage act for women and girls, and the legislation is on a fair level with that of the province of Ontario, which I consider is the best province in the Dominion.

Mr. CAHAN: The best province or the best legislation?

Mr. HEENAN: Oh, the best province.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Does the minister consider Ontario more advanced in social legislation than British Columbia?

Mr. HEENAN: I will give you credit out there. The social legislation Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith was instrumental in—

Mr. PLUNKETT: The people of British Columbia—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HEENAN: Last session they accepted a resolution requiring the insertion of a fair wage clause in pulp and paper mill and water-power contracts. It is probably the second province in Canada to accept that principle. They have put into operation an up-to-date workmen's compensation act. So taking all in all the province is doing fairly well. As between employer and employee, I do not think any government, either provincial or federal, will interfere with any contract between employer and employee.

Item agreed to.

Administration, Employment Offices' Co-ordination Act, $17,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there ought to be a much closer arrangement between the Department of Immigration and the employment agencies as operated under the Department of Labour. I should like to read two or three paragraphs from a letter that I received about two months ago, simply because this very well illustrates the position in which a great many casual labourers find themselves in this country. The writer used to be in British Columbia; I knew him there some years ago. For a time he was a settler on a farm there. Then he says:

> Owing to my wife's death our home in British Columbia was broken up and I went back to bush work, which I had followed up when I was a single man.
>
> This fall I happened to be in Ottawa after doing a summer's work in Ontario, working as navvy on the new highways. Well soon I was broke, had to go to work again. Engaged as general bushman at thirty-five dollars a month, board and bunk found, went down the Soo to work. Well when we got there we found the camp full of Swedes. Started work November 5th and finished work January 30th. Well after paying train fare here and living expenses got a few needful lumbermen's clothes, etc., I was broke. Then I found myself in Port Arthur destitute, stone broke. So had to go to the police station. I asked the police officer if I was to commit a crime or what. I wanted the right to work to live. They said, commit no crime but come up and the magistrate will sentence you under charge of vagrancy—no visible means of support. I got two months at the industrial farm. There were several I found at the farm in the same boat, no work, but the farm. Well, I came out of the jail farm at Fort William this morning. The work there is all right, food and bunk good, but the disgrace of mixing up and being locked up with petty thieves, etc. Surely there can be something done better than jail hard-working men.

Then he comments on the cause of himself and other men being placed in this position. He says:

> Now, as I said when I arrived at the Soo camp it was full of Swedes. We the British-speaking men were fired when the logs and roads were finished, the Swedes were kept on because they had been imported for twelve months' work, after the sleigh haul they were to start in the saw-mill. You see, sir, the timber companies know a thing or two about labour—every year they import green young men from Europe to stop the older men from organization to better thirty-five dollars a month, etc. So the new blood is kept on and the older bushmen take down the road. If broke we go to jail as vagrants.

I venture to read those paragraphs because in their own way, in not the very best English, they very well put the situation in which a great many casual labourers find themselves to-day. And we have to remember that a great deal of the construction work, bush work and harvest work across this country is carried on by these same transient labourers. It does seem that so long as there is a supply of these men in this country we have absolutely no right to admit any others. I think the labour department has a responsibility to insure that these men's jobs are protected. In this case the foreign-born men were given the preference, and men who had been for the greater part of their lives in this country were left jobless. What does the Minister of Labour propose to do in such a case? The other day the Minister of Immigration said that it was not his responsibility. The Minister of Labour was present, I think, when his colleague said: "That is a matter the labour employment bureaux will have to take care of." So he got through his estimates in that way. Now, I ask the Minister of Labour—

Mr. FORKE: Taking a bare statement and placing it before the committee as my considered opinion is not fair.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have not Hansard here, but I thought I was being fair.

Mr. FORKE: I do not deny using those words, but you should give the context leading up to them.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: My impression is that the Minister of Immigration took the ground that he could not be responsible for employment in such cases.

Mr. HEENAN: A specific case was mentioned.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so. But here is another case, and there are a great many of a similar kind, so I should like to ask the Minister of Labour how this difficulty can be obviated. I do not care whether the matter is taken up by the Department of Immigration or by the Department of Labour.

I want to see these transient labourers protected in their livelihood and not sent to gaol as this man was, in order to obtain a little to eat and a place in which to sleep.

Mr. HEENAN: In what month was it?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The letter is dated Fort William, March 30. The man had been in gaol two months and had just been released that morning.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): The case cited by the member for Winnipeg North Centre is one that occurs, to some degree at least, quite often. Men who move around from one province to another, two-thirds of the way across Canada, very often find themselves in difficulties. The hon. member has not given us any statement as to the character of this man or why he was sent to gaol, but surely when the authorities took that course there must have been something wrong with the man. Otherwise it is an accusation against the civil authorities.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, Mr. Chairman. I explained that the man found himself absolutely destitute and went to the authorities and asked if he could be put in gaol or given a lodging and food. At his own request he was placed in gaol.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): For two months?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: For vagrancy.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Even then it is a reflection on the civil authorities, not on the Minister of Labour at all. I have seen many men drifting around the country, knowing that when they got stuck they would get, in the common parlance of the casual labourer, grubstaked to a job. To complain that certain Scandinavians at the Soo were held on while this man was let out, is hardly fair. Everybody who is connected with bush work knows that Scandinavians as a rule are first class men, and lumber companies like other employers will keep the men who are most valuable to them. On the strength of a letter from a particular man who finds himself in unfortunate circumstances and about whom we know little, it is hardly fair to criticise the Minister of Labour. These men of their own volition wander up and down the country and take a certain amount of pleasure in seeing the country and moving around. Generally I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in his views on labour, but this is something that occurs frequently and it cannot be stopped by any Minister of Labour.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I gave this as a concrete instance. I have been up and down this country for the last twenty years and I know very intimately the position of these casual workers all the way from here to the coast, and I could give from my own personal knowledge scores and scores of cases like this; or I could take statistics to illustrate the situation. I do not think I need to tell the Minister of Labour that frequently native born Canadians have their places taken by newly arrived immigrants, and I should like him to inform the committee what steps he proposes to take in order to prevent this injustice being perpetuated.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): The hon. member has certainly used this case as an illustration of the complaint he was making.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: An illustration, yes; of course I did.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): He based his argument on that instance.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No; I did not base it on that instance; I gave the instance as an illustration.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I am pointing out that hundreds of men go "booming," as they themselves say, over the country. This man was working in British Columbia and he wandered to Sault Ste. Marie and Fort William, and we all know that throughout the country there is a large amount of casual labour to be obtained between those points at the time he went there.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I have two telegrams from Calgary dealing with this question. These telegrams were sent to me by the Trades and Labour Council of that city. For some reason or other the new arrivals land in Calgary every year in the spring. In this wire from the Trades and Labour Council no blame is laid on the Minister of Labour himself, but the statement is made that last week a number of continentals arrived through colonization associations. I know the particular colonization society in Calgary, but it is difficult to ascertain where they get these new continentals. At any rate, every year a number of these people—continentals, as this communication says—arrive in Calgary and take jobs at lower wages than those current in the city. The Trades and Labour Council also refer to the fair wage clause, which varies in the different departments. The gist of their representation is that there is not a uniform wage clause so far as the Dominion government is concerned, and I trust that the Minister of Labour will take cognizance of this telegram with a view to devising one uniform provision which shall apply to all contracts let by the Dominion,

and which he will be in a position to supervise. I have no doubt the minister realizes the importance of uniformity in this matter; he knows how desirable it is to have one wage clause which can be put into force by himself, obviating conflict as between one department and another. This telegram states that they know the Minister of Labour has done his best to enforce the act and to observe the minimum wage clause, and I just want to impress upon the minister the fact that if a uniform wage clause is not adopted it will simply prevent both himself and the labour council from properly enforcing the act. I do not know of any department of the government with which I have been more closely in touch than that of the Minister of Labour, particularly this session, for I have been there nearly every day in connection with a very serious wage dispute about which he knows; and so far as his department is concerned I can say I have received every consideration. And the Trades and Labour Council have so stated here. I hope that this question of uniformity in the matter of the fair wage clause will be seriously considered by the Minister of Labour, and I should be glad to be able to go back with the news that in future the various clauses will be eliminated and one uniform wage clause adopted which will enable the minister to enforce the provision more effectively and to the greater advantage of the labouring classes.

Mr. BENNETT: Why is it that, notwithstanding the minister's deep concern to have provision for an eight hour day inserted in contracts for public works, workmen who left Halifax under Mr. MacMillan and workmen who went to Churchill and have been employed directly by the government, are compelled to work ten hours a day with time and a half for work beyond that?

Mr. HEENAN: I have no direct knowledge of the case my hon. friend speaks of, but the eight hour provision is not in all public contracts. The custom which prevails in the particular district is what obtains in the fair wage clause. The government does not fix wages or conditions or hours of employment.

Mr. BENNETT: An eight hour day was agreed to in the Treaty of Versailles.

Mr. HEENAN: Yes; but the prevailing rate of wages is paid and the conditions are those that prevail in the district. I have no knowledge of the case to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. BENNETT: Does not the minister read the reports of the public accounts committee which are printed and which show that the contracts were produced in evidence? The statement was made by his colleague, the Minister of Railways the other night in answer to a question of mine as to what were the hours of labour at Churchill on work for the government of Canada. The Minister of Railways said ten hours.

Mr. HEENAN: I do not know anything about it. In regard to the question asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Woodsworth), the problem he has stated is an important one and one which I wish I could solve at once. In cooperation with the provincial governments we have sixty-four employment offices just to take care of these transient workers. They get information free as to where vacancies occur, the rates of wages, the conditions of employment, and so forth, and last year we placed 470,000 men through the agency of these sixty-four offices. My hon. friend should consider his question in relation to immigration. There is only one way I know of whereby we could solve this problem and that would be to have a system which would allow to come in only as many men as there are jobs for.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Well, isn't that reasonable?

Mr. HEENAN: That would involve a change of policy in immigration matters; it would call for a new general policy. I would point out to my hon. friend that every time I mention anything about restrictive immigration some hon. gentleman opposite as well as some newspapers take exception to my views in that regard.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Labour will back you up.

Mr. HEENAN: Thank heaven for a little help anyway. With respect to the point raised by my hon. friend from East Calgary in regard to the fair wage clause, I may point out that we have in operation at the present time what might be called two wage policies.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Three.

Mr. HEENAN: There are two. One is where we contribute by public expenditure to any public contracts, public buildings and so forth; and the other is where we insert a clause in water-power leases providing that those who obtain the leases shall not pay less than the prevailing rate. But in the latter case the administration is different in that we have not provided that the decision of the Minister of Labour in the matter shall be final; it is more in the nature of a contract, and if they do not observe this particular section the

lease is subject to cancellation. However, I may tell my hon. friend that we intend changing the contracts so that the clause will be uniform from now on.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I want to give the minister credit for helping us fight that particular clause, which contained the words, "in similar undertakings." That prevented him from putting the fair wage clause into effect; if that were eliminated and a fair wage clause put in which was uniform we would not have had the difficulty we experienced in the past in this connection.

Mr. HEENAN: We will fix it.

Mr. HOWARD: I would like to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Ontario a moment ago, because I do not think we should let false information go out to the country. I happen to camp around the Chateau Laurier and I am proud to be there. The hon. member stated that all the furniture in the new wing of the Chateau Laurier was made in Czechoslovakia, but that is not the case. The furniture in the Chateau Laurier was purchased from three Canadian firms employing Canadian workmen, but there is one chair which is used not only in the Chateau Laurier but in every hotel on the North American continent, a bent wood chair, which is not manufactured anywhere in the world except in Czechoslovakia; that is the ballroom chair. With that exception every bit of furniture in the Chateau Laurier was made in Canada.

Mr. KAISER: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say there was only one chair in the Chateau not made in Canada?

Mr. HOWARD: One type of chair.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I notice that the Minister of Labour of the new government in Great Britain has announced that the eight hour day is to be enforced. I should like to know whether the eight hour day cannot be enforced at once in connection with the government's own work in Canada, and I should like to know what excuse the minister can offer for not having taken this action before now. There is no British North America Act to prevent him from doing so.

Mr. HEENAN: In answering my hon. friend from East Calgary the other day with regard to this point, I stated that the government had the matter under consideration and I hope to be able to satisfy my hon. friends before next session.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: The point brought up by the member for Winnipeg North Centre is of very great importance to every person who is sympathetic to labour in Canada. Labour throughout this country is vitally interested in a reasonably short work day. I quite understand that this government cannot legislate for the provinces generally in the matter of the eight hour day, but certainly this government has the power to put in the eight hour day in connection with government work, and if my hon. friend the minister deserves a thousandth part of the eulogy, the panegyric and the bouquets flung at him tonight by the hon. member for Temiscouata he should give a lead to industrial corporations in this matter. To say that we will have it next session is merely to say that although he has been eulogized as the greatest Minister of Labour we have ever known he has fallen down on one of the most vital questions concerning organized and unorganized labour throughout Canada. There is absolutely no reason for delay in this matter. When workingmen try to obtain a reasonably short working day, one which will give them an opportunity for recreation, a chance to improve their mental faculties and sufficient rest, they are generally met with the statement that the government of this country itself asks its employees on its public works to work ten hours a day, at a wage of twenty-five cents an hour. That is the situation with regard to the construction of wharves and breakwaters in the maritime provinces. My hon. friend has mentioned the application of a fair wage clause. I want to ask the minister why it is that when the Department of Public Works starts to construct a wharf somewhere in the maritime provinces they always base what they call their fair wage clause on the rate prevailing in that district for unorganized labour. Why do they not take the rate which has been obtained by the organized workmen through collective bargaining? If we are to judge by the minister's reply to-night he hardly merits the very splendid and carefully prepared eulogy sung by the hon. member for Temiscouata. I do not think there should be any further delay in this matter; if my hon. friend is a real friend of labour, as I believe he is, he should use those powers which he possesses as Minister of Labour to see that organized and unorganized labour throughout Canada have a reasonably short work day. He can do it with respect to government contracts; the matter brooks no delay, and there is absolutely no shadow or semblance of an excuse for delay.

Mr. SPENCER: I should like to refer to the report made by the select standing com-

mitte on industrial and international relations in 1926. At page 17 Mr. Bolton of the Department of Labour stated that what he considered a comfort budget was $2,400; I take that to be a budget giving a reasonable standard of living. I should like to ask the Minister of Labour if he thinks that figure is too high.

Mr. HEENAN: Perhaps my hon. friend would bring up that matter when we come to a later item which covers it.

Mr. SPENCER: Very well.

Item agreed to.

Fair wages and inspection, $10,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Would my last question come under this item?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I would like to ask the minister what is the status of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act at present. How many provinces have passed enabling legislation to make this act effective, in view of the decision of the privy council that it was ultra vires of the federal parliament?

Mr. HEENAN: All the provinces except Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Has the minister held any conferences with the governments of these two provinces with a view to having enabling legislation passed?

Mr. HEENAN: Yes, but only in an indirect way; I do not think the federal Minister of Labour has any right to tell the provincial governments what they should do in this connection. We placed this question before the Dominion-provincial conference and said it would make it much easier for us if they passed that legislation, but that has not been done as yet by those two provinces.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Not only is it the right, but it is the duty of the Minister of Labour to approach the provinces of Ontario and Quebec in an endeavour to have such legislation enacted. The old barbaric method of settlement by force still prevails in those provinces, and I think the minister should approach them with a view to having enabling legislation passed.

Mr. HEENAN: I have done that in an indirect way. The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada has been asking these provinces to pass enabling legislation, but up to the present time they have not done so.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Could not the minister use his good offices in an endeavour to have that done?

Mr. SPENCER: The minister has not answered my question.

Mr. HEENAN: Will the hon. member please repeat it?

Mr. SPENCER: On page 17 of the proceedings of the industrial and international relations committee of 1926, I find that Mr. Bolton of the Labour department gave what he called a comfort budget, or decent standard of living, as $2,400 for a family of five. I would like to know if the minister thinks that that figure is too high, or does he agree with it?

Mr. HEENAN: I think the hon. member will find that Mr. Bolton was only quoting what someone else had said; I do not think he gave that figure as his own.

Mr. SPENCER: A member who was present in the committee has told me that he gave the figure as being the correct one.

Mr. HEENAN: I think he was quoting Professor Douglas.

Mr. SPENCER: The average wage is given as $1,003 for a family of five. If my figures are correct, does not the minister think that there is something wrong with the prosperity of this country? The prosperity must be very one-sided if the average wage earner is only receiving $1,003 per year.

Mr. HEENAN: If that is the average wage, it is too low, but the hon. member will understand that the Minister of Labour does not regulate wages.

Mr. SPENCER: Could the minister give me the average earnings of farmers throughout Canada?

Mr. CAMPBELL: It is less than nothing.

Mr. HEENAN: The April number of the Labour Gazette contains considerable information at page 453. Conditions have not changed since 1925, and wages of $40, $45 and so on are mentioned. It gives the board, wages, the earnings of female workers and so on.

Mr. SPENCER: That is for farm labour?

Mr. HEENAN: Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: Could the minister give me the net income of the farmers?

Mr. HEENAN: We have no statistics for the farmers.

Item agreed to.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $20,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What was the expenditure last year?

Mr. HEENAN: The total vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is this vote for overhead, or are there extra expenses in connection with particular investigations?

Mr. HEENAN: It is for all expenses in connection with the boards.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It apparently does not make very much difference whether or not they are acting, the overhead remains the same.

Mr. HEENAN: Oh, no, it depends upon the number of boards which are appointed. The expenditures in round figures for the past few years have been as follows:

1923-24	$25,000
1924-25	35,000
1925-26	3,000
1926-27	17,000
1927-28	20,000
1928-29	20,000

Mr. CAMPBELL: Could the minister give us some particulars as to the disputes investigated last year?

Mr. HEENAN: There were twenty-two applications made last year; thirteen boards were established and the remainder were settled by conciliation without establishing boards.

Item agreed to.

International Labour Conference, $20,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): We have been voting in this parliament from time to time very large sums of money in connection with this international conference, but the only result seems to be to furnish political planks which appear in the platforms of both parties. I am at a loss to find any other benefit in connection with these votes. Every time the Labour men in the house rise and ask for the application of the definite pledges of the political party in power, the answer is made that that is purely a matter for provincial legislation. Would it not be better if this money were voted for the purpose of endeavouring to encourage the provinces to undertake the sending of delegates to this International Labour Conference? Those delegates could return and the political parties in the provinces could put these planks into their platforms and we might get some legislation put through. Possibly the Department of Labour at Ottawa could act as a coordinating body in an endeavour to standardize the legislation of the different provinces, but at the present time I am at a loss to know what value there is in our sending delegates so long as this parliament takes the attitude that it has no power to pass the necessary legislation.

Mr. HEENAN: We are obligated under the peace treaty to make this appropriation for the purpose. I agree with my hon. friend that it would be better if the provinces took an interest in this matter. I might inform my hon. friend that every year we invite the provinces to send delegates to this conference.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Have they ever done that?

Mr. HEENAN: On two or three occasions, I am informed. The question was discussed during the Dominion-provincial conference. The government stated to the provinces that if they would get together and select one delegate representing the provinces we would name him as a Dominion representative. We offered to do that, but so far they have not got together to select a delegate to represent the provinces.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The statement of the minister would indicate quite clearly that he is of much the same opinion as I am with regard to this vote, namely, that until the provinces are as fully apprised as his delegates are of the situation at these international conferences, it is unlikely that we are going to get as speedy action as labour really requires and is justified in asking. Is the minister in further communication with the provinces at this time in regard to the matter, and when will the next international conference be held?

Mr. HEENAN: We asked the provinces again this year if they would name delegates or advisers and they have not done so. Therefore we do the next best thing; we select delegates and advisers from as many of the provinces as we can, consistent with the vote.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): When is the next conference?

Mr. HEENAN: There are two this year. There is the maritime conference in the fall, and of course there is this one every year.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: How many accompanied the minister to Geneva when he attended the economic conference? What are their names, and what was the total expense of that joy trip?

Mr. HEENAN: Does the hon. member mean those who accompanied me?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Yes.

Mr. HEENAN: Mrs. R. A. Rogers of Winnipeg; Mr. T. J. Cochrane of Ottawa, who, by the way, is a British Columbia man; Mr. H. B. McKinnon of Kenora, and Mr. O. Filion of Montreal.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It seems to me that we ought not to let our obligations under the Versailles treaty and the Washington conference pass by so lightly as we are doing. Either we as a nation were serious in signing that treaty and those conventions or we were not. I recognize there are certain constitutional difficulties, but I should like to take the broad ground that if we have the right to sign the treaty, we have the power to see that its terms are enforced.

Mr. BENNETT: In our own work at any rate.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes; and even in a broader way than in our own work. I would say it is our responsibility to see that its terms are enforced. In the British North America Act there are certain clauses regarding residual powers which can be readily interpreted as giving us the power to enforce treaties, and if the government were serious about this matter we could have these treaties enforced. We have held up before us on every occasion the provisions of the British North America Act and we are told that we cannot do anything. I have already pointed out in one instance to-day that the government is not attempting to give us the eight-hour day even on its own public works. There are in the public service of Canada men who are working seven days a week and no attempt whatever is being made to give them one day's rest in seven.

Mr. ROBB: Is my hon. friend referring to the ministers of the crown?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not, although some of them must work very long hours. Indeed some of us object to being called upon to work until twelve o'clock midnight after having commenced at eight, but that is the government's own responsibility in that matter. There are in the government service, employees who are working seven days a week. There are others who are working at less than a minimum wage. We have again and again brought that to the attention of the government. There are civil servants who are getting less than $100 a month, only $85, a month. I have repeatedly urged the government to bring the salaries of its own employees up to a decent standard of living, but nothing is done in that regard.

Early in the session I presented the plight of steel workers in Sydney who are working eleven hours by day and thirteen hours at night. They get one Sunday off in two weeks, and they make up for that by working on alternate fortnights for twenty-four hours on end. That is a scandal, a disgrace to any country that calls itself civilized. Yet when we bring this to the attention of the government they say simply: "Oh the British North America Act!"

"We are giving special concessions to that steel company, to all steel companies. There is the same situation at the Soo as at Sydney and to a lesser degree at Hamilton in connection with some of the continuous operations. We might make it a condition precedent to the giving of any sort of special consideration to the companies that their employees must not be permitted to work more than eight hours a day. That is quite within the power of the government, but year after year the matter is passed by, the government saying that it has no power. If we had in authority a government that wanted to enforce the provisions of the Versailles treaty, it could do it and do it at once. But it is easier to hold up excuses rather than frankly to face the problem. I can hardly understand the Prime Minister taking the attitude he does; I know he personally would like to see these reforms. He is an idealist; he has sympathy; but the fact remains that he is not taking any action with regard to these matters.

I am speaking now on the estimates of the Minister of Labour. He apparently, although personally sympathetic with labour, has not the power inside the cabinet to make his wishes prevail. I do not know whether he has courage enough to face the issue and force the government to take action along this line. But I know labour across the country has been waiting—waiting in vain for some action to be taken along this line. Three or four years ago in reviewing the sessions of 1921 to 1925 I remember taking up in detail the planks of the Liberal platform and showing that there had been no earnest effort to implement any of those planks in so far as they referred to labour. I do not know whether the situation would be any better if we had another government in power. Both the Liberals and the Conservatives, representing the major part of the membership of this house, are definitely pledged to the main planks in the platform of organized labour, and yet nothing happens. That is the situation we face. I cannot quite see

how the Minister of Labour, this human dynamo as to-night he has been characterized, can sit quietly, in face of this kind of thing, and refuse to give the little bit of that dynamic that would put these reforms into effect.

Item agreed to.

Joint Industrial Councils, $5,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the minister explain the relationship between this item and item 208, referring to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act? Are they not one and the same?

Mr. HEENAN: There is no relationship between the two items. As my hon. friend knows, the appropriation for the joint industrial councils was inserted in the estimates during the war. During the time there was unrest in this country it was thought if there were joint industrial councils, this might eliminate some of the industrial disputes. It was found that the government could not do very much; that it was a matter between employers and employees whether they would establish joint industrial councils or not. Therefore we have kept this item in the estimates purposely to keep the vote alive in case it might be needed.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Must we have another industrial upheaval before we get the councils?

Mr. HEENAN: It was thought that joint industrial councils might eliminate strife in part, but no one knows better than my hon. friend that you cannot establish joint industrial councils unless the workmen and the employers are themselves satisfied to establish them. There is an industrial council, for instance, in the very works where men are working, my hon. friend says, under disgraceful conditions, and I agree with him that they are working under disgraceful conditions.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In the steel plant at Sydney?

Mr. HEENAN: In the steel plant.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the minister mean that Bishoff scheme—the company union that is in operation there?

Mr. HEENAN: Yes.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I hope that we will not spend one cent to have anything of that character established.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. HEENAN: So do I. The fair wage officer that we have in Montreal is paid under this vote. He was appointed, not by the Civil Service Commission, but by the Union government during the war, and he has been giving very good service. We also intend to utilize this vote to pay expenses in connection with the national council for the civil service, which will be established I hope in a few weeks.

Item agreed to.

Administration, Old Age Pensions Act, $10,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: This does not cover all the cost of administration of the Old Age Pensions Act, does it?

Mr. HEENAN: The administration comes under the provinces. This is to provide for printing, travelling expenses and so forth. The vote was $5,000 last year, but owing to the other provinces coming in we expect a greater expenditure this year.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has the minister any indication to give as to whether Quebec and the maritime provinces will enter the scheme?

Mr. HEENAN: Nothing except that they have shown that they are interested by inquiring how the scheme is working out, the cost and so forth. We have no encouragement to say that they are coming in, other than the inquiries that have been made. But we are encouraged because of the fact that they have not said that they are not coming in.

Mr. SPENCER: Five provinces so far are taking advantage of the scheme?

Mr. HEENAN: Yes, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario.

Mr. ADSHEAD: How much has the Dominion government paid out in old age pensions so far?

Mr. HEENAN: For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929, $832,668.78. The total amount up to date paid out by the provinces is $1,928,277.58. The federal government pays half.

Item agreed to.

Labour — salaries, $251,450; contingencies, $30,000.

Mr. BENNETT: I desire to make a few observations with respect to the increased salaries of deputy ministers. I promised the other evening that I would do so. I find

that Mr. Fielding, speaking as Minister of Finance, in the House of Commons, in 1923, said:

The salaries of the deputies is a troublesome question at all times. We have adopted a rule, which when I mention it, I think will be accepted. It was felt at first that the salaries of the deputies were not high and that there was fair claim for consideration. Then it was argued with some force that regard must be had for length of service, and the decision we reached was that in the case of any deputy in active service at the head of a department who had a service to his credit of ten years or more, we would consider that he was entitled to an advance; but those whose terms of service were less than ten years were left out, but not because they were not capable or efficient, but because it was held, and I think with reason, that some regard should be had for the term of service. At all events that is the explanation. In every case where a deputy has served for ten years or more, and is in active service at the head of the department, he receives the increase, unless he already has the increased salary; but as to the others there is no discrimination, except that which arises from the term of service.

Looking over the salaries proposed for the various deputies as contained in the estimates, I find that some are to be increased by $2,000, others by $1,000, and others receive no increase. Some of these deputies have served ten years, some less than ten years. The deputy of the department now under discussion was appointed originally at $6,000. His salary was raised to $8,000, and now it is proposed to make it $9,000, although according to the record, he has not been in the service ten years altogether as deputy. He may have been longer in the service than ten years, because the records do not clearly indicate the length of service. What I am saying has nothing to do with respect to the individual; it applies merely to the office, and I am discussing the question from that standpoint.

I come to the next question, which I discussed briefly the other evening when we had under consideration the salary paid to the clerk of the privy council. If the committee will look at the revised statutes of Canada of 1927, chapter 22, the Civil Service Act, they will find the following in subsection 2:

2. (3) "deputy" or "deputy head" means and includes the deputy minister of the crown presiding over the department, the clerk of the privy council, the clerks of the senate and House of Commons, the librarians of parliament, the comptroller of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the superintendent of insurance—

His salary is increased:

—the Dominion archivist—

His salary also is increased:

—the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada and, in all cases in which such meaning is not inconsistent with his powers and duties under the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, the Auditor General.

2. (e) "head of the department" means the minister of the crown for the time being presiding over the department and includes the Speakers of the Senate and House of Commons.

I find that those are the only terms that are used with respect to them. The Prime Minister the other evening said that the clerk of the privy council is a deputy head. If he is a deputy head he is a deputy head by virtue of section 2 of chapter 22 of the revised statutes of 1927, which places in the same category, within the next few words, the clerks of the Senate and House of Commons, the librarians of parliament, the comptroller of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend will find that the clerk of the privy council is a deputy by virtue of the statute which relates to the privy council, and which was passed many years ago.

Mr. BENNETT: But the Civil Service Act distinctly says—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: For the purposes of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BENNETT: The Civil Service Act is what I have been reading from. I am reading from section 2 of chapter 22 of the revised statutes of 1927, and it says:

"deputy" or "deputy head" means and includes the deputy minister of the crown presiding over the department—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Referring to that act.

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly. It goes on:

the clerk of the privy council, the clerks of the Senate and House of Commons—

The significance given to those words is attached to them in all the other statutes referring to them—the Superannuation Act, the Retirement Fund Act, the Insurance Act, and other acts. In other words, the definition given by the Civil Service Act is the definition that is accepted in the other statutes in dealing with various appointees. So that a discrimination has been practised with respect to a number of these gentlemen. In addition to that there is no fixed principle applied to those who are deputy ministers of departments. Mr. Fielding said it was difficult, but he laid down a rule. In this instance, as I pointed out the other day, if you take the various departments and go through

them you will see one deputy minister getting an increase of $1,000, another an increase of $2,000, another an increase of $1,800, and so on, without regard to any fixed principle that could be applied; and certainly with respect to one or two of them it is perfectly clear that their duties are very, very light, while in other cases they are very, very onerous. I take this opportunity of mentioning this because the other evening I mentioned the deputy of the Minister of National Defence, whose duties have become very much lighter because of the disarmament alleged by the minister, and the position of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to which reference was made the other evening. Now we come to the Department of Labour, in which I think there has been a departure from the principle laid down by Mr. Fielding in the first instance.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I should like also to refer to a statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister in discussing the position of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He was under the impression that Doctor Roche simply held office for a fixed term and was not in the same position as a deputy minister. In the Civil Service Act of 1918, chapter 12, part 1, section 3, it is provided:

> There shall be three commissioners each with the rank of a deputy minister. Each commissioner shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons.
>
> Provided, however, that any commissioner hereafter appointed shall hold office during good behaviour for a period of ten years from the date of his appointment, but shall be removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons, and shall cease to hold office upon reaching the age of sixty-five years.

Then the Civil Service Act found in the present revised statutes, chapter 22, provides by subsection 3 of section 3:—

> 3. The commissioners in office on the twenty-fourth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen, shall hold office during good behaviour. Each subsequently appointed commissioner hsall hold office during good behaviour for a period of ten years from the date of his appointment, save that his tenure of office shall cease upon his attaining the age of sixty-five years.

By subsection 4 it is provided:

> Any commissioner shall be removed from office at any time by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons.

So that the head of the Civil Service Commission holds office for life, and not for a fixed period of ten years. He is in all respects in the same position as any deputy minister.

[Mr. Bennett.]

In fact, he is in a stronger position, I should think. It would appear that he ought to be treated in the same way as other deputy ministers.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Apparently I was mistaken, and I am glad my hon. friend has directed my attention to it. But what strikes me from his reading the statutes is that the discrimination to which the hon. leader of the opposition has been referring seems in that case to have been practised with a vengeance.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): In what respect?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government of the day was looking after its own friends by making the appointments outright, but taking care to see that subsequent governments could appoint members to the board for ten years only.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I cannot see any discrimination in that. They have to take the same chance as their opponents in future.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All right.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: With this fully developed Department of Labour and highly-paid officials, it seems to me we should look for some very much overdue labour legislation. Let me give simply one instance. This year there was trouble in Toronto. The Rapid Grip Company brought in from Europe workmen to take the place of their regular employees. If I understand aright, the Minister claims that under the alien labour legislation he has not the power effectively to handle a situation of that kind. Why does he not introduce legislation that will give him that power? In this case certain German workmen were introduced into the city of Toronto and took the places of the regular workmen. The same thing has been occurring in other places—in Edmonton and out at the coast. Does the minister propose introducing legislation which will enable him to handle a situation of this kind and thus protect Canadian workmen?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Cannot we have some answer in regard to this matter? The minister, I know, has had this situation under consideration.

Mr. HEENAN: The Prime Minister has already said that there will be no further legislation this session. The question of what should be done in future might be left until we see whether further legislation is necessary, because the case of which the hon. member speaks is to-day in litigation. Of course, the

hon. member realizes that there is no doubt about the present law applying to workmen from the United States. When these men were brought in I called the attention of the company to the fact, and they immediately sent back the American workmen; they did retain a few of the Frenchmen, Germans and Swiss. The union interested thinks that the Alien Labour Act does apply, and have taken action in the courts.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—Public Archives—salaries, $110,180; contingencies, $20,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the explanation of the increase?

Mr. RINFRET: This is the usual vote. There is no change except the statutory increase of $1,364.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

Thursday, June 13, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SALARIES OF DEPUTY MINISTERS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

What are the names and salaries of officials of the civil service who enjoy the rank of deputy minister and who may not be actually in charge of a department, exclusive of those reported in unrevised Hansard, April 17, 1929, page 1720?

Mr. RINFRET:

Public Archives:

A. G. Doughty, deputy minister, $9,000.

Auditor General:

The auditor general, Georges Gonthier, $15,000 per annum.

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer:

Jules Castonguay, chief electoral officer, salary $6,000 a year.

Civil Service Commission:

Honourable William James Roche, M.D., LL.D., P.C., chairman, $7,000; Joseph Emile Tremblay, commissioner, $6,000; Newton McFaul MacTavish, M.A., D. Litt., commissioner, $6,000.

Library of Parliament:

There are two joint-librarians, each having the rank of deputy minister; i.e. Hon. Martin Burrell, parliamentary librarian, and M. J. de L. Tache, general librarian. Each receives a salary of $6,000 per annum.

Department of Justice:

E. R. Cameron, K.C., registrar of Supreme Court of Canada, salary $6,000 per annum.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE—OFFICERS PENSIONS

Mr. HUBBS:

How many officers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force had their pensions reduced under section (14) subsection (1) of the Pensions Act, in each of the years 1921-2-3-4-5-6-7?

Mr. KING (Kootenay):

The information asked for is not available as statistics relating to individual sections of the Pension Act are not kept. To give a correct reply would involve an examination of the file of each disability pensioner since 1920.

IMMIGRATION—R. A. BURRISS

Mr. COWAN:

1. Does the Dominion of Canada own the site of the immigration hall at Port Arthur, Ontario, and the building thereon, and, if so, what did the site and building cost?

2. When was R. A. Burriss appointed immigration officer at Port Arthur; what were the terms of his employment, and is any record available of the number of settlers located by him?

3. When did R. A. Burriss cease to be immigration officer, and why?

4. Why has no successor been appointed to fill the office of immigration officer at Port Arthur?

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Title vested in Canadian National Realties Limited.

2. (a) The record of Mr. Burriss's employment at Port Arthur is as follows—February 1, 1899, as agent for the purpose of obtaining settlers from the United States. The terms of his employment were:—February 1, 1898 to March 31, 1899, allowance of $50 per month for expenses plus a commission of $3 for every male settler over 18 years, $2 for every female settler over 18 years, and $1 for all under 18 years. From April 1, 1899, to October 1, 1899, expense grant of $100 per month instead of $50 per month as formerly. August 1, 1900, placed on the salary basis of $50 per month from the Dominion government and $50 per month from the Ontario government. No commission. May 1, 1901, owing to withdrawal of Ontario government grant, appointed as temporary agent at salary of $1,000 per annum and travelling expenses when

away from headquarters. September 1, 1901, salary increased to $1,200 per annum. (b) The amount paid to Mr. Burriss on account of bonuses for persons settled by him in Canada in, 1899-1900 was $209. 1900-1901 was $113. The number of settlers actually located is not available.

3. (a) December 31, 1911. (b) No information.

4. It was not considered necessary to continue an immigration agent at Port Arthur to encourage settlers from the United States; such work is better accomplished by Canadian agents resident in the United States. A full time inspector was appointed at Port Arthur in 1921 and this arrangement is still in effect.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CIVIL SERVICE ACT—EXEMPTIONS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. In each department, what is the total number of persons who are filling positions that have been exempted from the operation of the Civil Service Act: (a) as full time employees; (b) as part time employees?

2. What are the names and salaries or wages of clerks or other employees in any department who have been taken on as labourers or in other exempted capacities, but who are being utilized in occupations that are not so exempted?

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS SUPERVISION COMMITTEE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

For the fiscal year 1927-28 what is the total amount of purchases made by the following departments (exclusive of any purchases made on their behalf by the "Government Contracts Supervision Committee"): (a) Indian Affairs; (b) Interior; (c) Justice; (d) Marine; (e) Fisheries; (f) National Defence; (g) Mines; (h) Royal Canadian Mounted Police; (i) Post Office; (j) Public Works; (k) Public Printing and Stationery; (l) Raiiways and Canals; (m) Pensions and National Health?

IMPORTS OF WEAVING YARNS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. B. PLUNKETT (Victoria): I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to a telegram I received this morning from the city of Victoria. This telegram reads:

Recent removal of 12½ per cent duty on imported worsted weaving yarns is jeopardizing ultimate success of plant recently established here. City vitally interested in undertaking owing to having guaranteed bond issue. Understand matter has been discussed in house. Can you advise me what prospects are to get duty reimposed this session.

Mayor H. Anscombe.

[Mr. Rinfret.]

I would ask the minister to give me some assurance which will enable me to send back a satisfactory reply to this city. I explained during the budget debate how the city of Victoria—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member must confine his remarks to a question; he must not make a speech.

Mr. PLUNKETT: May I ask, then, what relief will be given to the city of Victoria in this matter?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): The changes affecting worsted yarns were determined upon after a careful investigation of the whole industry, and this industry to which my hon. friend refers was started after those changes had been made.

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION SUPPLIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I have been asked to direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that in the advertisements now appearing in Nova Scotia for supplies for the Hudson Bay expedition Campbell's soups are specified, and I understand that these soups are really an American product. The same thing may be said with respect to other supplies. I would respectfully direct the minister's attention to this fact in the hope that he may be able to provide that Canadian goods shall be utilized and not American products.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I shall be pleased to look into the matter and try to meet my hon. friend's request, which is a reasonable one.

CONTROL OF RADIO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. G. BELL (St. Antoine): There is a rumour to the effect that all radio will be under the control of the Canadian National Railways. Can the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell us whether there is any truth in that report?

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I shall look into the question.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

TIME OF MEETING OF PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): Will the Prime Minister be good enough to inform the

house whether the government would take into serious consideration the possibility of calling the next session of parliament about the first of November instead of in February, as has been the case this year?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): After one of my hon. friends on the opposite side introduced the subject yesterday, I had prepared a schedule which helps to indicate the length of sessions in previous years. I shall be glad to furnish the hon. member if he so desires with a copy of that memorandum. I think he will find when the sessions were called in the fall that for the most part they lasted just as long into the following year as they have when the sessions began early in the new year. The house has had experience with both practices. Sir Wilfrid Laurier adopted for a time the practice of having parliament meet in November and it was discontinued later by Sir Robert Borden, largely I think on the representation of members from western Canada who complained that they should not be kept away from their homes so long. However, with respect to the time of the meeting of parliament, that like all others is a matter which the government will have to consider in the light of existing circumstances. I regret I cannot say more than that, but the government will do in this as in all else, what it believes to be most in the national interest.

Mr. COOTE: May I point out that we have now new rules governing procedure and if parliament were called on the first of November there is no reason why the session might not be through by the first of May. It seems to me it would be much better for all members of parliament, particularly those who come such long distances.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Health of animals, administration of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and Meat and Canned Foods Act, and necessary buildings, $2,450,000.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): I have a suggestion to make with respect to this vote. There was some discussion on it the last time it was before the committee and in order to expedite the passage of these items I suggest that further discussion of the vote be deferred until we come to the supplementary vote of the same character, No. 361, with respect to health of animals. It would facilitate business if we passed now this large vote in the main estimates, leaving further discussion until we reach that supplementary vote. I have no idea of restricting discussion, but it would make for greater progress in disposing of the smaller items which immediately follow this vote.

Mr. BENNETT: If it meets with the view of hon. members to the left, I think it would serve some useful purpose to do so. There would be no lessening of the discussion and we would get the matter in hand as we go along.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is all very well, but this vote might be called some night at a quarter to twelve o'clock.

Mr. BENNETT: It will be called now, I understand.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, we just want to make some progress on the smaller items.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If we can have the assurance that this item will be called at a reasonable hour, in order to give us an opportunity of debating it, that might be all right.

Mr. BENNETT: I suggest that we discuss both items together.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We might keep at this for an hour and not make very much progress. My suggestion is that we let this go through and then have the discussion on the same item in the supplementary estimates. Then we can make some progress in the smaller items following the main vote.

Mr. COOTE: This seems a peculiar suggestion. If the minister desires to get on with some of the smaller items, why not call those items and let this one stand?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Very well.

Item stands.

Entomology, $25,000.

Mr. TUMMON: Under this item I might repeat the question I asked the minister some time ago. Recently there was an announcement that property had been obtained in the city of Belleville for the Department of Agriculture, and I presume that it has reference to this vote. I would be very glad if the minister would make a short statement as to the work he intends to carry on at that point.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am reminded by my deputy that the building in Belleville to which my hon. friend refers is for the purpose of housing all our staff in that vicinity, including our seed inspection and entomological staffs. The purchase has not been completed as yet, but it is in the course of

completion and we secured the building at a very good price, very much less than it could be built for at present.

Item agreed to.

Administration of Destructive Insect and Pest Act, and necessary buildings, $580,000.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister tell us the reason for this increase of $50,000?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The insect invasions of Canada are becoming more numerous and more serious all the time, and we have to spend more money to circumscribe their activities. I have in mind the campaign carried on by the provincial government of Ontario and ourselves against the corn borer, as a result of which the corn acreage has come back to 75 per cent of what it was before the invasion of that insect, showing that our activities have been successful in restricting its ravages. Then there is the oriental peach moth; by keeping after that pest continually I think we can save at least a remnant of the peach crop.

Mr. BENNETT: What part of this vote is intended for buildings? There is a miscellaneous item which we are told includes the construction of a very costly building, perhaps costing $150,000. I think estimates which deal with the extermination of pests and at the same time include buildings are not very good unless it is indicated just what the buildings are, how much of the estimate is to be expended for that purpose and to what extent there is a co-relation of the activities of this branch of this department with the research bureau, because I take it that you are studying methods by which to destroy these insects and pests which are so injurious to agriculture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think the point is well taken. When I took charge of the department I found that there were a certain number of small buildings being erected, costing up to $4,000, without such provisions being made. I consulted the Auditor General about it and he thought if we were going to put up further buildings in connection with these votes it should be so indicated. This reference to buildings was first included in the entomological vote when we erected the rust laboratory at Winnipeg; that was included in the vote after consultation with the Auditor General and it has been continued since. However, there are no buildings anticipated under this year's vote.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Salary and expenses of agricultural produce marketing agent in Great Britain, $15,000.

Mr. COOTE: What part of this item is for salaries?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I believe Mr. Wilson has reached his maximum; I think his salary is $5,200.

Item agreed to.

Farm economics, including agricultural co-operative marketing, $10,000.

Mr. GARDINER: I notice this is a new item. Will the minister explain?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This matter has been under discussion for several years; it has been more or less in the public mind, and since cooperative marketing is becoming more popular and is practiced more and more throughout Canada it was felt by my staff and myself that it was time we had a central organization, a sort of clearing house for these activities, since some of these organizations are now becoming Dominion-wide and someone should be in charge of work of this kind. Up to quite recently this work has been of a provincial character, but there are now several Dominion-wide cooperative concerns, such as the Cooperative Livestock Growers' Association, the Cooperative Wool Growers' Association and others, and there are a great many activities which necessitate a Dominion branch in charge of that work, in cooperation with the different provincial authorities.

In a word I believe that is the object of this item. We are now advertising for a director for this work, and we hope to secure the services of some well qualified man. Of course this is a Civil Service Commission appointment and will take some time to complete, but we hope the appointment will be made before the end of July. Our intention is to have a properly qualified man commence work with a survey of these activities in order to find out all the different aspects. There are many cooperative activities being carried on; some of them are stock companies, some are pools of a voluntary nature, some have contracts for three or five years, and in British Columbia there is one organization of a more or less compulsory nature, so a survey will be necessary in order to get a line on this work, since we realize that we cannot have similarity in such a large country as Canada.

Mr. COOTE: Will the minister tell us what will be the title of this official?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He will be the commissioner of agricultural economics, and his salary is advertised as $4,320.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Would the minister tell us if it is proposed to break any new ground in this work, or will the duty of this official be merely to assist existing organizations? Will he go in to new fields and try to develop new cooperative organizations?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Of course he will be working in cooperation with those organizations already existing. We conducted a campaign in the county of Essex with the idea of organizing the tobacco growers. We had no officers of our own for that purpose and we applied to Mr. McPhail of the central wheat pool to let us have some men of agreeable personality, skilled in that class of work and possessing knowledge of the whole subject. They sent down three men and we obtained from them a lot of information. Conditions were not absolutely favourable to the continuance of the work which we hoped to take up later on because there was an organization already in existence. There were many problems which made it difficult to go any further, but this is one of the things which should be taken charge of in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture of Ontario; something should be done for the tobacco growers in western Ontario because they are too much at the mercy of those who buy and the question of quality is not receiving the consideration it should. This and other matters are largely of federal concern, and I think there is a very decided place for a service of this kind.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I desire to commend the minister for taking this step, and I trust the venture will be a successful one. May I suggest to the minister that it might be well to spend a little money to look into the whole matter of the cost of distribution. Whether or not you call it cooperation, that is one of the great problems which will have to be solved. A few days ago the hon. members from the maritimes were complaining about the difficulties they encountered in marketing their fish. As the hon. minister knows, we would buy their fish in the west if it could be purchased at a price we could afford to pay, and the same thing applies to British Columbia fruit. It seems to me that this question of the cost of distribution is one which might be taken up by the official whom the minister proposes to appoint under this item. The following appeared in a recent issue of The Western Producer of Saskatoon:

> Apples which sell at $2.50 a box return about 50 cents to the producer. If butter which sells at 50 cents a pound only returned ten cents to the producer for butter fat what would the producer of buttter fat do? Would he clamour for ¾ cent a pound tariff to save his business, or reorganize his method of marketing? The fruit grower thinks a tariff of ¾ cent per pound helps him out.

I would like to quote from an article which appeared in the Manitoba Free Press last fall, as follows:

> The prairie provinces are the natural market for the fruit-grower of British Columbia, and that market could be greatly enlarged, without waiting for future increase of population, if there could be a reduction in the retail price of the fruit on the prairies. The British Columbia apple is an excellent product and the consumption in these provinces is limited only by the ability to purchase. There is no doubt that the sale now is much larger than a few years ago when the west was suffering from a severe depression. The people are buying more because they are able to do so, and they would buy still more if the price were lowered.
>
> A very large proportion of the retail price goes to pay handling costs, freight, and wholesale and retail dealers' profits, leaving only a fraction of the price to pay the fruit grower for the care of his orchard and interest on his investment. The handling and distribution charges on a box of apples are given as follows by the Western Producer of Saskatoon after an investigation of the matter:

	Cents
Box	16
Paper for wrapping	5½
Labelling	1
Packing	7
Lidding	1
Superintendence, loading	10½
Associated Growers' charge	7
Total handling and shipping charge	48
Freight to Saskatoon	56
Wholesalers' profit	40
Retailers' profit	60
Total charges	$2 04

If there is an overhead charge of $2.04 per box, before the producer of the apples gets one cent, then it is a serious matter and something which the department should examine into. These figures are based on carload rates to Saskatoon, but those of us who live in the little outlying villages know that apples have to come from the larger centres such as Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Yorkton and so on, and they are distributed at less than carload rates which runs the cost up much higher. It means that we have to pay $3.50 to $4 per box, and the average small town dweller or farmer is not able to pay that much. I have known of cases where the British Columbia producer got only a few cents per box for his apples, and I think the official whom the minister proposes to appoint should go into this matter, not merely with regard to apples or fish,

but he should consider the broad question of the cost of distribution. It seems to me that this cost of distribution is more important than the tariff, and if we spent a little money trying to get that cost down I believe we would get somewhere. It would not only reduce the cost of living, but we would be increasing consumption by enlarging the market for our own products.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, I cannot take any exception to the remarks of the hon. member but I would draw his attention to the fact that the term "farm economics" is a very wide expression. The qualifications asked for in the advertisement for this vacancy cover exactly what my hon. friend has been discussing. If my hon. friend desires I will read the advertisement, but it takes care of the services to which he referred.

Mr. ROWE: How large a staff will this appointee have?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We are calling for only a small staff, an assistant and a secretary.

Mr. ROWE: With the head office in Ottawa?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There will be just three at the outset.

Item agreed to.

Contributions to Empire Bureau, $25,000.

Mr. LUCAS: As this is a new vote, will the minister kindly give an explanation?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: At the empire conference of 1923, this question was tentatively brought up; some progress was made, but it was really just a start. At the conference of 1926, at which the government and the department heads were well represented, the matter was dealt with again and a tentative program was laid out for the establishment of these clearing houses or bureaus, for the centralization of agricultural information from the whole empire. Doctor Orr of Rowatt Institute and Sir Robert Greig were appointed in Great Britain to do the initial work in the matter of organizing these bureaus in the different parts of the empire. Many of the dependencies have expressed a desire to work in cooperation with the central bureau in the United Kingdom. One bureau has been established at Edinburgh, which has to do with animal genetics, or animal breeding. There, all the questions, we will say, of contagious abortion, sterility in cows and many other diseases are studied and the causes worked out. Any information we get in Canada or in any other part of the empire, for instance, when we make any discovery with respect to any of these diseases, we immediately forward to the central bureau which acts as a clearing house and which in turn forwards it to all the rest. All the units of the empire engage in this great work. Therefore we are cooperating with each other, for example one of us finding out something about a particular disease, perhaps not enough to make it public but enough to forward to other workers in the same field of activity so as to put them on their guard as to what course to pursue with respect to the problem. Let me cite the case of rickets in pigs. That comes under the question of animal nutrition. I am sure all farmers in Canada, especially in the west, know what it is to have rickets in pigs. If you once see a rickety pig, you will never forget its appearance. This question is being studied in all parts of the country and if research workers in any country discover something in regard to the cause of it—and it is largely connected with feeding—that information will be transmitted to all other bureaus.

There is another branch that has to do with micrology, that is science which treats of microscopic objects. For instance, it deals with rust and other kindred diseases. We have six of these investigators who are working in cooperation with every part of the empire. Every dominion has joined in this bureau proposition and it is now pretty well established and in line with the central bureau, not only giving information but receiving it in turn.

Mr. ROWE: We have heard about rickety pigs and other things, but we have not heard anything about how the minister is going to spend this $25,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is the allocation amongst the various units engaged in this cooperative work:

Contribution from	Amount
United Kingdom	£3,750
Colonial Office	3,750
Canada	3,125
Australia	3,125
India	2,187.10s.
Union of South Africa	1,562.10s.
New Zealand	1,250
Irish Free State	625
Southern Rhodesia	250
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	250
Newfoundland	125

Then in addition to these, there are two units that have been operating for some time, one since 1912. The latter is the bureau of micrology and the other I mentioned is the bureau of entomology.

Mr. ROWE: What about the other $10,000?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: One of them is $5,000 and the other is $1,500. They are included in this vote.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Where is the main central bureau? Is it in London?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The central administrative offices are in London under Mr. Chadwick.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is he in one of the government offices.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, and the others are located at various points throughout the United Kingdom.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Department of Agriculture, province of Nova Scotia, to complete amortization of the debt against the science building at the Agricultural college, Truro, Nova Scotia, $8,389.08.

Mr. GARDINER: Is this the last payment necessary to complete this contract?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Dairying, including grant of $5,000 to the National Dairy Council and necessary new buildings, $295,000.

Mr. LUCAS: Will the minister explain the increase in this item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is for a laboratory to be established at the experimental farm. It is primarily for the purpose of giving us accommodation for conducting our research work in dairying. We have a very important export product in cheese and occasionally we have found trouble with bacteria. It takes some time to develop and we have found difficulty in discovering it without more up to date equipment than we have at the present time. For instance, in Grenville county recently—and the hon. member for that constituency spoke to me about the matter—there was some difficulty in connection with shipments of cheese from certain factories. It was discovered that after the cheese was of a certain age it developed deleterious bacteria. Complaints were made and we took up the problem even with the facilities that we have in this city, and found out the cause of the bacterial action. We discovered that it was due to the preservative that was put in the curd and that should not have been put in. It was thought proper to add saltpetre to cheese to discourage the development of certain flavours. But it was found to have the opposite effect. It was a good thing that this was discovered before it had continued for any length of time, because a number of cheese factories were pursuing this practice and they were notified to discontinue it. Instead of preserving the cheese, it had the opposite effect. We want to do work of that nature expeditiously so as to check any unwise or harmful practice before it adversely affects the cheese.

Mr. ROWE: How many new inspectors are included in this vote?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think any particular inspectors will be necessary on account of the establishment of this laboratory. I think we shall have to have one or two more graders for the purpose of keeping track of the work. This trouble got quite a start before it was drawn to our attention. As a matter of fact it did not develop until the cheese got across the water, and we want to keep closer tab than we are able to do at present. We want to lock the door before the horse is stolen, before any danger arises, and that is why we require these additional facilities.

Mr. GARDINER: I notice a grant of $5,000 to the National Dairy Council. What, in the minister's opinion, are the functions of that council? Is it primarily political, for the purpose of advocating an increased tariff on dairy products?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This institution was organized before I had anything to do with the Department of Agriculture, but I have found it a very useful organization in promoting the cause of dairying.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And the cause of protection.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was organized before I came here, but I do not consider it the better or the worse for that. I remember the late D'Arcy Scott, the secretary, and the late Mr. Stonehouse, the president, were there when I had first to do with it. I found they were very efficient officers working for the general promotion of the dairying industry throughout Canada. I have reason to think the activities in that direction are quite as useful still. If my hon. friend has anything he wishes to bring to my attention with regard to the activities of the National Dairy Council, I think I have under my hand a statement with regard to what they are engaged in doing.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the minister not think that the activities of the National Dairy Council have, for the past two years, been directed very largely towards the cause of the protectionist, rather than to the improvement of the dairy industry?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: May I first read this memorandum:

The National Dairy Council is an association composed of representatives of the various branches of the dairy industry. It was originally formed for the purpose of advancing the dairy industry throughout Canada by taking such steps both legal and otherwise as would best bring about the end in view.

One of its first activities consisted in the efforts made to have legislation passed prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada. It has also been of considerable service to the dairy industry, through representations to the Board of Railway Commissioners, in having conditions improved and freight charges adjusted in connection with the transportation of dairy produce generally.

The organizations represented in the National Dairy Council are as follows:—

British Columbia Dairymen's Association.
Alberta Dairymen's Association.
Western Ice Cream Manufacturers.
Alberta Producers' Association.
Saskatchewan Dairy Association.
Western Butter Manufacturers.
Manitoba Dairy Association.
Western Milk Distributors.
Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario.
Eastern Ontario Dairymen's Association.
Canadian Creamery Association.
The Ontario Milk Producers' Association.
Canadian Association of Ice Cream Mgrs.
Condensed Milk and Powdered Milk Interests.
Quebec Dairy Association.
Montreal Milk Producers' Association.
Montreal Milk Distributors.
Canadian Produce Merchants' Ass'n.
New Brunswick Dairymen United.
Nova Scotia Dairymen's Association.
Prince Edward Island Dairy Association.
Holstein-Friesian Association.
Canadian Ayrshire Breeders' Association.
Canadian Jersey Cattle Club.

The newly elected president is Mr. F. E. M. Robinson, of Richmond, Quebec, while the secretary-treasurer is W. F. Stephen, of Ottawa, Ontario. The National Dairy Council obtains a grant from the federal government of $5,000 per annum.

I gather from the remarks of the hon. member for Bow River that he thinks these gentlemen have something akin to protective ideas with respect to their industry.

Mr. ROWE: They should have too.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does my hon. friend think that with these grants should go a condition that these people circumscribe their views with regard to certain questions? Should I say to Toronto, for instance, which gets a large number of grants: "You must not be so protectionist as you are." I do not see how I could do that effectively.

Mr. ROWE: You will never do it either.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Speaking quite seriously, I do not see how we can in a democratic country give grants of this nature and then dictate what the recipient shall or shall not discuss. I remember that when I was connected with a grain growers' organization myself in the old territorial days we got a very modest grant of $250 from a Conservative minister of agriculture, and I can imagine what remark I would have made if he had said: "We will give you this grant but you must say and talk about the things I want you to talk about." I do not think I would have taken the grant under those conditions, and I likely would have had something to say besides. I cannot imagine any line of advice that could be given to the recipients of these grants that would not be considered wholly objectionable under our conception of democractic government. We are making dozens and scores and hundreds of grants of one kind and another all over Canada, and we have never thought of imposing any such conditions. I may say to my hon. friend that I have suggested to different organizations that it would be easier for me to continue the grants they were receiving if they were not so free in discussing controversial questions at certain times, but I have never thought of imposing any conditions upon them; I just pointed out my difficulties. We have an example of those difficulties right now in the criticism of the hon. member for Bow River, whose opinion I usually regard with high favour, but not this one.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I can imagine no circumstances under which the minister could be silent. As to this particular point the minister's difficulty is quite clear. I should imagine that precisely the same difficulty would meet the Prime Minister, say, when he was selecting his cabinet, that if it were made a condition that every member of the low tariff ministry must be really a low tariff man and never preach anything but low tariff, terrible complications would ensue in the present ministry, and I take it that it would be almost hopeless for them to attempt to carry on. So the same policy is to be carried out in regard to the National Dairy Council that prevails with the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches now—let every man have his own opinions, let him give them out to the world if he wants to, but when election time comes around we will all tell the people how gallantly we are fighting for low tariffs; but in parliament when the session is on we will make sure there is no material reduction in the tariff.

Mr. ADSHEAD: With reference to the list of dairymens' associations which the minister has just read, I would draw his attention to

a statement made in the house a few days ago by the hon. member for Yale, who said that a large amount of imported Australian butter was being wrapped in Canada in other wrappers and sold as Canadian butter. It is quite evident that the farmers in this country who milk their cows would not be doing that, and evidently it must be the dairymens' associations that are perpetrating this fraud. I would ask the minister to investigate that matter.

Mr. BARBER: I think we have a right to an answer from the minister as to whether it is permissible under the regulations to bring in forty or fifty cars of New Zealand butter, work it over in the dairies of this country, wash it and sweeten it, and sell it to the people as Canadian or Ontario butter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Of course, that is quite contrary to the regulations, and if my hon. friend or anybody else will supply us with some evidence we will certainly investigate it. We are investigating complaints all the time. There is not a month that we are not prosecuting somebody for some offence under the regulations, and we do not mind taking on one more.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is it not the duty of the department to investigate these complaints of its own initiative?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is true that quite frequently complaints are investigated following reports from our own inspectors; whenever complaints are made we investigate.

Mr. ADSHEAD: The direct charge was made in this house by an hon. member that certain companies were importing Australian butter, rewrapping it in Canadian wrappers, and selling it as Canadian butter. When these charges are made in this house by an hon. member surely it is the duty of the department to investigate them and try to get evidence substantiating the charges.

Mr. CHAPLIN: More specific charges than that have been made in this house. The statement has been made by hon. members that you do not have to go outside of this very district to find that that practice prevails only a few miles from Ottawa.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am sure the Minister of Justice can testify to the fact that hardly a month passes when we are not prosecuting someone for violation of our regulations. In connection with the live stock records here in Ontario, for instance, we prosecuted and had a man fined on four charges, and the fines aggregated $2,000. There can be no complaint made against the department of reluctance to prosecute offences under the acts or regulations. Just bring us something like evidence and we will investigate it for all it is worth.

Mr. TUMMON: Has the department made any investigations in regard to this particular matter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: Have any of your inspectors ever brought to your attention cases of the kind just mentioned where New Zealand butter is being wrapped in Canadian wrappers and sold as Canadian butter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: One or two. The inspectors report to the Dairy Commissioner, he reports to the deputy minister, who reports to me. Complaints have come, but we have not had sufficient evidence to warrant a prosecution.

Mr. SENN: Is it not a fact that any dairy company that is sending out butter under its own label has to have that label registered? When they are reworking New Zealand butter and sending it to the market they put it in a different wrapper entirely, so they are not evading the regulations, after all. Is not that the reason that there have been no prosecutions?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They have to have registered labels for export cheese and butter. There is neither compulsory inspection nor labelling of cheese or butter for home consumption.

Mr. TUMMON: Under the regulations is it legal for a creamery to put New Zealand butter into their churns, work it over, sweeten it, and put it in pound prints and wrap it, placing the name of their factory on the wrappers?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is entirely illegal.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): Does the minister say it is not being done?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not say it is not being done at all. We would like to get sufficient evidence to enter a prosecution; but we have not had that yet.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): Then where is all this New Zealand butter going, what is it being sold as?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As New Zealand butter.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): I am advised that a number of creameries buy New Zealand butter, wrap it and sell it as their own. Is this really taking place?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not heard of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): Then what are they doing with carloads and carloads of New Zealand butter that they are buying?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand from my deputy that if the butter is sent out in wrappers bearing a name, without any indication of the source of origin, it is not a violation of the law; but if designated as Canadian butter when really it is of other origin, that is a violation of the law.

Mr. GARDINER: Is there any regulation in force which requires that imported butter be sold with the name of the country of origin on the package?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. GARDINER: That should be done.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think this discussion is well justified. If the Minister will bring in a regulation requiring that no butter be sold in this country without bearing on the package the country of origin, it would work no hardship on anybody. The minister says that to-day New Zealand butter may be taken into the creameries, rewrapped there and sent out in any kind of package so long as that package does not state that the butter is made in Canada.

Mr. TUMMON: But bearing the name of the creamery doing so.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, bearing the name of the Ottawa Dairy, the Fraser River Dairy, or whatever other dairy it may be, creating the impression in the public mind that it is Canadian butter. That is wholly unfair. If that is the case, I think the minister would be well advised to bring in the necessary regulation, if one does not exist—he says it does not—to require on the package the country of origin of butter of this character.

Mr. ROBB: Would my hon. friend apply that policy to all importations?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think so. We rather pride ourselves on our exports of agricultural products; we are proud of our cheese, cream, wheat, beef, and are very glad to have it marked Canadian. I see no reason whatever why goods imported into this country should not be always marked with the country of origin.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. CHAPLIN: I think the Minister of Agriculture must realize that such a practice is against the ordinary food laws of this country. This is nothing more nor less than a fraud upon our people, and I think those perpetrating it could be proceeded against under the ordinary common law. It is nothing more, nothing less, than a fraud.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend need not get quite so excited.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am not excited at all. The minister should be excited, but he is not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is not the time to get excited.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is too late in the session.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am glad my hon. friend from Bow River has brought up the question. I should like to apply such a regulation to a lot of things, but I understand there is the usual constitutional question to be worked out.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The British North America Act?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What has my hon. friend from Lincoln got to say about it?

An hon. MEMBER: Nothing.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thought it was nothing. In Great Britain the British Merchandise Marks Act is gradually being invoked against all importations. I should like to see the necessary regulation apply to practically all imports.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Why cannot it be done?

Mr. SENN: It is a protective measure of course.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Why has not the law been introduced before?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why has it not been enforced?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have the reputation of introducing so many amendments that until those are consolidated I hesitate to introduce any more.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I submit the minister has enough inspectors around to ascertain what is going on.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The inspectors are there to enforce the law. I do not think we can make any regulations under the existing law, in fact I am quite sure about it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Just why? The minister has said he is in favour of this and would like to have it done.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Surely.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): He says difficulties may arise. What are they?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Constitutional difficulties.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What constitutional difficulties?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This is the first time I have ever heard of constitutional difficulties in the way of requiring our importers to stamp the country of origin on their goods.

Mr. FRASER: The minister need not be so fearful about statutory authority in this case, because other ministers proceed to make all kinds of regulations and orders in council without any statutory authority at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When the same question arose with regard to the inspection and grading of farm products for home consumption, we found we had to get what is called concurrent legislation. It took us six years to bring that about. That applies now to all products for home consumption under the Farm Products Act. The provinces do not like this sort of legislation very much; they feel that it is an invasion of their legislative domain.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think that is imaginative.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The western provinces came through quickly, but some of the provinces down here were reluctant. Without a popular demand I hesitate to try this out in regard to butter. This concurrent legislation does not include butter. It does include eggs and the live stock yards, and it does include the grading of all things for export. The concurrent legislation is necessary to cover all things for home consumption but it is not necessary as regards exports.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I can see where constitutional difficulties might arise in the stamping of domestic goods in the provinces, but surely the federal government has complete control in the matter of regulations governing the entry of foreign goods.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have no law of that nature under our department but I can assure my hon. friend and the committee generally that personally I am in favour of it. I am in favour of having the same law that is on the statutes of Great Britain, that is, the British Merchandise Marks Act. I should like to have a similar law invoked in Canada and applied wherever practicable and desirable.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the minister promise to introduce legislation along this line next year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: With respect to hay, I have legislation which has been lying in cold storage since last year, and I have legislation also with respect to maple products, for which a great many people in eastern Ontario and Quebec are anxious. I will seek an opportunity at another session to place that legislation before the house and I hope I shall have then the same buoyant support which the proposal seems to be receiving now.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): The minister speaks of constitutional difficulties. May I ask him whether he is referring to the Canadian constitution or to the constitution of the cabinet?

Mr. ROWE: It seems to me that the minister is merely splitting hairs on this question. The government have passed a good many orders in council and made regulations covering far greater scope than this mere detail of bringing butter under the regulations that now exist with respect to eggs and other products for home consumption. They have camouflaged the real situation. There are 25,000,000 pounds of butter coming into this country every year, which the people do not know. The minister takes a side glance in the direction of some of his free trade friends in the cabinet—because now I believe he is a protectionist—to see whether the suggestion which has been made is satisfactory to them. At first when the hon. member for Bow River mentioned it the minister said he would bring in a regulation; but, as I say, taking a side glance at his colleagues, he believed it might be dangerous to reveal to the people of Canada the quantities of dairy products that are coming into this country. It is my personal belief that the government are desirous of keeping from the public the knowledge of how much dairy butter is coming into Canada. The minister says that wherever practicable or desirable the British Merchandise Marks Act could be put into effect here. Well, I suggest that it

is not desirable on the part of this government to show to the Canadian people that there are 25,000,000 pounds of foreign dairy butter coming into Canada.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The returns must show it.

Mr. ROWE: Yes, they do show it; but the people do not know it yet. They will not know until next year. So far as this $5,000 grant to the National Dairy Council is concerned, I submit to the minister that when he gives such a grant to a council one expects that the advice offered by that council, and the resolutions which they pass, will be taken into consideration. I ask the minister now where he stands personally in view of the resolution from the National Dairy Council. Some of the most important resolutions that have reached the government have come from that council, and in my opinion the grant should be increased to $10,000; because if any council has courage enough to give this government a hint to protect the home markets for the home producer, it deserves every consideration for such advice.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): If that is what the dairy council are doing we had better cut out the grant.

Mr. ROWE: The resolutions of the dairy council are as important to this country as any of the recommendations that are made by the Consumers' League in connection with the famous tariff board.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): We are not giving a grant to the league.

Mr. ROWE: I ask hon. members whether the National Dairy Council's advice would not be of more benefit if acted upon than any advice given by the Consumers' League. I would ask the minister now to tell us where he stands on this question. Does he not believe himself that some protection should be given to the dairy industry of the country? We are importing 25,000,000 pounds of foreign produced butter; there are 1,000 cows less in Canada this year than last year; there is consequent depression in the swine industry which is so closely associated with dairying; and there is an all round depressing effect on the activities of the basic industry of Canada. In view of these facts, will the minister rise in his place now and tell us where he stands personally, independently of the free trade inclination of some of his colleagues?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think that the committee is interested in my personal views on the question; the government's views are one.

[Mr. Rowe.]

Mr. ROWE: I know what their views are.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The committee is not interested in my personal views.

Mr. ROWE: We certainly are.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As regards the suggestion that we are trying to camouflage the amount of Australian and New Zealand butter coming into the country by desisting from giving the facts, the thing is absurd; that question never entered my mind for a moment. As a matter of fact, the question of marking on imported products the country of origin has never before come up in this house, so far as I know, and I am just wondering whether, if such legislation were proposed, it would meet with this uproarious support from certain quarters of the house. Judging from the way the British Merchandise Marks Act has worked out, I believe it is a good thing. I have never seen the act but I believe it serves a good purpose. But it must be invoked with a great deal of caution, because they have met with a good deal of trouble in the old country in imposing it.

Mr. ROWE: It seems to me just as absurd to carry on the way we are doing as it is to make the proposal which has been submitted to the minister. Surely we ought to know the origin of goods which are imported into the country; the place of manufacture ought to be indicated. You so mark your furniture in the Chateau Laurier; surely then it will not be suggested that it is absurd to have foreign products coming into Canada marked to show the country of origin.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: From the departmental standpoint I shall be delighted, we shall all be delighted, to have the question looked into during the recess to see whether we cannot bring it in some form or other before the house at another session. Looking at it cursorily, I think it is good; but I found long ago that it is always best to look twice before you jump once, and to be quite sure just where you are getting off at. It looks goods to me and I should like to see it applied all round whenever practicable, but the matter must be looked into.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): When the minister does propose it and he finds himself instantly met with strenuous opposition from the dairy council, I hope he will not waiver. I anticipate that the dairy council will be the first body to issue a strenuous protest against the proposed marking of the country of importation.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think so; I think they will be in favour of it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not think so.

Mr. COOTE: Have they ever suggested it?

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): The Conservative party has changed over night. Last evening they were opposed to a delegate to the Labour Council even making a speech while she was on her way to Geneva, To-day they would double the grant to the dairy council in order to have them go out and advocate protection, which is political propaganda.

I think this vote is very important; there was a time when a number of the creameries were opposed to the importation of New Zealand butter, but many of them raise no objection now because they have conceived the idea of wrapping it up differently, putting it into different packages and selling it as though it were Canadian butter, and the public does not know the difference. I think a few moments ago the minister became confused with regard to the regulations of his department. We grade eggs and various other farm products, and it does seem strange that we should not be able to grade foreign products or have some way of letting the public know where they came from and what they are like. It does seem to me that if we can have regulations for the grading of our own products we should have some way of grading these foreign importations, and I think steps should be taken along that line.

Mr. ADSHEAD: This question was first brought to my attention by the farmers who have milch cows in the province of Alberta. A quantity of New Zealand butter was brought to the city of Calgary, but though I searched through every store in Calgary I could not find one pound of New Zealand butter anywhere. Surely when that amount of butter was brought in it should not require an amendment to the British North America Act to trace it up and see what became of it, because it was never exported as such. Surely a live inspector could find out what was done with that butter, and I think the dairy institutions owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for Yale for bringing up this matter in the house.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I do not think the statement made by the hon. member should be allowed to pass without a word with regard to the situation in other parts of the country. Within the last year I have been in British Columbia twice, and I think the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Plunkett) will bear me out when I say that in the city of Victoria, New Zealand butter is sold as such, displayed on the counter with a sign on it, and sold for two cents a pound more than any other butter. They are not hiding it there.

Mr. BANCROFT: While the minister is investigating this matter perhaps he might find out if any of the members of the National Dairy Council are selling New Zealand butter as Canadian butter. If they are doing so the minister might ascertain whether they are making any profit from it, and if they are making a profit perhaps they might get along next year without this grant.

While I am on my feet I might tell the minister that the producers of cream carry on their organization by taking a certain deduction from the butter fat each month. If the other members of the council are making money by selling imported butter as Canadian butter, they should be able to pay their share of the upkeep of this organization without a grant from the government.

Mr. SENN: A moment ago an hon. member to my left took rather a fling at the Conservative party for changing its attitude overnight, but I notice that certain members of the group to my left have also changed their attitude to a certain extent. They tell us they are in favour of marking the origin of foreign products sold in Canada in packages, and surely that is more or less a protective measure. That is the reason the minister does not want to adopt it, but I am glad hon. gentlemen to my left are adopting our views in that respect.

I noticed that the Minister of Finance asked the hon. member for Bow River whether he would be in favour of that being done with all products, and the hon. member answered in the affirmative. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is in favour of taking such action. A few moments ago the Minister of Agriculture declined to give his personal views on this question, when he was asked to do so by a member on this side. Why did he not want to give the committee his personal opinion; is he afraid or ashamed of his views in that respect? Do they differ from the views of the other members of the cabinet, or why is he unwilling to give them? I think we should have some answer to that question.

With regard to the National Dairy Council, the Minister of Agriculture was good enough to give us the names of the former president

and secretary of the council. The name of the present secretary is Mr. Stephen, and if I am correctly informed for a long time, and perhaps even yet, Mr. Stephen was one of the political henchmen of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have no information as to that.

Mr. SENN: Surely we could not accuse Mr. Stephen or the Minister of Finance of being in favour of a protective measure of this kind, so if the National Dairy Council have advocated protection for the dairy industry it must be because they have been forced to the conclusion, without regard to their own private views, that it is absolutely necessary for their industry.

In conclusion I would repeat that if the Minister of Agriculture is not ashamed of his own private views on this question I think he should let the house know what they are.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The committee is not interested in them.

Mr. CHAPLIN: A few moments ago the Minister of Finance elicited from the hon. member for Bow River his opinion with regard to the marking of goods in general. Now I think the Minister of Finance might tell us his opinion on the same question.

Mr. ROBB: I am not under cross-examination at the moment. My opinion is that we might profitably go on with the business of the house and pass supply.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The Minister of Finance is not interested now but he was interested only a moment ago, when he questioned the hon. member for Bow River. I think the Minister of Finance should not cross-examine another member if he is not willing to be cross-examined himself.

Mr. ROWE: I think this is a reasonable question to ask the Minister of Finance, but he tells us we should go on with the business of the house. Every year since I have been a member here the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture have been brought down either on a Friday night, when a number of members leave for their homes in Quebec and Ontario, where mixed farming is carried on to the greatest extent—

Mr. LAPOINTE: They should stay here.

Mr. ROWE: I think that is right, but I stay here almost as much as the Minister of Justice does. Surely the minister could give us a clear statement as to where he stands on a question of such importance; surely the government cannot camouflage the people all the time. We would like to know where the government stands on one of the most important questions to the agricultural industry in Canada to-day, and if the Minister of Agriculture cannot tell us perhaps the Minister of Finance could give us that information. Again this year we have the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture coming up at twelve o'clock on the last day of the session, since it is generally understood that the house is to conclude its business to-night and prorogue tomorrow.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ROWE: I am not particular about it; it does not matter a great deal whether the house closes this week or next week, but this department is one of the most important in the government, and every year the estimates come down either late on a Friday night or within the last day or two of the session. The most important of these estimates have not been touched yet, and now it is twelve o'clock noon on the last day of the session. This is a very important item, and the Minister of Finance says that we should go on with the business of the country.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think these extraneous fiscal matters should be introduced into my estimates. I will have to leave in a few minutes and we are taking up a lot of time discussing a matter which should have been discussed on the budget, and which was discussed.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The Minister of Agriculture says that he has only a few minutes left to complete his estimates; in future these estimates should be brought down before the end of the session.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think the last remark of the Minister of Agriculture is wholly unfair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What is that?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister suggested that the debate on the budget was the proper place to bring in these suggestions; I suggest that there has never been a more proper moment than the present one for introducing a matter of this kind.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: To discuss fiscal matters?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This particular matter of marking. The Minister of Finance is the one responsible for introducing that aspect into it, because in his usual subtle and tricky fashion he asked a question with the obvious intention of using my answer at some future time; there is no doubt in the world about that.

An hon. MEMBER: You fell for it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, I did not fall for it; I knew exactly what his intention was, and I was very careful in making my answer.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Could I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Just a moment, first of all I want to get an answer from another Liberal member. The Minister of Finance has asked a question and it has been answered courteously, and I would like to ask him if he does not believe in the suggestion which has been offered here of marking packaged goods with the country of origin?

Mr. ROBB: Why limit it to packaged goods?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Naturally the minister realizes that there are some goods which cannot be stamped; we could not stamp steel ingots or articles of that kind.

Mr. VALLANCE: I was in the trade, and we imported many of those articles into Canada.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the minister's view as to marking the goods with the country of origin? That is a fair question and should receive a fair answer.

Mr. ROBB: Some years ago the hon. gentlemen brought up a resolution along that line and I pointed out to them that it was a measure of protection, and I have not changed my view on that matter. There is much to be said for it, but it cannot be done as broadly as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No one knows more than the minister himself that he is talking utter poppycock when he says that the principle of protection is implied in marking articles with the country of origin. It has nothing to do with protection; it does not enable the manufacturer to charge the consumer any more for the goods, and the minister himself knows that. He is trying to twist things around and has not as yet answered my direct question. Is he in favour of the stamping of the country of origin upon goods imported into Canada, where it can be done?

Mr. POULIOT: May I ask a question?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Never mind, I want to get an answer first.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What have the views of the Minister of Finance to do with this item?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The Minister of Finance started this thing.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He may have been in error, but the hon. member is doubly so.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister asked a question in his usual subtle manner, but I knew the workings of his mind. There is no man in the house who is more subtle in tricking a member into answering a question which may be used against him at some future time. I have been fair to the minister, let him be fair to me.

Mr. ROBB: If the hon. member thinks that I have tricked him into answering a question, I will withdraw the question and I will not use his answer against him.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, the minister is being trickier than ever in making that answer.

The CHAIRMAN: I think I should suggest to the hon. member that the word "tricky" is not a parliamentary term.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If it is against the rules of the house, I have no desire to use it. I suggest to the hon. Minister of Finance that he is still evading the answering of my question; he is being absolutely unfair. If the minister wants to be unfair I must leave him in that position.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): Is the Minister of Agriculture in favour of marking New Zealand butter as New Zealand butter? I have received a letter from a party in my riding claiming that a number of Ontario creameries are purchasing New Zealand butter and selling it under their own creamery brand. Is the minister in favour of marking that butter?

Mr. ADSHEAD: Will the hon. gentleman repeat that?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am very sorry, but it is necessary that I go.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): They purchase New Zealand butter and then sell it under their own creamery brand. Would the minister be good enough to find out if that is not contrary to law, and if the department should not consider that butter as being renovated butter?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As the Minister of Agriculture has to go to address a religious meeting, I suggest that the item stand, and we will call one item in the Fisheries department.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington): I have to attend a religious meeting this afternoon. It will take the minister only a second to answer my question. During the last three or four months over $8,000,000 worth of butter has come in from New Zealand, and where did it go? The people are buying this butter believing that it is Canadian made, and the Minister of Agriculture knows that and does nothing to stop the practice.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to answer the hon. member's question when I return this afternoon. In the meantime, let me supplement the explanation given by the Minister of Justice for being obliged to leave the committee at this stage. I am going to the experimental farm to assist the Prime Minister in receiving the pilgrims from abroad.

Item stands.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

To provide for an investigation into the life history of the Pacific halibut by the international fishery commission appointed under the Pacific Halibut treaty of 2nd March, 1923, $31,500.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): This item is for the payment of our share of the expenditures in connection with the international fisheries commission.

Mr. McRAE: Might I suggest to the minister that he represent to the commission the fact that our halibut fisheries are not making the progress in reestablishment which we might reasonably expect. I am told that overfishing is still being carried on in the Hecate strait.

Mr. CARDIN: I regret to admit that my hon. friend is practically correct. That condition still exists.

Mr. FRASER: Is it a fact that under the Fisheries Act the minister has power to prohibit and does prohibit the export of salmon from British Columbia?

Mr. CARDIN: We are prohibiting the export of raw salmon, but not of salmon in a canned or cured state.

Mr. FRASER: This is the prohibition of the export of a natural product. Could it not be applied to other products? Why are the fishermen picked out as the only ones whose product cannot be exported? We are asking for some regulation of our wood products in an unmanufactured state. Why are the fishermen picked out as the only producers who are prohibited, under regulations of this government, from the markets of the world?

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. CARDIN: The request of my hon. friend will have to be made to the ministers looking after other departments.

Mr. FRASER: Why does the minister pick out producers under his administration as the only ones in the Dominion of Canada who are subjected to that treatment?

Mr. CARDIN: I confess that I am not in a position to give a complete explanation to my hon. friend as to that. It is rather a complicated issue and I would ask my hon. friend to be kind enough to give me an opportunity to have a statement prepared by my officials in regard to the matter.

Mr. FRASER: I shall be pleased to do that for the minister, but I should like to point this out: my information may be wrong; I am not absolutely certain of it, but I have information which leads me to believe that if the fishermen in British Columbia were allowed to export their fish to the United States, they could get a higher price for their product. Under the regulations of the department they are prohibited from exporting it and consequently they cannot get as high a price for their fish as they could if the market were a local one.

Mr. COOTE: I have always felt that the policy of the government in regard to the salmon industry is almost beyond understanding. We are worried for fear our salmon will become extinct if we do not protect it with very strict regulations regarding the catch. We prohibit the export of raw sockeye salmon, but we go to great pains to make trade treaties with Australia and other countries trying to get very satisfactory arrangements for the export of our canned salmon to them. I have never been able to understand the policy of this country with regard to the salmon industry. On the one hand we are endeavouring to protect it from becoming extinct, so that future Canadians will be able to enjoy this palatable fish. On the other, we are doing our best to negotiate trade treaties which will enable our salmon canners to export this fish to every country in the world.

Mr. WARD: I would like to take this opportunity of saying a word with regard to our western Canada fisheries. A few days ago an hon. member, referring to this department, made a statement to the effect that in all the years he had been in the house he had never known this department to do anything that would assist in turning the fishing industry to any great account. I gather from the remarks of some hon. members that they

regard a few oyster beds on the Atlantic or a few salmon on the Pacific coast as the only fisheries in Canada. I represent a constituency with 250 miles of large lake shoreline and I say that from one small lake in that area we produce every year 250 carloads of the highest grade fish produced in Canada. About ten or twelve years ago a hatchery located on an island in lake Winnipegosis was producing annually about 35,000,000 fry, and the annual catch at that time was about thirty-five carloads of fish. Last year and the year before the same lake produced about 250 carloads of fish, principally of what are known as yellow pike and whitefish. This hatchery, which is a government institution, has been for several years producing an average of 100,000,000 fry annually. The same success has been obtained at all the other hatcheries connected with our Manitoba lakes. The annual production of fish in Manitoba has almost doubled within recent years. This, I think, is entirely attributable to the consideration and attention given to that industry by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It is only fair that I should make that statement and it was unfair for hon. members from the maritime provinces who are finding some difficulty with their oyster beds or western members who are finding some difficulty with their Yankee friends in protecting the salmon on the Pacific coast, to go off at a tangent and think the only fish in Canada are the few that may be produced on the Atlantic or the Pacific coast.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the expenses of the British Columbia fisheries reference to the Privy Council, $15,000.

Mr. McRAE: Will the minister give the committee a little outline of what this item refers to?

Mr. CARDIN: This is to cover the expenses of the reference to the Privy Council of the difficulty which arose in British Columbia. A company requested the department to issue a license to operate a cannery in British Columbia, and the department would not agree to do so, because they were not satisfied that such a cannery should be permitted to operate. The company started to operate without a license. Prosecution was instituted against them and we lost the case before the court in British Columbia, the decision being practically that they could operate a cannery without obtaining a license from the federal government. The court held that it was not within our authority to regulate or to issue licenses to canneries or to refuse them permission to operate without such licenses. The matter was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, and I regret to say that our contention was not sustained there. It was held that the decision of the court in British Columbia was correct, and that the federal authorities had no right to regulate these canneries by the issuance or refusal of licenses.

One other point which is raised in the reference is the power of the minister to discriminate between applicants asking for fishing licenses in British Columbia and elsewhere. This is a very important issue, because if it is established that we have not power to regulate in this matter; that the power to regulate in British Columbia rests with the provincial authorities, it means as a result that the whole administration of the fisheries in that province will probably pass under the control of the provincial authorities, because they can block all the operations of the Department of Fisheries if they have the right to regulate the canneries.

Mr. McRAE: Who is representing the department before the Privy Council?

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. Eugene Lafleur of Montreal.

Mr. SPENCER: Does the Department of Marine and Fisheries control canneries located on interprovincial streams or on lakes within a province?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: Everywhere?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. McRAE: I would suggest to the minister, inasmuch as this is a controversy of long standing on the coast, that it might be well to have associated with Mr. Lafleur, for whom I have the highest regard, some counsel who is familiar with the controversy.

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. A. B. MacDonald is associated with him.

Item agreed to.

Marine Biological Board of Canada—(a) purely scientific work, $100,775; (b) practical and experimental work, $200,960; (c) fish culture investigations, $47,150.—Total, $348,885.

Mr. McRAE: The amount which it is proposed to vote for this year, $348,885, represents a very large increase over last year's appropriation of $200,100, an increase of 74 per cent in one year. I think the committee would be interested in knowing how this increase is accounted for.

Mr. CARDIN: The increase is made up of the following items:

(a) For the operation of the biological stations at St. Andrews, New Brunswick, and Nanaimo, British Columbia, necessitating additional scientific help for the former and a boat for the use of the latter station to be used on the west coast of Vancouver island, $5,275.

Mr. McRAE: Is that amount for the boat?

Mr. CARDIN: It includes the scientific help required.

Mr. McRAE: All I can say is that any boat you can get for $5,000 will not go very far in the seas you get on the west coast of Vancouver island. It would not be much better than a rowboat.

Mr. CARDIN: It is a very small boat that is being purchased on the recommendation of the board. The other details are as follows:

(b) A new permanent building is required at Halifax. Due to the expansion of the work of instruction to fishermen and fishery officers, the present building in which are housed the laboratories, offices and class rooms, is far too small, so much so that all who applied for instruction this year could not be accommodated, $50,000.

At Halifax a boat is required to be specially fitted to demonstrate the best methods of handling and keeping fresh fish in good condition, $15,000.

The demonstration building requires a second storey to provide space for canning equipment and demonstration work, $9,500.

Eastern Passage marine laboratory, which was built to provide a necessary part of the training of students taking the university course of Fisheries Bachelor of Science, $10,000.

A new building is required at Prince Rupert to house the refrigeration plant for experimental and demonstration work, in view of the advance now taking place in rapid freezing, $16,000.

Refrigeration machinery for the above, $16,000.

For additional scientific staff and the general operation of the above station, $11,460.

(c) To provide for a systematic investigation of the oyster fishery and to build a small laboratory for the work, $7,000.

Fish hatchery for experimental and demonstration work, $4,000.

Surveying lakes, especially of the prairie provinces (additional), $3,500.

Incidental expenses, $1,050.—Total, $148,785.

Mr. McRAE: I notice that there is a large appropriation of $40,000 odd in connection with buildings and equipment and additional station staff at Prince Rupert. Who is in charge of that Prince Rupert station?

Mr. CARDIN: Doctor Finn.

Mr. McRAE: Does he live at Prince Rupert?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

[Mr. McRae.]

Mr. BRADY: This is a very interesting and a very important subject. A part of the vote is for purely scientific work of an experimental nature and the other part is for practical work. I do not know how many members are really qualified to express in ordinary terms what a great number of these words mean, for instance, protozoa, diatoms and copepods. What progress have we made in the study of this organic life which belongs to what is known as the plankton group? This group comprises a very remarkable family of roaming organic life found drifting in the waters, and includes the flora and the fauna of this particular group. A German expedition in 1894 made a thorough survey of this minute organic life in the Atlantic ocean, and I would ask the minister what data is available for us as to what is being done in that particular group?

Mr. CARDIN: I am sure that my hon. friend does not expect from me a detailed explanation of the work of the biological stations. I have no hesitation in confessing that I am far from being familiar with these scientific matters. Reports are published by the biological board in which all their activities are discussed. I might mention that one of the great problems in relation to the halibut on the Pacific coast was to prevent discolouration or yellowing, on account of which condition the price of the fish would be reduced by five or six cents a pound. The biological board have been studying that problem, and I believe that they have discovered a cure for the trouble. That discovery will be of great benefit to all interested in fisheries. In fact the head of one of the important British Columbia fishing companies stated that this one discovery and remedy would justify all the expenditure by the biological board.

Mr. BRADY: I am pleased to hear the minister's statement. One of our finest food fish is the famous white spring salmon. I have seen these fish caught in the Dixon entrance as heavy as sixty and seventy pounds. Unfortunately owing to the prejudice against its lack of colour white spring salmon does not fetch more than two or three cents a pound, as against twelve or fourteen cents a pound for our red spring salmon. Would it not be worth while to undertake research work with a view to devising some innocuous method whereby this very valuable food fish could be put on the market as best red spring salmon?

I observe that the department is studying the habits of the wood-boring worm known

as the teredo. Unless hon. gentlemen have visited the Pacific coast they can have no idea of how rapidly these wood-borers destroy our wharves. As the minister knows, after a freshly cut pile of about twenty-four inches in diameter has been in the water six weeks it is practically ruined. I would ask that the department continue their scientific work in order to discover measures for checking this pest. How far has the investigation proceeded?

Mr. CARDIN: The biological board is studying the problem. I shall be pleased to draw the attention of the board to my hon. friends' representations.

Mr. McRAE: Although the discolouration of halibut has been known for some time by the men in the trade who handle halibut in a large way, I notice the biological board take a good deal of credit to themselves for their discovery. The discolouration comes about while the fish are in the hold of the vessel. What we need is some means of preventing this discolouration. The biological board should bend their efforts to a practical solution of the problem.

Progress reported.

REPORT PRESENTED

Seventeenth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Parent.

LOUIS COIT DARGAVEL

Mr. A. C. CASSELMAN (Grenville-Dundas): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Stewart (Leeds):

That Bill No. 348 (letter 19 of the senate), intituled: "An act for the relief of Louis Coit Dargavel," be placed on the order paper this day.

Mr. GARDINER: I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is objection it is well taken.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at three o'clock.

SUPPLY

MARINE AND FISHERIES

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. McRAE: When the committee rose I was discussing the biological board and I intended asking the minister these questions: How long has the board been established at Nanaimo, and are all the persons whose names are mentioned in the report on the pay roll of the department? The list is quite extensive and I shall refer to it somewhat in detail later, but it would shorten the discussion if we had now a brief explanation as to how these various persons are engaged.

Mr. CARDIN: The station has been in operation for about twenty years. The board is not paid but the staff is.

Mr. McRAE: I have reference to the report of the fisheries branch for 1927-28, which is the last one to hand, and on page 110 of which there appear a large number of names of persons who are making investigations and research. I should like to know whether these persons are all in the employ of the department on regular salary or, if not, how they are paid.

Mr. CARDIN: The station provides facilities for those who wish to make experiments, but these persons are not paid by the department, although their results are available to us. These people are carrying on investigations but are not paid by us.

Mr. McRAE: It seems rather unusual that in the departmental report the department should take credit for the work of so many persons whom they do not pay. These people are not really in the employ of the department. Will the minister tell me how many persons are employed by the department at Nanaimo?

Mr. CARDIN: We pay the following salaries: director, $3,600; captain of boat, $1,800; engineer, $1,560; secretary, $900; cook, $600; maid, $420; caretaker, $900; assistant caretaker, $840. These are the only employees whom we take.

Mr. McRAE: I have been particularly concerned about the work of the biological board inasmuch as it bears on the sockeye salmon situation in our province. I have gone over the report very carefully and I must say I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena, regarding the technical terms which he used so freely this morning. But to me at least this report is not very clear. In this respect I am sure it would be interesting to know just how the fishermen regard the lectures which the board give them on different occasions. I may say that they are sceptical of the practical importance of this biological work; they feel that the work of the board is entirely too theoretical and technical and that not sufficient time is given

to the practical phase of the fishing situation in our province. They are of the opinion that the investigations of the board are too abstract and academic: to use the expression of the fishermen themselves, you cannot put this knowledge into the can. The particular claim which the fishermen make is that there are too many desk men, what we might call office men, being sent into the field to inquire about matters which responsible fishermen have known for a very long time. I referred the other day to the inquiry into sea lions, when as a matter of fact what should be inquired into is the problem how to destroy the sea lions which are eating up our fish. The fishermen claim that investigators from the board try experiments in artificial planting in areas where hatchery fish would not have the slightest chance owing to freshets on the one hand or where streams dry up. The board officials have not the necessary knowledge and, the fishermen claim, errors are made which could be avoided if practical fishermen were consulted. I mention this matter in order to convey to the minister the idea that the board is not nearly as practical as it should be. I know that these long names which are referred to in the reports of the research department—such terms for instance as protozoa-diatoms copepods and zooplankton, and all that sort of thing—are all right in their place. They refer to the very lowest and microscopic forms of animal life in existence, some that cannot be seen with the naked eye.

Mr. CARDIN: What big names.

Mr. McRAE: Yes I am afraid the sockeye salmon will be in that class soon. If we cannot get some practical work done by this biological board we will not be able to see the sockeye salmon, not on account of its size but on account of its extinction. I notice that among other things mentioned in the report is an investigation of the life history of the teredo, to which the hon. member for Skeena referred. We all know enough about the life history of the teredo; it lives too long to please us and what we want is some preparation which will prevent the teredo from doing so much harm. We have succeeded now in finding that method in part through creosoting.

As you read the report the thing that impresses you very much is the small consideration which has been given to the reestablishment of our fisheries; in fact you will find only one reference to it in this research work, and that is the study of salmon scales for the provincial government. That is rather an absurd reference.

[Mr. McRae.]

I think the department would be well advised to cut out those things in future reports. The report is supposed to be read by members who, like myself, do not follow it very closely, and I suggest that if it were confined to practical matters and written in common trade terms which we can all understand, the government would be saved a lot of printing expense and the members of this house would have more information than they obtain from this report at present.

With regard to field investigations, there again the findings of the board do not deal with salmon. Coming to the heading "Publicity," and as far as I can see that is confined to two small aquariums which are being established at Nanaimo. I submit that if we are going to establish any of these aquariums for the education of the public they should be located in the populous centres where more people will see them and more good will be done. I have no doubt that these aquariums would be more advantageously located in Vancouver or Victoria than in Nanaimo, where very few people go and where there are very few fishermen. Nanaimo is a coal town and there are no fishermen there except a few Japanese who fish for herring and that sort of thing. Why we should put this biological board in Nanaimo is not clear to me, particularly as it appears from these reports that the board has an educational duty to perform. I notice they are to build a museum in Prince Rupert; I fear that we have about reached that stage of the fisheries problem in our province where museums will be necessary in order to display the last specimens of that great commercial fish, the sockeye salmon. As far as I can see there is no other useful purpose to be served by these museums and there is no reason why the public money should be spent in this way while we have a real fish problem to work out.

I have given the views of the fishermen and now I want to give the views of the cannery men, who say there is certainly great room for biological work in the fish business, and that perhaps the reason why this board had not done very much was because they had not much money. Just here I might say that the United States authorities reported a year or two ago that the work done by this biological board was very good, but that it was very meagre. The business interests in my province have expressed the opinion that there is great need for a biological board but that this board is not devoting very much consideration to the practical issues with which we are confronted.

Now I want to refer to the question of fish culture, with which this vote has to do. There is very little space devoted in the report to the culture of sockeye salmon; some seven or eight lines on page 15 constitutes the only reference. In passing I want to observe that this branch of the service turned out about 105,000,000 fry in 1927-28, which cost us $112,562.35, an average of roughly $1.15 per thousand. This figure is materially higher than what the state of Washington claim it costs them to turn out fingerlings four or five inches long and six or seven months old under the pond system. I mention this fact to show that it is not a matter of cost with regard to this kind of propagation but rather a question of courage on the part of our department to get that work under way.

Our investigations have been going on ever since the branch was established in British Columbia forty-five years ago; I presume we have been investigating sockeye salmon since that time. They are the greatest commercial fish we have and they present a real problem which we must solve. I discussed this matter the other day at some length, and the minister stated in reply that the biological board had been instructed to make a complete investigation and that the department was prepared to follow the recommendations of that board. I must say to the committee that this promises no solution of our problem at all. I do not say that the men who compose that biological board have not the ability to make this investigation if they were so directed. I submit that this board now has been in operation for a great many years, and apparently they are not making any investigation whatever with regard to the rehabilitation of the sockeye salmon fisheries, which the department has said will mount up to at least $35,000,000 a year. There is time enough to get down to theory and theoretical matters later, but I say that before we proceed with the expenditure of the amount of money covered by this vote we should have some further assurance than has been given so far that this increase is necessary. It is not my intention to offer a motion but I do suggest that if we vote $200,100 this year it is enough. I suggest that the minister postpone these additional expenditures and reduce this vote to what it was last year. I think that is a reasonable request until such time as the minister can give us some information to show the effectiveness of this board.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed by the deputy that the board has been looking into the sockeye salmon question for four years and that they have complete equipment at Cultus lake.

There is another point upon which I am in a position to agree with my hon. friend. He complains that the report is somewhat technical and not in plain language. I quite agree with him and I will ask the officers of the department to try to make the report more comprehensible to the ordinary man who does not understand the scientific and technical words which are used by members of the biological board.

Mr. McRAE: Reference has been made by the minister to the cultural work which is being done at Cultus lake in British Columbia, and this information will be found on pages 117 and 118 of the report of 1927-28. This is one of the smallest hatcheries we have in British Columbia, and in 1927-28 the expenditure was only $4,819.05. It is only necessary for any member of the committee to read these pages to realize what a feeble effort is made in studying the culture of sockeye salmon. Very few fish are released from this hatchery, and, as stated in the report, during some years none at all return. About 70 per cent of the fish must be accounted for and returns by the canneries in Puget sound south of the line, and I leave it to the committee to say just how valuable that information is. That is not even playing with the thing and it is making no effort whatever to solve this problem. Mr. Minister, this headless department of yours will have to get a move on if anything effective is to be done for the sockeye salmon industry.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I am intensely interested in the subject which he has been discussing and I am very sympathetic to the proposal he has made with respect to the sockeye salmon fishing industry. I have been out to the coast and studied this matter a little, but I am at a complete loss to know just what the hon. member is proposing.

Mr. McRAE: I take it that the hon. member was not in the house the other day when I made a definite proposal, but I will be glad to repeat it. The Department of Marine and Fisheries, constituted as it is under governments as they must be formed, cannot grasp the situation in British Columbia. In my talk the other day I suggested that the government should appoint a British Columbia fish commission, to be composed of representatives of the fishermen, of the canneries, and of the business interests in the province, who understand this problem.

These men are deeply interested in this matter and would be only too pleased to give their services gratis to their country to bring about the reestablishment of their salmon industry which has been diminishing so rapidly.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is all very well, but I do not know how it would get us very far; I do not see that it is any better than the suggestion of the minister, although I do not see that he is getting us anywhere either. So far as I understand the situation the difficulty has been the depletion of the sockeye run, partly as a result of conditions in the Fraser river itself and chiefly as a result of American trapping. With all due respect to the hon. gentleman, I do not see how that question can be solved other than by the making of an international agreement. If we could secure an international agreement to limit the catch for some years, thus allowing a gerater number of mature fish to go up the river to spawn, I think the industry would find itself rehabilitated much quicker than it would be by the appointment of a commission. It is not commissions that we want, we want a return flow of the fish into the streams. I am only a layman on this subject; I am not a fisherman myself, but for the life of me I cannot understand how the Cultus lake hatchery is going to be responsible for the great increase in the vote this year. I do not think the minister can be serious when he suggests that reason. I have seen that hatchery myself, and I presume that some work is being done at Cultus lake and some at Chilliwack river.

Mr. CARDIN: The hatchery at Cultus lake is for experimental purposes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I agree with the hon. member for North Vancouver; I think this vote is out of all reason. Until there is a more definite program laid before this committee, we might return to the old amount. The hon. member is from that part of the country and he knows the requirements out there; he suggested to the minister that this item be reduced to the original amount of $200,000, and in the absence of a more reasonable explanation from the minister I am afraid that I must agree with the hon. member. As to the rehabilitation of the sockeye salmon industry, I think the minister will have to find some way of getting an international agreement on that. Let us get more of the salmon up the stream and we will solve the problem.

Mr. McRAE: I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as far as the Fraser river is concerned, but that is only one of the several great streams in our province, in all of which the fish are being depleted. By appointing this British Columbia fish commission the government would be getting the experience of directors who could not be hired for nominal salaries, men who would be prepared to give their time to the development of this great industry. I am led to make that statement by what has happened in regard to the Columbia river. They have a non-political body of citizens in Oregon who have done great work in the reestablishment of the fisheries on that great river. I am confident that the commission I am suggesting would do for our fishing industry in British Columbia what a similar commission has done in the state of Oregon.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Who comprises the biological board?

Mr. CARDIN: Doctor J. Playfair McMurrich, Toronto, chairman; J. J. Cowie, Ottawa, secretary-treasurer, an employee of the department; Doctor Philip Cox of Fredericton, N.B.; Doctor C. J. Connolly, Antigonish, N.S.; Professor A. T. Cameron, Winnipeg; John Dybhavn, Prince Rupert, representing the industry; Professor J. N. Gowanlock, Halifax; Reverend Canon V. A. Huard, of Quebec university; Professor A. H. Hutchinson, Vancouver; Professor W. T. MacClement, Kingston; Professor Marie-Victorin, Montreal university; Doctor E. E. Prince, Ottawa; J. A. Rodd, Ottawa, another employee of the department; A. Handfield Whitman, Halifax, representing the industry; Professor A. Willey, Montreal.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is Professor Connolly still on the board.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I understand he has not been in Canada for the last two or three years.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed that he attended the last meeting of the board.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): He is a professor at one of the universities in the United States. I expected that the minister or his deputy would have been able to give some answer to the questions put and the criticism made by the hon. member for North Vancouver. As a supporter of the biological board I was distinctly disappointed, and if what the minister gave to the committee was a history of the work done by the board, I could not conscientiously vote for half that amount of money. Surely the minister, if he is in sympathy with the work of the board, would say that something had been done. The

biological board, constituted as it was a few years ago, was the first to enter a complaint in regard to the fishery situation, contending that the hatcheries were not doing the good we expected them to do. As a result they studied the losses in the fish hatcheries and to-day we are getting some results and cooperation. The minister at least might have given the board credit for that. He might also have given the board credit for having investigated such matters as lobster canning. Although they made an extensive study of that and would have put it where it was before, yet they lacked the support of the department and the officials connected therewith.

The minister might have told us, too, that scientific studies must play some part in these classes for fishery officials, but when the classes were started first they lacked absolutely that backing and support. The fishery officials who attended those classes naturally would find the course of study very difficult at the time, the same as any student in a university would, but it would take only three or four years to give them a background whereby they would understand what the board wanted. What does the minister expect the board to do? Does he expect the board, composed altogether of scientific men, to go out and examine personally all these things? They cannot do that. They must depend upon the reports provided by the officials of the department and if those officials lack the education and knowledge expected of them, there is only one thing to do: either get a new class of officials, or have the present one educated so that they can supply satisfactory results to the board.

I agree with the statement that a great deal of the work of the board has been done in eastern Canada, and that very good results have been obtained therefrom. I do not know whether one should give the credit to the board or not, but the whitefish supply in lake Ontario, for example, increased very noticeably from 1913 to 1924. In 1913 the catch was only 495,000 pounds, whereas in 1924 it had risen to 2,653,000 pounds. If cooperation can secure a result like that, cooperation is the one thing that the whole department should strive for. I have a report of the first classes called by the biological board. The superintendent of fisheries pronounced them of no value whatever, though he did not attend one class. He did not know anything about them. That is lack of cooperation. I am sure, however, the board is getting cooperation and better results to-day. There is a great deal that the minister could have given the committee to-day with regard to results achieved by the board. If hon. members will look over the reports and papers furnished by the National Research Council, they will find very few practical papers. I am surprised that the minister, in speaking of the people employed, said that they were not paid anything. They are certainly paid the expense of carrying on that research work. I have tried to find out from the minister and the department how these researches are allotted. By a lot of studying I have obtained the information myself, and there seems to be a lack of direction, of getting finality in this research work. The only papers in the report are the "Bottom fauna of lake Nipigon" and "An investigation into the question of early putrefaction of eviscerated fish in which the gills have been left"; that was given in 1919. I am sure the minister could have given the committee a splendid description of the results secured, if he had taken only the success in regard to the freezing of fish and that kind of thing. The board is at the bottom of all this work. The study of fish is a distinctly scientific subject, and the direction must come from scientific men with a knowledge of fish history, fish food, aquaculture and so forth. They must also make use of that information, for practical purposes. The department is falling down, in that respect and also in not placing before the board the information given in the house by hon. members as to where the failure of the fishing industry is taking place, and in not saying to the board: "Give us a solution of the problem." The minister can increase the board by giving the western section of the country their own men on it and a field to work in. Salmon life on the Atlantic is altogether different from salmon life on the Pacific, and the western people should have an opportunity of dealing with salmon life on the Pacific. Before I sit down, might I ask what pay is given to the members of the board?

Mr. CARDIN: No pay.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is one answer which the minister might have given to the committee.

Mr. CARDIN: I gave it this morning.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I have been sitting here and I must confess I did not get all this information from the minister.

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend was out of the chamber at that very moment, but I gave it this morning.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I heard the statement made this morning, and I also heard it repeated this afternoon, that the minister

could get a body of men for nothing. This is a body of men that he is getting for nothing. I know these men. They have been working for the department for years and they have given time to this work. Some of them, owing to lack of the cooperation they desired, have resigned and left the board. I am not altogether pessimistic about the biological board. We need it and we need these men at the head of it, but there must be some driving force behind it. The department must support it and it would be wise to say to the biological board: So far you have been giving a great deal of attention to eastern Canada; put more men on the west and get results there. It is very sad if our salmon industry cannot be brought up in the same way as they have brought up the lake Ontario whitefish industry, and I believe the same results can be accomplished.

Item agreed to.

Marine Biological Board of Canada—further amount required—(a) purely scientific work, $10,000.

Mr. McRAE: What is this for?

Mr. CARDIN: This is a further amount required for the biological board for purely scientific work.

Mr. McRAE: I would like to move that it be reduced to $1.

Mr. CARDIN: I do not think my hon. friend is fair in making that request. I have been given the following particulars in regard to the increase in this vote. It is proposed to remodel, extend and equip a building for experimental fish handling, which work it is estimated will cost $4,500. The board also proposes to enlarge and furnish an existing house to accommodate scientific workers with families. This also will cost $4,500. The above extension will be made at the biological station at St. Andrews, New Brunswick.

I think after the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend from Kingston City, the department should rather be supported for giving to the board all the money they require to carry on their work. No one disputes the importance of the work which the board has been doing in the past. It is true that I have not given a very lengthy statement of what they have accomplished, but I have never failed to give credit to that very important organization for the good work which they have done. This morning I mentioned more particularly the very important investigations which they have made in British Columbia in regard to the discolouration of halibut. They have found the cause of the trouble and have suggested a remedy. That is very important and, as my hon. friend from North Vancouver admitted, it is something worth while. In Halifax the board has discovered a method of rapid freezing which is going to prove very advantageous for the fisheries as a whole. I need not say that the department is quite ready to cooperate with the board. While its work is largely of a scientific nature, in practically every country, and perhaps more so in countries not far distant from us, industry is going in for scientific research more and more. I think therefore that we should not be asked to reduce the amount which we are asking the committee to place at the disposal of the board in order to permit them to continue and even extend their works. The request for this increased vote does not come simply from the department but from the board itself. They feel that they need this additional amount to carry on properly the work which has been assigned to them, and I think it would be unfair and not in the interests of the industry which it is seeking to serve to refuse this small additional amount. I can see the point made by my hon. friend that the board's activities in British Columbia should probably be extended further, and that they should be requested to give more of their time to the important problem of reclaiming as much as possible the sockeye fisheries. I can assure him that his views and those that have been expressed by other hon. members will be brought before the board, and I shall ask them to give special attention to the interests of British Columbia during the coming year.

Mr. McRAE: I wish to make it perfectly clear that my sympathy is entirely with the biological board, but I want to make it equally clear to the committee that it is the unanimous opinion of those interested in the industry in British Columbia that the board lacks practical direction. That is not the fault of the board so much as it is of the deparment. There is an increase of 74 per cent in the vote this year over last year, and I submit that in view of the discussion on fisheries which has taken place in this house in the past week, the minister might very well forego this supplementary vote entirely. The list he has read is for more or less permanent improvements. I think the committee would feel better if we got along without any supplementary vote for this purpose, and next year, as the minister has said, he will be able to come here with the matter better in hand, and the committee will understand better what work is being done and the

manner in which it is being carried on. I think the idea that the department should expect people to carry on with those investigators unpaid is rather unreasonable. It is hardly to be expected that men will give the necessary time for these long investigations without compensation. I suggest this to the minister for his consideration. I do think, however, that we have voted enough money for this department this year, and that the minister should not ask the committee to approve $10,000 more by way of supplementaries.

Item agreed to.

Fisheries branch — contingencies — further amount required, $3,000.

Mr. McRAE: Before we leave these estimates, I notice that $160,000 is provided for fishing bounties. Is this bounty, which is paid under statute, confined entirely to the Atlantic coast?

Mr. CARDIN: It is by statute, and is confined to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. McRAE: I have only this to say. We have fishermen who need help out on the Pacific coast. I have no objection at all to voting $160,000 for the Atlantic coast fishermen, but I think we should consider when the proper time comes giving equal help to our fishermen on the Pacific coast.

Mr. VENIOT: This is not given for help to the Atlantic fishermen, but as their right under a treaty with the United States.

Mr. NEILL: I protest against the remarks of the last speaker. We discussed this matter last year. This is a case where my hon. friend from Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) was very indignant because I suggested that he give up the graft which the Atlantic fishermen have been enjoying for the past twenty-six years. This money is voted by statute for the improvement of the deep sea fisheries. That is what the statute says and nothing else, but the money has been deliberately diverted from the purpose of encouraging deep sea fishing throughout Canada into a means of giving—I will not call it graft—but a little hand-out to a few fishermen on the Atlantic coast—$1.45 to one fisherman, 89 cents to another, and they call that encouraging deep sea fishing. The money is being entirely wasted from the point of view of the purpose for which it was granted, if it was granted for the encouragement of deep sea fishing. Secondly, the money is beoing deliberately diverted from the British Columbia coast, where we are just as much entitled to the bounty as the people on the Atlantic coast. My friends from New Brunswick will no doubt get up and say, as they did last year, that it has always been so. That was the biggest argument that they could advance, but when did antiquity lend countenance to a wrong? If it has been a wrong, the sooner we stop it the better. The fact hat it has been done for a number of years does not establish more than that beautiful thing called a precedent. They claim that this bounty was granted on account of some concession given to the Americans in return for which the Americans agreed to pay a sum of money, two or three million dollars, and this $160,000 is the interest on that sum. But that money was not ear-marked for the Atlantic fishermen. It was put into the treasury of the country, into the consolidated fund. You can read the act under which this money is voted from beginning to end and backwards again and you will not find anything in it which says that the money is to be devoted entirely to the fishermen of one province. I suggest that we stop paying this bounty, a little dab here to this fisherman who goes out in a boat, and a little dab there to that fishermen. That does not encourage deep sea fishing. Is a man going to be encouraged to engage in deep sea fishing by giving him $1.35 a year? The thing is ridiculous. This money should be used for some advantageous purpose, such as the development of biological work. I could quote plenty of cases where it could be used to advantage on the British Columbia coast.

Mr. VENIOT: Take it all to the Pacific coast and give us nothing.

Mr. NEILL: I would suggest that you give it all to the Pacific coast for the next few years to make up for the thirty years during which you have been swiping our share of it from British Columbia. I will not go into details, but there are lots of opportunities on the Pacific coast where money could be well spent in the development of the deep sea fisheries. I protest against this bounty for these two reasons: The money is being utterly wasted, and secondly, British Columbia is as much entitled by law to receive a share of this money as the Atlantic fishermen. I do not want my friends to get up and talk about precedents. What the statute says is what counts. The statute must be read by itself, and it says that the money is for the purpose of encouraging the deep sea fisheries of Canada. If there were any other intentions, they do not appear in the statute.

Item agreed to.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

Amount required for soldier land settlement advances and cost of administration of soldier settlement, $1,445,000.

Amount required for general land settlement advances and cost of administration of general land settlement, $1,400,000.

Mr. LUCAS: I want to take up with the minister the case of a returned soldier in my constituency. It is in connection with a barn built on the Ogilvie farm. Oglivie secured a full loan from the soldiers' settlement board for land and equipment. He ordered lumber to the value of over sixteen hundred dollars from a lumber firm in Edmonton, and engaged this returned soldier to build the barn. Ogilvie afterwards left the place. The lumber company lost the full amount of their account, not being able to place a lien on crown property. I am not fighting for payment of the claim of the lumber company. Like any business concern, they always set aside a certain amount for bad debts, and it was up to them to look after their own business. But the returned soldier is not in the best of circumstances. He was anxious to get the work in order to support his family, and when Ogilvie engaged him this returned soldier acted in good faith and built a very excellent barn. All he charged was four hundred and eighty dollars. The legion have done their best to help this man, and every time I visit the district they take the case up with me. When I was there last they drove me out to view the barn. This man not only built the barn, but he overhauled the house as well. The board resold the farm to a British family settler. The purchase price of the land to Ogilvie was fifty-five hundred dollars, leaving out the stock and equipment, which are separate items. The board resold the farm for fifty-two hundred dollars, or at a loss of only three hundred dollars. The officers of the department have assured me that the barn added a thousand dollars to the resale value of the farm. In other words, if the building had not been erected, the board could not have resold the farm within a thousand dollars of the price they received for it. I have placed the case before the minister on several occasions, in fact it has been pending for several years. He is sympathetic, but he thinks he has no means of getting the money to pay this claim. I would ask him if there is not some way by which he can take care of the debt owing to this returned soldier.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, I admit this case involves considerable hardship to the carpenter concerned, but for the department to deal with it as my hon. friend wishes would open up a pretty wide field. For the information of the house I might read the statement from the soldiers' settlement board:

This settler was established about 1920, receiving the full amount as allowed by statute to be advanced to soldier settlers; viz: $7,500. The following year he engaged to build a barn, obtaining the lumber on his own credit and hiring a man to build the barn. The soldier settlement board had nothing to do with the arrangement in building the barn. A year or two afterwards he left the farm and it reverted to the board. No purchaser was found for it until it was set aside for settlement under the 3,000 British Family Settlement Scheme in 1926.

The carpenter who built the barn made a claim on the board for his work, about $480. The board, not being in any way responsible for this debt, have refused to pay same. When the farm was sold to the British family settler it showed a loss to the board of something like $1,700, not including any interest. If interest was included it would be over $4,000. The board has neither power nor authority to pay out any moneys on the private debts of delinquent settlers.

Now, to deal with this case as requested would establish a precedent for ten thousand soldier settlers to incur debts on their own responsibility, and their creditors would look to the board for payment. I admit the hardship in this individual case, but really I cannot see any other course open to the board than to repudiate the debts of soldier settlers incurred on their own responsibility after they have obtained full loans under the act. Unfortunately a principle is involved that we cannot ignore, otherwise we might stretch a point in this particular case.

Mr. LUCAS: The loss on the resale which is given in the statement read by the minister of course includes the original loan for stock and equipment. But the new settler who purchased the farm did not get any of that. The land in the first place cost fifty-five hundred dollars, and it was sold for fifty-two hundred dollars; so the actual loss to the board was only three hundred dollars on the farm itself. I think any officer of the department who has seen the barn will frankly admit that if it had not been on the farm the board would not have realized within a thousand dollars of the price on the resale. In order to aid our soldier settlers in 1922, we wiped out approximately eleven million dollars of interest, and the last revaluation will probably involve something like fourteen million dollars. Now here is the case of a returned man who did not go on the land. He is trying to support himself and his family, and in good faith he goes and builds a barn on government property; he does certain work and is not paid for it. He is not asking for

charity; he is simply asking for pay for services rendered. The government in this case have something they have not paid for, and I think it is the duty of the minister to try to find some means of doing justice so far as this man is concerned.

Mr. ADSHEAD: If this were a private matter the man could file a workman's lien and that would stand before any other debt. I do not think it is quite fair, because the government occupies a peculiar position, that it should simply ignore a responsibility which any ordinary private individual would have to meet. If in private matters it is simple honesty that a workman's wages should take priority to any other claim, surely to goodness the government will not act less honestly.

Mr. FORKE: I thoroughly sympathize with the carpenter in this case, which seems a hard one. We took the advice of the Department of Justice, but if there is any way whereby we can meet the situation I shall be glad to take the matter up again with a view to having the man paid.

Mr. LUCAS: I thank the minister very much, and I hope he will not say definitely that he will do nothing.

Mr. FORKE: I am not trying to get out of it.

Mr. LUCAS: As the hon. member for East Calgary has pointed out, if this were private and not government property the man could file a lien and have his bill paid. Is the government going to take a different stand from the position which any ordinary individual would find himself in, and refuse to pay the man?

Mr. FORKE: My hon. friend must bear in mind that we have to deal with a large number of soldier settlers, and if they could incur private liabilities and charge them to us we do not know what the government would be let in for. The principle is bad; the hon. member can readily see that. Of course, this carpenter has some recourse in relation to the individual who had the farm in the first place. However, I will look into the matter and see what can be done.

Mr. LUCAS: I would point out to the minister that in the first instance the officials of his department were lax in this matter. They allowed Ogilvie to get into the condition we see in this case and get away scot free, and therefore I say there was laxity on their part.

Mr. FORKE: This was ten years ago.

Mr. LUCAS: I know; and this man has been out of his pay all these years. The man is trying to make a living and it is a real hardship on him. The people of that district are incensed over the affair. This man has been held up in connection with $480 worth of work and the whole thing has left a bad feeling in the district. I hope the minister will find some way of settling the question.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The first of the two items comprising this vote is for advances and for administration costs. How much of it will be used for further advances to settlers and how much will be taken up in costs?

Mr. FORKE: To soldier settlers for taxes, insurance premiums, seed and feed, refund of surplus on resale, initial payment returns, general land settlement, and so on, $690,000.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: And the balance is for costs of administration.

Mr. FORKE: There is $690,000 for advances and $755,000 for administration.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: How many men were originally placed under this act and how many are there at present on the land?

Mr. FORKE: There went on the land originally 31,360 soldier settlers. Soldier settlers who were granted loans numbered 24,484 and 224 Indian soldier settlers were established, making a total of 24,708 under this particular head. Soldier entries without loan numbered 6,652, bringing the total up to 31,360. Active settlers now on the land number 13,778.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Thirteen thousand out of thirty thousand?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is worse than I thought.

Mr. FORKE: Of course, only 24,484 got loans from the board. There were 6,000 soldiers who took up homesteads without loans.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Of that 24,000 the minister mentions there are 13,000 left on the land.

Mr. FORKE: Yes. There are 1,266 soldier settlers who have paid off loans and these must be added to the 13,000.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The minister is adding those 6,000 to the 13,000. What was the outstanding indebtedness in the fall of 1922? What was the original outstanding indebtedness and how much has been paid? In other words, what proportion of the moneys has been returned?

Mr. FORKE: I do not seem to have the figures just at hand.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: What was the total amount which should have been paid by the settlers from the fall of 1922, when there was a consolidation, up to date? How much was due from them and how much have they paid? I would like to know those figures in order to ascertain just what position we are in, and in order to do so I must find out how much was due and how much was paid. I think the chairman of the board must have that form which is handed out every year showing the amount due and the amount paid during that year, and I only want the aggregate of those sums from 1922 to date.

Mr. FORKE: Perhaps you had better go on while the chairman is looking for those figures.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I will leave it there for the moment, although it is rather difficult for me to proceed as I had intended. Can the minister say what is the average size of the farms held by the soldier settlers and the average indebtedness, including loans for all purposes, charged against those farms?

Mr. FORKE: The average size would run around 240 acres, I suppose, but I have not the average loan before me.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: While these figures are being looked up for my hon. friend from Red Deer I would like to make a comment which strikes me on looking at this vote. I do not understand how it is possible for the advances at this late date to amount to as much as $690,000 in a year. There are no new soldier settlers going on the land, as I understand it, and the advances were supposed to be made long ago.

Mr. FORKE: Of course we have been paying taxes and keeping the land in good standing; we have paid insurance premiums, seed and feed have been furnished in some cases and in other cases initial payments have been returned. In other words, some improvements have been put on the farms, and those amounts are all charged up against the land.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Are these all fresh advances made to the same men who secured advances some years ago?

Mr. FORKE: Yes, these are recoverable advances charged against the land.

Mr. GARDINER: What was the amount of taxes paid last year?

Mr. FORKE: About $250,000.

[Mr. Speakman.]

Mr. McRAE: Can the minister say how many soldiers are in arrears?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Perhaps the minister might give me the information I have requested.

Mr. FORKE: The original loans amounted to $112,551,042, and at present the amount outstanding is $73,100,111.30.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: How much of that amount represents arrears?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: It would be of particular value if I could ascertain how much in the aggregate was due from 1922 to the present time and how much has been paid by the settlers during that time. That will give me the information I require as to our position in this regard.

Mr. FORKE: It is a little difficult to get those figures.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I will be satisfied to take the figures right from the beginning but I thought I was making it easier in this way because there was a consolidation in 1922.

Mr. FORKE: The unpaid interest amounts to $3,854,648 at present.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is of some assistance to me.

Mr. FORKE: The total amount due and unpaid as of October 1 last was $5,392,838. Of all the soldier settlers, 88·5 per cent have either paid in full or paid a percentage.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That number has paid something?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I want to find out the total amount due from 1922 to the present time; what percentage of the amount due has been paid?

Mr. FORKE: The information I have is that the initial payments amounted to $6,245,505; the repayments of principal amounted to $20,934,029; the repayments of interest amounted to $12,271,395; making total payments of $39,450,930, leaving a balance due of $73,100,111.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The percentage of the total amount due which has been paid is shown for each year, but I want to get the aggregate amount.

Mr. FORKE: That information is not divided up in that way.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Then there is no use of my pressing for an answer.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister said that the amount of unpaid interest up to the present time amounted to over $3,000,000, and the unpaid principal amounted to over $5,392,000; that would be something like $8,500,000 which would be added to the $39,000,000.

Mr. FORKE: The $5,000,000 includes principal and interest, and of that amount $3,791,533 has been paid this year to May 31.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: How much was due this year?

Mr. FORKE: This $5,392,838, and of that amount $3,791,533 has been paid.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is the information I want, only I want it from 1922 up to the present time. I want to know how much has become due in that time; how much has been paid; to what extent the men have fallen behind—the minister has given me the information for last year, but I would like it from 1922 on. I take a great deal of interest in this work and I am trying to find out the result of the experiment. In order to do that I must know how much is due, how much has been paid, and how much is still left unpaid from 1922 to the present time.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Perhaps the minister could bring down that information at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I have a few suggestions to make, but I cannot make them until I have that information.

Mr. FORKE: It should be possible to obtain that.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: There should be no trouble about it.

Mr. FORKE: We have it for this year, and I do not see why it should not be available for the other years.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: We will let that matter stand for the moment. I have a number of other questions along the same line which I would like to ask the minister. To what extent has revaluation been carried on, that is, how many applications have been made to date, how many appraisals have been made, how many final awards have been sanctioned by the courts, and how many appeals have been filed?

Mr. FORKE: The number of settlers eligible to apply was 10,682.

Mr. GARDINER: Is that the number of actual applicants?

Mr. FORKE: That was the number who were eligible to apply. The number of applications received was 8,290; of that number, 167 were withdrawn. The number of appraisals up to date is 7,377; the number of appraisals which have been received at the head office in Ottawa is 5,905; the number of final awards approved, 4,598, and the sale price to the settlers, of the 10,682 eligible, $17,007,585.

The board's award to the present time has made a reduction of $3,934,602. Soldiers to the number of 3,372 have given their consent to the award that has been made; 876 have not yet consented; 138 to date have appealed to the exchequer court and 21 appeals have been withdrawn since being lodged. The average percentage of reduction is 23·1 per cent.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Does the minister know what percentage of the awards granted were swallowed up in arrears which the men have incurred? The point is this: when an award is made, the settler is credited with that amount as a cash payment. It frequently happens that arrears accumulated between the fall of 1922 when all arrears were reconsolidated, and the time that the appraisal was made and the award given. The practice has been to cancel the arrears to the extent of the award made, that is, to apply it to the man's outstanding indebtedness. It often happens that the reduction granted under the revaluation does not cover even the amount of arrears into which the men have fallen during previous years. In how many cases did the award result in an actual reduction in the annual payments and in how many cases was it absorbed by the arrears?

Mr. FORKE: Some of those questions are going to be pretty difficult to answer until the whole thing is wound up. I understand the hon. member's point of view; it is that in some cases the payments may be just as great in the future as they were in the past.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I realize it would be very difficult to get any such percentage at the moment, but the point is there and the minister is aware of it. In a number of cases —I cannot say just now how many—the arrears of the man practically swallowed up the amount awarded to him, so that the annual payment was as great as before. This brings me to this situation: during the six years between the amendment of 1922 which consolidated and amortized the outstanding indebtedness of that time, and the fall of 1928, when the appraisals were made, a percentage, how large I do not know, of those settlers fell behind so badly in their annual payments

that the reduction itself of 23 per cent did not meet the arrears. I have cases that I dealt with personally where the reduction granted fell far short of meeting the arrears. I am not going to stress that point as far as I might, but I will give an illustration which will show the committee exactly what I mean and what the situation is. As a matter of fact, I am taking one out of a good many that have gone through my own hands.

This man, an overseas man of British birth, a man who had given good service, returned and bought a quarter-section under the board. His indebtedness at the time of purchase of land, stock and all the equipment he required, was something like $7,300. He fell behind rather badly prior to 1922, but with the reconsolidation of 1922 he made a fresh start. In 1928, when the appraisal was made, he was awarded, I think, $1,600 or within a few dollars of that. It was what he considered and what I consider, too, as a very fair award, and he had no complaint in that regard. But his arrears had accumulated during the six years to $2,300, in spite of the fact that for four out of those six years no interest charge had been made. The committee is well aware of the fact that by the amendment of 1922, the consolidated indebtedness was exempt from interest for two, three or four years according to the year in which the man had originally purchased the land. Therefore in his case for four out of those six years, from 1922 to 1928, he had paid no interest on his capital, that is, his annual payment was about 50 per cent of the annual payment with interest included. But during that time he went behind $2,300. He received his revaluation which left him with something like $800 of arrears which were not met by the reduction. After revaluation had taken place, the remaining indebtedness was reconsolidated and again amortized into annual payments, with the result in this man's case and in many others with which I am familiar, the annual payment, after revaluation, was larger than the annual payment before, due to the fact that the arrears in 1928 amounted to more than the award granted. I think the committee will appreciate very clearly that if a man went behind $2,300 in six years, paying, I think, about $650 a year during two of those years and about $350 during the first four of the six years, the man is going to have very little chance even after revaluation when the annual payment is greater than before, and his actual capital indebtedness, in spite of the fact that he has made fair, I do not say high, payments during the past years, is greater than when he borrowed the money ten years ago.

[Mr. Speakman.]

I am bringing this forward, not by way of criticism of the minister. The minister knows the situation; he understands it and he is just as sympathetic toward it as I am. But to my mind we are approaching the time when we must decide very definitely whether we are going to forget to a large extent about the capital indebtedness or whether we are going to have the men leave the land, others come on and leave it in their turn, as I propose to show, and finally to allow the land itself to be sold for far less than its value. This man's case typified a problem that has been worrying me a great deal, not just for the sake of the country, not just from the point of view of the taxpayer, but because of the human element that is involved.

This is a man of the very best type. A few days before I came east, he came to see me in order to put his case before me, not to ask anything of the government. He said that they had done fairly by him, but he wanted to ask my advice as to what he should do. He is in the prime of life and has worked for ten years on a quarter-section. City life has no allure for him; his sole ambition is to stay on the land and to make a success of it. He has four young children born during the time he has been on the farm.

That man, of course, cannot stay. If he went in arrears $2,300 in those six years, during part of which time the payments were only half of what he was paying at another time, it is absolutely impossible for him to meet his payments in the future when in spite of revaluation the annual payment is greater than before. That is the very type of man that we are trying to get into this country, that we are encouraging and assisting to come here, a man of good habits, a patriot, a man raising a family, a man whose whole desire was to work on the land and stay there. Yet here is this man with all the necessary qualifications in an absolutely hopeless position. I have been asked why he failed if he was an average farmer. It was for this reason, and the minister and every hon. member who is a farmer knows. On the average quarter-section in the three prairie provinces to-day it is absolutely impossible for a man to raise a family of four children and support his wife and himself, pay the running costs of the farm, and pay a capital charge of approximately $700 a year. I have tried it. I went out with my parents homesteading forty years ago, and for thirty years I have known no other life than the farm, and I know that in my part of the country and in the greater part of the three prairie provinces it is impossible for a man to raise a family decently, pay the running costs of the

farm, and meet a capital payment of six or seven hundred dollars a year. The government has gone a long way to meeting the situation by the revaluation, but I am convinced that revaluation will simply defer the evil day, because in so many cases the amount awarded was eaten up by the arrears, and the annual payments in many cases are as large and in some cases larger than they were in the beginning. There are two or three phases of the situation that make it a very difficult one to deal with. I do not know a farmer in my part of the country who has made six per cent on his capital investment year after year. Our farmers on the average are a little better farmers than the soldier settlers, because a greater percentage of them have had experience, and they also had a little capital of their own, so in general perhaps they are a little better farmers. Then the average farm is a little better than the farm occupied by the average soldier settler, because when the land was first purchased for the soldier settlers it was not the best land that could be bought, partly because the inspectors did not know their job—it was a new organization created shortly after the war, and they had not been trained in their work—partly because the settler himself was not a good picker, and partly because the average farmer would not dispose of his best land. The average farmer cannot make the payments that the soldier is expected to make and live.

Mr. FORKE: I agree to some extent with the remarks made by my hon. friend for Red Deer. I believe that the board have in a great many cases advised the soldiers who were in such difficulties as my hon. friend mentioned that there was no chance of their ever being able to get on their feet, but strange to say, the board have found that in many cases they wanted to stay on the farm and were perfectly sure that they would make good under conditions that a practical farmer knew would make it impossible for him to meet the overhead expenses and carry on. I do not know what can be done to meet the situation put before the house by my hon. friend. It was really an indictment of agricultural operations as they are carried on throughout the whole of western Canada today.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It was not an indictment; it was a mere statement of fact.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I did not state that the whole of agriculture was in that position, but my remarks applied with peculiar force to these soldier settlers because they had a capital indebtedness far greater in proportion to their security than the average farmer would be allowed to undertake, because a mortgage company will loan only up to 50 per cent, whereas the soldier settler got 100 per cent.

Mr. FORKE: I might point out that 1,200 soldier settlers have paid off their total indebtedness, so they have not all failed. They got the 40 per cent reduction on their stock and implements one year, and a 25 per cent reduction the following year, and the interest was also cancelled. Now they are getting a revaluation of their farms. I do not see just what we can do about it. We cannot wipe off all their indebtedness. That would be unfair to those settlers who have paid off their indebtedness. I cannot see any other way than giving them all possible encouragement and assistance if we think there is a chance of their pulling through. If we think they are unable to wipe off their indebtedness, and they have a fair chance now to move off their holding and take up a new homestead, that indebtedness does not follow them to the new homestead. I think it was a good thing that last year they were given the chance to make a new start. My heart bleeds for these people who are in trouble or in debt, and if anything can be suggested by the committee to assist them in any other way, I shall be only too glad to give it consideration. There is a good deal of truth in what my hon. friend says, and I think it is a good thing for the country to know it.

Mr. JENKINS: As the minister is going to prepare figures for the hon. member for Red Deer, possibly at the same time he might compile figures showing the amount overdue by the soldier settlers in the province of Prince Edward Island. I am rather anxious to know how their percentages of indebtedness compare with that of soldier settlers in other provinces. I have the impression that the men who were placed on the land in our province have been doing perhaps a little better than the settlers in other provinces, and I would like to have the figures to see whether that impression is correct. I realize that in Prince Edward Island there were some men placed on the land who never should have gone there, some who were quite well fitted for office work, but would never make farmers. Some of these have left the farm and gone into other vocations and are doing very well. Generally I think the soldier settlers in our province have been doing very nicely. I would ask the minister to bring down a statement showing the capital outstanding, the

amount of interest overdue, and exactly how Prince Edward Island compares with the other provinces in the matter of payments. I feel sure that I shall not be ashamed of the comparison, because I know that nearly all the soldier settlers have been doing very well indeed in our province.

Mr. FORKE: I might point out to the hon. member for Red Deer that out of 15,225 settlers who had payments due last year, 5,747 paid in full. I question whether the average farmer in western Canada made a very much better showing than the soldier settlers in that respect. These were soldier settlers actively engaged on their farms.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is the amount in connection with the general land settlement advances required for the arrangement with the empire settlement board?

Mr. FORKE: It includes the major part of it. The general land settlement board is really the colonization end of the department.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister stated that $770,000 odd would be spent for administration purposes. Does he realize that this amounts to over $56 for each settlement account?

Mr. FORKE: The administration expenses amount to $775,000.

Mr. GARDINER: That is a little over $56 for each active account. I submit that under the circumstances there is something wrong with the administration, and the minister should look into it.

Mr. FORKE: Last session there was some agitation to place the soldier settlement board under the Civil Service Act. Before this was done it was decided to have a thorough invsetigation into the work of the board. This investigation is being conducted by the audit department. As soon as I receive their report I shall be in a better position to judge whether the overhead is too heavy and whether something can be done to simplify the administration. In the meantime I think some injustice is being done to those employees of the soldier settlement board who have been ten years in the service but are not entitled to superannuation. They are doing their work quite efficiently. Next session I hope to be in a position to submit plans for carrying on the organization and placing those employees who intend to remain in the service in the position to which they are entitled. At that time if there is to be any elimination it can be carried out. The investigation to which I have referred is being made for the sole purpose of ascertaining whether this is the most efficient system for carrying out the work. It must be remembered that the government has $77,000,000 at stake; therefore it is advisable that the department should be properly administered.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Are there not efficiency experts in connection with the audit board?

Mr. FORKE: They are under the finance department.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Has the minister received any representations from the Saskatchewan association of rural municipalities regarding the payment of taxes on soldier settlement land?

Mr. FORKE: Yes. The taxation question has been a very difficult one. The hon. member will perhaps recall that some years ago when this question first came up I viewed it from that corner of the house as one on the outside.

Mr. GARDINER: Now you are on the inside.

Mr. FORKE: After I got inside one of my first resolutions was to clean up this taxation problem if possible. I realize the injustice which the municipalities are suffering, and I think I have made a fairly satisfactory arrangement. I notice that at the last convention of the Saskatchewan association the president said:

> In viewing the situation during the past year we find there has been a wonderful improvement in the payment of taxes on soldier settlement board lands, a fact for which we acknowledge our appreciation. The present policy outlined by the board is that all 1927 taxes on purchased patented lands acquired by the board where settlers are in possession were to be paid during 1928 with 6 per cent simple interest. Taxes on this class of lands after that date will be paid before due date, if possible, but in case arrears occur statutory penalties will be paid. The board are paying the taxes on abandoned lands leased to civilians where the amount of revenue is sufficient to pay taxes in full. Where the revenue received is insufficient, the board will apply amount received on the taxes.

I direct this to the attention of hon. members:

> The board are also paying taxes on crown lands that have been acquired by the board where the settler has remained in possession continuously. If this policy is adhered to in its entirety, there should be no more question about payments of penalties in the future.

The secretary-treasurer reported to the convention:

Once again your executive have found it necessary to devote their time and attention to this problem, but we are pleased to report that conditions regarding the standing of arrears of taxes on S.S.B. lands are vastly improved from what they were one year ago. In so far as those lands, which before being acquired by the board, were fully patented and tax paying, and which are still occupied, are concerned, we believe that our difficulties are nearing an end. from the reports which we have received it would appear that the board have paid on behalf of the soldier settler during the calendar year 1928, the sum of $333,374.34—

I hope the member for Argenteuil is listening, because this accounts for a large part of the advances.

—to the municipalities of the province. We are further informed that arrangements are now being made for the payment of arrears of taxes on every parcel of land coming under this classification.

The only point of difference between the board and municipalities is in regard to lands that have reverted to the crown. No attempt is being made to hold those lands, they are placed on the market and sold as rapidly as possible. and will not long be a factor in the tax problem. It must be borne in mind that this is one of the most difficult problems, the government having been in possession of so much land, and it will continue until the final payments have been made by soldier or civil purchasers. The taxes will be a first charge on the crop and on the land, so that the municipalities have not much to complain of in that regard.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am ready to admit that there has been a very great improvement in the tax situation since the minister made the changes he did some time ago, but there still remains a very grave problem in connection with unoccupied lands. There are a great many of the lands which were not exceptionally good when taken up, and now that they are discarded and left in a very poor condition, the municipality is of course piling up a heavy indebtedness against them. In many cases bonds have been issued against lands which were assessable in the municipality. Schools were built, ordinary liabilities incurred by the municipality against them, anad there is therefore a great hardship on the municipality. I have here a letter from the Saskatchewan association of rural municipalities, a copy of which was forwarded to the minister, and I will read it in part. It refers to the fact that the department is now paying taxes on these lands, which taxes, before the lands were acquired by the board, were fully paid. The letter states that they have included in the classification certain other lands, such as school and Indian lands. It goes on to say:

Our most serious grievance however, is in regard to those lands held by the board which have been abandoned by the soldier settler or where his contract has been cancelled. There are large amounts of arrears of taxes outstanding against these lands and the financial position of many municipalities is being undermined through their inability to collect these taxes. With a view to clearing up the whole situation, a series of meetings have been held by the committee of the Western Union of Rural Municipalities, which organization is comprised of representatives of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the Manitoba Union of Municipalities and the Alberta Association of municipal districts. As a result of these meetings, it has been decided to ask the government at Ottawa to so amend the S.S.B. as to replace these lands in the tax-paying category in which they stood before being acquired by the board.

The letter goes on to mention an amendment which is proposed to the act and which these organizations hope the minister will look upon with favour. The suggested amendment reads:

In case any land which has in any way been disposed of by the board to a settler, or which has been mortaged to or charged with the payment of money in favour of the board free from the claims of the settler, it shall be lawful for the board to pay all lawful rates, taxes and assessments chargeable in respect of such land accrued before or accruing after the same becomes revested in the board; and if the board does not duly pay all such taxes, then the lands in respect of which the same are payable, shall become liable to sale or forfeiture or both pursuant to the provisions of any provincial statute for the recovery of taxes.

After all, there is an important principle at stake, I see no reason why the federal government should enjoy any special privileges in this regard. If lands are held in the title of the crown, lands which have been used and against which bonds have been issued and liabilities incurred in connection with improvements made at a time when there were settlers on that land, it seems to me only reasonable to expect that the government should assume the responsibility which any ordinary ratepayer in the municipality or any mortgage company is obliged to assume. I quite appreciate the fact that there has been a vast improvement so far, but I do think that the minister ought to go the whole length. I do not say that the principle should be applied to crown lands not occupied; but in respect to crown lands which have been used and which have once appeared on the assessment list, the board should assume their proper responsibility and pay their share, just as is done by ordinary owners of any other land. Certainly the government should not be in

the position of enjoying the special privilege of having improvements made at the expense of other settlers' lands. The minister mentioned the representations he made and the advice he gave to the government when he sat on this side of the house. At that time he went the whole way, and I suggest to him, now that he is in a position to carry it out, that he take his own advice. Let him take the advice which he gave to the government while he was on this side of the house.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like to get some information from the minister with regard to the policy of the soldier settlement board in the matter of the treatment of the settlers themselves. Seizures are made sometimes, are they not? Under what conditions would seizures on a settler be made? Would he have of necessity to be in arrears?

Mr. FORKE: He would have to be in arrears and there would have to be evidence that he was trying to evade payment.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In other words, one would not expect seizure to be made unless the man were obviously—

Mr. FORKE: Trying to evade his payments.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Exactly. I should imagine that would be the policy. I wonder why it has been changed.

Mr. FORKE: I did not know it had been changed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Well, I may tell the minister that in the west, or at any rate in Alberta, I find a widespread dissatisfaction with the recently adopted autocratic attitude on the part of the board. I have asked the minister these two leading questions in order to get the situation clearly before the committee. Now what would the minister think of a situation like this? Here is a soldier settler, a splendid young chap who served as a captain in the Canadian expeditionary force, has one of the nicest, cleanest and neatest farms in the whole province, his buildings well appointed, and everything in perfect shape. He is a traction farmer—he uses a tractor and is thoroughly efficient. He s a married man though without children. He had some small arrears running up to September last, but on September 13 the arrears were all paid off by cheque and receipt given. On October 4 the supervisor from Calgary—really from Drumheller though he is attached to the Calgary office—came around to the man and said he wanted his payments. The current payments had become due on October 1, amounting to some $500 in round figures. The man was harvesting and threshing his crop at the time, the grain was running No. 6, the initial payment from the pool was very low, and he had only partly threshed his crop. He requested the supervisor to hold off the claim for a little while. The supervisor had known him for some time to be a first class man and willingly withheld the claim for the moment. Then the soldier settler said to him: "Don't you think it would be possible to secure a stay of collection over this year in order that I may seed some more grain next summer?" The supervisor said, "No; there is no chance of that." He stated that he had been instructed to make seizure. But, the man pointed out, he did not owe the board a cent. He said, "The current payments have only just now come due. How can you possibly make seizure?" The supervisor pulled out of his letter file the seizure papers filled in and dated and signed as of September 15—at a time when the man did not owe the board a dollar and when even his arrears were very small, and which arrears had been paid off in the meantime. Now here is a fine type of settler, a man who had never been in any financial difficulties with his neighbours, who had never had any trouble with the bank, and who had conducted his business on a high plane: here he is threatened with seizure. It was a blow such as most of us would not like. How would any hon. gentleman like to be threatened and indeed to be shown the seizure papers at a time when he did not owe a single dollar to the person who was going to serve him? As a result of his advice to the supervisor and the supervisor's knowledge of the man himself, he withheld the seizure until he could interview Mr. Woods, the superintendent, at Calgary. I think that interview took place somewhere near Hanna, prior to October 11, and on October 11 the supervisor again called on this settler and informed him that he had taken up the matter with the superintendent on October 4 and that the superintendent had instructed him to proceed to the settler's farm and execute the seizure.

Do hon. members realize the drastic action which was advised by the superintendent at Calgary? As I said before, on September 13 the papers were made out ordering the man off his farm; on October 12 the supervisor called again and said, "You will have to make the payments or I will have to seize the farm." It was too late that night to go to the bank, so the supervisor stayed over night and in the morning the settler went to the bank. This man asked the supervisor

to call up the Calgary office and find out what terms could be secured for the payment of the amount due, as the settler did not have all the cash and might have difficulty in collecting it from the bank on a loan. The Calgary office apparently stated that they would be willing to accept an assignment of his wheat on the wheat pool. The settler then made arrangement to pay some $252 in cash, which he borrowed from the bank, and he gave the soldier settlement board an assignment for the balance on 700 bushels of wheat.

As soon as this assignment was sent to the Calgary office they replied by letter, a copy of which I have here, stating that the assignment was not satisfactory and that the man would have to pay the whole amount in cash. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not know one of the mortgage companies, those cold-blooded, brutal octopi which we have discussed so much in this house and to which the minister has referred in scathing terms from time to time, that would have acted in such a cold-blooded, brutal manner towards one of its creditors. This is not a solitary case, either. There was another case in that very district, which has been settled; the unfortunate settler managed to make the payment at considerable cost to himself; he had to borrow a large amount of money from the bank and hypothecate other assets in order to make the payments.

Now I want to know first of all why it was necessary to drive this settler into the borrowing class in order to meet a loan which had only just become due. Why did the board have seizure papers made out two weeks before the current payment was due and, above all, when the condition of the crop this year had been placed before the board? The wheat grown on this farm was a No. 6 wheat, low in quality and very low in price, but the board insisted on payment in full in cash. That is not fair treatment; that is not giving consideration to the soldiers; that is not giving them a chance to stay on the land. This man is a particularly high type of settler, judging from the letters he received from the board. Last spring he received a letter asking if he would be able to take some of the empire settlement immigrants, if he could give them work during the summer, and in that letter he was addressed as a No. 1 settler. Now he is informed by the supervisor that in order to justify the seizure papers being made out, he has been demoted and is now a class four settler on the files of the Calgary office. These are all things requiring explanation and in this case, as in several others, I find a clear indication of a change in the policy of the soldier settlement board since it has become attached to the Department of Immigration, and possibly hopes to become a permanent institution.

Mr. FORKE: It is no more attached to the department now than it was formerly.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Well, it is working in close cooperation with it, especially since the soldier settlement board has taken over the empire settlement scheme. That, I think, is more than simply a hyphen between the board and the Department of Immigration; it is an absolute connecting link between the two.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have placed before the minister a clear case, and I want a statement in respect to it. The name of the soldier settler is Captain N. J. McCrimmon and his loan number is 756.

Mr. FORKE: While I have no doubt that my hon. friend has made these statements in absolute good faith, I have had so much experience in looking into apparent cases of injustice and finding that there are always two sides to a question that I very much doubt if the information supplied to my hon. friend, and given the committee to-day, is absolutely correct.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That was my purpose in bringing it to the attention of the minister; I want the minister's reasons, either for the position as I have stated it or for a different position, if such is found to be the case.

Mr. FORKE: I can only state that my instructions to the board always have been that I am more interested in the success of the settler than in the collections, because if the settler succeeds eventually the collections will be made. Of course, the committee will understand that I scarcely know anything about the work of the board unless there are some complaints, and my stand has always been that if the settler is successful the payments will be made eventually. At the same time, often it is just as well that the board does press for payment, because when arrears begin to accumulate sometimes the difficulties pile up, and quite often people are so optimistic that they get into trouble which they are not likely to get out of. If they are pressed for payment sometimes it is for their own good in the long run.

I can hardly believe that Superintendent Woods would act in this way; from my information with regard to that gentleman I have never learned of any such hard dealings

with a man who was making an attempt to meet his payments. I cannot give an answer to my hon. friend to-day; probably I will not have an oportunity to give my answer in the house, but I will inquire fully into the matter and will see that my hon. friend gets full information with regard to this particular case. I am sure this is an isolated case; the actions mentioned by the hon. member are entirely opposed to the policy of the board. We treat them with the utmost leniency as long as there is a chance of payment, but sometimes people are not very anxious to pay and they must have pressure brought to bear upon them.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister's reply may be all that could be expected at the moment, but I have given the name of the settler and his loan number, at the request of the minister. This settler feels extremely hurt over this whole situation. The case is clear, but evidently the minister did not listen quite so intently as I had hoped he might. On September 14 this man owed the board $142.66 arrears. On September 15 that amount was paid in full, so from September 14 to October 1 this settler was fully paid up. On October 1 his current annual payment of $507.08 came due. On September 13 seizure papers were made out, signed, and presented to the supervisor who travels over that country. These papers were made out in the Calgary office and given him to serve on this man if he did not immediately make his payment. This information was given the settler on October 4, just four days after the amount became due and at a time when he was actually engaged in threshing his crop. The actual service of the papers took place on October 11, after Superintendent Woods had been requested to stay action in the matter until some discussion could take place. This is not an isolated case, and I am simply raising it because it is the one case in which I am satisfied the evidence is clear. The documents in support of the evidence are in my possession, and I am satisfied that the department will have a great deal of difficulty in putting up any defence. I have received many complaints from the Craigmyle, Rowley and other districts, but I have refrained from taking these matters up because in most instances the only information I could obtain was that of the settler, and he did not always have the real evidence with which I could build up a case. But I want the minister to take particular cognizance of this matter and if he finds that the statements which I have made are correct I want him to take the most drastic action with respect to the Calgary office. Their activities should be checked up and if they are acting in a dictatorial or domineering fashion towards the settlers, the officials should be removed from the office.

Mr. FORKE: I have not received any notice of the case mentioned by the hon. member. If he had made that statement to me a week ago I would have been in a position to reply to him to-day. This is the last day of the session and the hon. member is making certain statements.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister has no authority for stating that this is the last day of the session; the session may run into next week or the week after.

Mr. FORKE: I am in no hurry.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If this matter has been taken up by the settler himself with the Calgary office, and I presume with the Ottawa office, then the whole file should be in the minister's department.

Mr. FORKE: I can get the file, but this is the first time I have received any notice of the case. If the hon. member had given me this information a week ago I would have been able to have the information before the house to-day and the matter could have been settled. If the hon. member is willing to keep the house sitting for another week, I can get the information. He is giving what was stated to him by the settlers, but there are two sides to every question.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I asked the minister to bring in this information after eight o'clock, along with the figures he is to get for the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. FORKE: It might be necessary to send to Calgary for the information.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are the records not kept down here?

Mr. FORKE: They do not know that a case like that is going to come up; the accounting is done here.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks in connection with the tightening-up process in making collections. I have made inquiries to find out whether or not such orders have been issued from Ottawa, and I assume that there has been a little tightening up.

Mr. FORKE: The collections have not been what might have been expected.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: When the revaluation takes place and the farmer is notified of the reduction, the attitude of the board seems to be that the price is at rock bottom and more stringent collection should be made. I have taken up a number of seizure cases this year, but I must say that I have not had one of such outstanding importance as that mentioned by the hon. member for Bow River. When these cases are brought to me I draw the files from the board and arrive at my own conclusions, and I must say that I have no reason to complain of the treatment I have received. I think in one hundred per cent of the cases in which I have taken issue with the board adjustments have been made. I cannot help but think that if the adjustments are made on my request the first decisions must have been arrived at without full consideration, because no department would be willing to overlook their own opinion and accept that of an outsider as to what was fair in the matter. I think this matter requires some careful checking up. I should like to ask the minister a question or two in regard to the procedure of appeal to the exchequer court. A number of men have lodged appeals and they are anxious to know just what arrangements have been made as to the procedure to be followed by the court.

Mr. FORKE: I think the best explanation would be to read the hon. member's letter.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I referred only to costs, but I desire to know what arrangements have been made as to the sittings of the court and what procedure will be followed.

Mr. FORKE: I think the hon. member's own letter is the best explanation I can give.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I want to know whether the court itself had come to a decision as to the time and place of its sittings, and as to the procedure which will be followed.

Mr. FORKE: The revaluations will be finished this summer, and the matter is being taken up with the exchequer court to undertake this work at the earliest possible moment. It is just a little doubtful whether Judge Maclean or Judge Audette will be able to find time to undertake the work, but there will be a judge appointed specially who will go west and meet those who are making appeals. All expenses of the court will be paid by the soldier settlement board, with the exception of the soldier settlers' own expenses. The judge also may be allowed his expenses. The Justice department have this matter in hand and I have been pressing them for information as to when the appointment may be made; in fact, I expected that the order in council would be issued to-day. The department would like to have all the appeals in before the judge begins to hold court so that it will not be necessary for him to go over the ground twice.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: No definite arrangements have been made as yet as to the time and place of sitting or as to the procedure?

Mr. FORKE: They will be made as convenient as possible for the soldier settlers.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Another matter is the time allowed for filing an appeal, and in this connection I am a little critical of the action of the minister. When a soldier settler has received an award from the board and does not accept it, he is permitted, under the provisions of the act, to appeal to the exchequer court. That appeal has to be made within a given number of days from the time he is advised of the official award. But at the time the first notices of appeal came in, each settler so giving notice was instructed by the departmental solicitor or superintendent that while he could go ahead and this was the way to do it, he must bear in mind that the court in its discretion might assess the whole costs of the case against him.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think that is the case.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is practically what was in the letter—I am boiling it down: that the appeal would be treated as an ordinary exchequer court case and the court would, in its discretion, assess the costs against either party or both. The result, as I was sure it would be as soon as that letter was received, was that the settlers, being in a state of uncertainty whether or not the costs would be assessed against them, and not in the least knowing how heavy the costs might be, would not appeal. To my mind that is why such a very small number of appeals have so far been lodged. The first letter I wrote to the minister was on December 10, in which I outlined the case, but I was unable to receive a ruling until May 6, and that is the point on which I am critical. I believe the ruling itself is fair and just, namely, that the settler would be guaranteed against costs no matter how trivial the grounds of the appeal might be. But that uncertainty, both as to whether he might be assessed costs by the court and as to the amount by which he might be so assessed, prevented many a settler from lodging an appeal. I suggest that a good deal of leniency be shown as to the time within

which an appeal shall be made. It is only a few weeks since the doubt was removed from their minds and they know now what they may expect in connection with costs if they appeal. I discussed the matter with some of the members of the court and I think the minister will find that the court will fully concur in the suggestion that a good deal of leniency might apply in respect to the time limit, so that men who feel they have a grievance and who, on account of uncertainty as to the costs, did not appeal within the time provided, might have an opportunity of appealing now that that doubt has been removed.

Mr. CAMPBELL: With regard to the question of the activities of the local officials of the soldier settlement board in collecting accounts against soldier settlers and the apparent highhandedness, of those officials it is only fair to say this: I have had referred to me many cases in which there seemed to be rather officious and highhanded action on the part of the local officials, but I must say that in discussing these cases with the chairman of the board I received as fair treatment as I could expect under the circumstances. We must recognize the fact that these officials are responsible for taking care of a great deal of the country's property, and while we expect them to give all reasonable consideration to soldier settlers, yet on the other hand we must realize that they have a financial responsibility as well. I thought it was only fair to say that the chairman has given most sympathetic consideration to any cases I have referred to him.

While I am on my feet I want to ask the minister whether or not he will make a statement as to his attitude toward the suggestion made to him or his department by the Saskatchewan association of rural municipalities, as I think it is called, as to amending the act so that the department will be liable for the taxes on all lands that have been once occupied as well as the lands that have reverted to the crown, that have been deserted by settlers or on which the settlers have been foreclosed.

Mr. FORKE: I think the amount of land under this category is exaggerated. The board is selling about 100 farms a month, and in a short time there will be very little land left on the hands of the government. In regard to some very poor land—I have no authority to say this, but I am not at all afraid I can get it through when I want to—we will be quite willing to hand some of that land over to the municipalities for the taxes and let them do what they like with it. It is not worth more than the taxes. This, however, is a matter of government policy. If the government is going to pay taxes on government property, the board will pay those taxes. Mr. Lamb and others have addressed personal letters to the Prime Minister in regard to this, and it is a matter of government policy.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That is all the association is asking for, namely, that in case the board are not prepared to pay the taxes, we permit the municipalities to foreclose on them for tax sales the same as they do with regard to privately owned land. If the land is not worth the taxes, they are quite satisfied to take it over.

Mr. BROWN: In view of the fact that there is a great deal of criticism, some of it fair and some of it unfair, of the board, I may say that I received a letter from one branch of the Canadian legion in my constituency, expressing their very hearty appreciation of the way in which the board had dealt with all the cases of the soldiers in that particular part of the country. I had occasion to visit that branch of the legion in the early part of the winter. They were then discussing the matter in my presence, and since coming to Ottawa I have, as I say, received from them a letter expressing their appreciation of the way in which the board has dealt with the settlers.

Mr. SPENCER: This item is a double-headed one. There is about $1,500,000 for soldier land settlement advances and cost of administration of soldier settlement. Could the minister inform the committee as to the actual cost of administration outside of the advances?

Mr. FORKE: $755,000. As regards vote No. 60, soldier and general land settlement, the amount to be voted is $2,845,000. The total amount recoverable is $1,090,000; that all comes back to the government, or at least it stands against the lands. The way in which those estimates are made up in the Immigration department and the soldier settlement board, is very misleading as regards the amount of money that is really being expended. Only about half of the vote is really being expended. Out of the total vote of $2,845,000, $1,090,000 consists of recoverable expenditures. As regards the general land settlement, the administration expenses amount to $600,000 and as regards the soldier settlement, the administration expenses amount to $755,000, making a total of $1,355,000 that is not recoverable.

Mr. GARDINER: Would the minister state how much land the soldier settlement board has unoccupied on its hands at the present time?

Mr. FORKE: I will have that looked up.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: How many British families are now on the land in connection with the empire settlement scheme?

Mr. FORKE: It is expected that we shall have a full complement this summer. I think it lacks three hundred at the present time. I want to make it plain that that three thousand family scheme might be never-ending, because you will find some families dropping out every year and they will need to be replaced. But no more families will be brought out next year under that scheme.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: What is the average amount of loan, on account of land purchased, made by the Canadian government to these settlers, and what is the average indebtedness of each family towards the British government? These families, of course, carry a double-headed debt. There is the $1,500 received from the British government to assist in stocking a farm, and there is the cost of the land turned over to them by the Canadian government. I should like to find out the indebtedness carried by the average family if the minister has that information, and if not, I should like to have it prepared.

Mr. FORKE: The average indebtedness is $3,505.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is the average purchase price?

Mr. FORKE: Yes. The hon. member referred to loans made to British settlers. The Dominion government makes no loans of any kind to these settlers.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: You sell them land on time.

Mr. FORKE: Yes, but I want to repeat, because there is a general misapprehension on the subject, that the Dominion government makes no loans of any kind to these settlers.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was not under a misapprehension. Perhaps I did not put my question clearly. I want to know, first, the amount to which the average settler is indebted to the Canadian government in respect of the land purchased, and second, the amount to which he is indebted to the British government in respect of loans made.

Mr. FORKE: To get at that figure, you have first the average amount paid for a farm, which is $3,505, and you have 3,000 families. Multiply those two figures, and you get the total amount owing, less what has already been paid.

Mr. GARDINER: You do not collect for the British government?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: What is the average indebtedness to the British government by way of loan, for which you are not responsible but which you collect?

Mr. FORKE: I cannot give those figures offhand.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Have these settlers on the average received $1,500?

Mr. FORKE: I do not think that the three thousand families have paid as well in proportion as the soldier settlers.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I did not ask that. I asked the average loan made by the British government to each family. I understand that $1,500 is the basis, but that the loans vary. I am trying to find the capital indebtedness of each farm under the empire settlement scheme, and that would include the cost of the land, the loan made by the British government, and the passage money advanced, which is repayable. Those are three types of public indebtedness which these farms would carry.

Mr. FORKE: I think $800 would be about the average indebtedness.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the average acreage per farm allocated to the British families?

Mr. FORKE: Mostly half-sections.

Mr. GARDINER: For only a total cost of $3,505?

Mr. FORKE: There are a number of quarter-sections.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is a very great deal more than the 23 per cent reduction that the soldier settlers got on the revaluation. The farms that I have seen are quarter-sections.

Mr. FORKE: I am speaking without the book.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I want definite information on this because I have been working on the subject for a long time, and I am being continually asked for information.

Mr. FORKE: It is difficult to say offhand just how many quarter-sections and half-sections have been occupied.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the minister give us the total acreage allocated under the three thousand family scheme?

Mr. FORKE: I have not got that.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The terms under which they get the loan from the British government provide for no payments being made for two years, if that is right, in most cases the first payment would be made last fall.

Mr. FORKE: There is generally one year of probation, and another year before they make any payment.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: As they have only come in within the last few years it is only now that payments are coming due.

Mr. FORKE: It does not amount to very much yet.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: You have not the definite amount, but are of opinion that it is not quite as satisfactory, by percentage, as the soldier settlers. I shall not repeat the arguments that I have already made with regard to soldier land settlement, but most of those arguments apply to this settlement scheme as well. The minister agrees with me, without saying now that the scheme is damned, that we will take good care to see how it is going to work out before we extend it.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the land settlement board selling to civilian Canadians land on the same terms as granted to the British families, provided that the Canadian settler owns his stock and equipment?

Mr. FORKE: I do not see any reason why they should not. They are selling this land to Canadian civilians right now on twenty-five equal annual payments.

Mr. GARDINER: On exactly the same terms as to the British?

Mr. FORKE: Practically the same terms, twenty-five equal annual payments but if they fall down in their payments we have nothing to take the place of the British government.

Mr. GARDINER: Why do you need the British government when these Canadian settlers have their own stock and equipment? Do you call for any payment down from Canadian settlers?

Mr. FORKE: A payment down of ten per cent.

Mr. GARDINER: That is the difference, and you do not give them two years' probation.

Mr. FORKE: They do not need it.

Mr. GARDINER: Do you give them one year's probation?

Mr. FORKE: I think they get one year.

Mr. GARDINER: Are you quite sure of that?

Mr. FORKE: It is a matter of adjustment. I think they get as good terms as the British settler.

Mr. GARDINER: Not when they pay ten per cent down.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—Dairying, including grant of $5,000 to the National Dairy Council and necessary new buildings, $295,000.

Mr. SPENCER: If on investigation the minister finds that certain members of the National Dairy Council are getting rid of New Zealand or other imported butter of inferior quality as Canadian butter, will he discontinue the grant to the council?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, if they are doing it it is wrong, and we had better stop it by law or regulation, but I do not think we should penalize the council. My hon. friend speaks of "getting rid of" New Zealand butter as if it was an inferior product. I do not know why any dealer in butter should attempt to disguise New Zealand butter, because it is good butter. However, if what is alleged is being done I think it should be stopped. We have investigated complaints but so far we have not got sufficient evidence to warrant a prosecution.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If large quantities of New Zealand and other imported butter of an inferior quality are being sold throughout the country as Canadian butter it is a serious situation that calls for drastic action on the part of the Department of Agriculture. The minister seems to think that he has no legislative authority to take action. I think he must be mistaken. If we sell our wheat as being of a certain grade, and it turns out to be of an inferior grade, we have to compensate the buyer or we are liable to a charge of fraud. Certainly the minister must be in a position to deal with this situation.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This New Zealand butter is not inferior to ours, and if it is not sold as Canadian butter there is no violation of the law. If, however, it is sold as butter of Canadian origin, undoubtedly there is a violation of the law.

Mr. COTNAM: Is it the policy of the government to allow the continued importation of New Zealand butter?

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope the house will agree to accept the following motion:

That this house shall not be adjourned at eleven o'clock to-day.

There is a possibility that we may conclude even before eleven o'clock, but I think it is advisable if the proceedings go beyond that hour that we should be at liberty to sit at least as late as we did last night.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Until twelve?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend (Mr. Cotnam) wanted to know whether we would continue the policy under the order in council, applying the Australian treaty to New Zealand. The Department of Agriculture has never undertaken to enunciate government policies; that would be a matter for the government.

Mr. COTNAM: Does not the Minister of Agriculture, as such, know the policy of the government in that respect?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; I am not commissioned to make any reply in regard to either the Australian treaty or its application to New Zealand.

Mr. COTNAM: Then perhaps the minister knows his own mind in the matter. Does he think that the Australian treaty is beneficial to the Canadian dairy farmers as well as to the mixed farmers of Canada, particularly in Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a matter of opinion, I expect.

Mr. COTNAM: I should be glad to know the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture. That is a fair request; he knows his own mind.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COTNAM: Just a moment; I want an answer to that question.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will make a careful survey of the situation.

Mr. COTNAM: Does the minister mean that while he is making that careful survey the Canadian dairy farmer is to be penalized to the extent of having his market taken from him through the importation of almost thirty million pounds of New Zealand butter every year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is an extraordinary revival of butter making in Saskatchewan and the west generally. During the past four or five months the manufacture of butter in Saskatchewan has more than doubled each month. So that I shall have to reserve my opinion on this question until I see how things work out this summer.

Mr. COTNAM: Am I to infer from the minister's answer that he thinks the treaty beneficial to the dairy farmers, of Saskatchewan at any rate? I am prepared to say that it has not worked out to the advantage of the dairy farmers of Ontario. I can assure the minister that the dairy farmers of Ontario feel very keenly the loss of this market for their dairy products. Perhaps the reason for a part of the immigration which is taking place to-day is to be found in this very fact. Many of our farmers are becoming discouraged in their endeavour to carry on their dairy operations when they seem to get so little cooperation from the Department of Agriculture and this government.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): It appears to me, after listening to the discussion to-day, that the opinion prevails in some quarters that because the National Dairy Council receive a grant of $5,000 per annum from this government, the government is in duty bound to accept its fiscal policy from that council. I confess I cannot see the logic of that argument. In my opinion any organization receiving a cash grant of public money from the government should keep strictly out of politics. I understand that this organization has been actively engaged spreading political propaganda of a kind not acceptable to a good many people in this country and in this house, and I suggest that before any money is paid to this council they be required to

give an assurance that they will keep strictly out of politics and neither interfere nor attempt to interfere with the fiscal policy of the government. Will the minister give us an assurance to that effect?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have already spoken to the council of the unwisdom of making themselves conspicuous on certain controversial questions, and have pointed out that it would render it easier for me to keep the grant going and possibly to increase it if necessary if they were not so active in displaying their views. I think there is a marked improvement in this regard. They are not offensive this year so far as I can see.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): But they are active.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know about their activity, but I cannot see any offensiveness on their part, particularly since the election of the present president.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I wish to make one or two observations in regard to the question of the marking of goods imported into Canada so as to indicate the country of origin. I support this proposition. The minister, for whose subtlety I have a great deal of respect, when this matter was brought up on a previous occasion, tried to link it up with the general idea of protection. I will not say that he was confused in his own mind, because I am sure he was not; but he did not make any particular attempt to ensure the house against confusion. I may say that I am in favour of a good many kinds of protection, but it is not necessarily the sort of protection the minister has referred to. For example, I am in favour of protectiong the consumer against exploitation, though that is not protection of the sort the minister speaks of; and I am equally in favour of protecting the consumer against fraud or against any uncertainty as to the quality of the goods he buys. I am not prepared to impose a high tariff, but I do support the idea that the consumer should know just where the goods come from which he is buying, what the quality is, and so forth, so that he may make his choice. That is the kind of protection I want. It is the minister's obvious intent to permit a wrong impression to prevail, and I have no wish to see it succeed.

Mr. BROWN: I have been interested in this discussion with regard to New Zealand butter being sold under the guise of Canadian butter. In what form does that butter come into Canada? Is it in pound prints or in larger packages?

[Mr. E. J. Young.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In fifty-six pound packages.

Mr. BROWN: Then it must be repacked by someone in Canada. I can understand that the Dominion government might very well require that the packages coming to Canada should be marked with the country of origin, but I can see some difficulty in the way of the Dominion government acting when that butter goes out to the trade and is repacked in pound prints, as I presume it is sold. Then I cannot be just sure, on this question of fraud, whether the objection is taken because New Zealand butter is better or worse than Canadian butter. It cannot be fraud practised on the consumer if, as was stated this afternoon, New Zealand butter is selling in Vancouver for two cents per pound more than Canadian butter.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I consider it fraud when a consumer is induced to buy something under the belief that it is a different article. I am not referring to the inferiority or superiority of New Zealand butter; I merely desire that the customer may know what he is buying and may get what he wants.

Mr. BROWN: On the other hand, if this butter is simply going out as butter, not labeled, I do not see how the question of fraud can enter into the transaction.

Mr. FRASER: There is a bonus of $100 paid to creameries under this vote. Would the minister tell us on what basis that bonus is given?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This bonus of $100 is intended to assist in the provision of cooling rooms for small creameries which have not a sufficient turnover to justify their putting in a cold storage. That grant is offered the creameries provided they comply with inspection conditions, and of course these cooling rooms cost a good deal more than that. This is an encouragement to them to put in their own money in order to provide the very necessary requisite of a cooling room.

Item agreed to.

Cold storage warehouses, $467,837.

Mr. LUCAS: Will the minister explain this large increase?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The increase is due to the construction, under the Cold Storage Act, of a large warehouse at Halifax and another warehouse at New Westminster. Perhaps I might give the details of this vote:

Fourth instalment to United Farmers' Cooperative Company, Limited, Toronto, Ont., $1,732.

Third instalment to Eloi Cote, Chicoutimi, Que., $480.
Second instalment to Pictou County Dairy Company, Limited, Stellarton, Nova Scotia, $3,500.
Second instalment to A. Landry, Riviere du Loup, Quebec, $875.
First instalment to Nova Scotia Public Fish and Cold Storage Terminals, Limited, Halifax, Nova Scotia, $326,250.
First instalment to Pacific Coast Terminals Limited, New Westminster, British Columbia, $135,000.

Mr. LUCAS: What will be the total cost of the buildings at Halifax and New Westminster?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The total subsidy is 30 per cent of the total cost; we pay half the subsidy the first year while the other half is spread over three or four years, so these amounts will represent 15 per cent of the total cost.

Mr. LUCAS: What percentage is paid by the government towards the cost of these buildings?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We pay 30 per cent of the total, under the terms of the Cold Storage Act.

Item agreed to.

Fruit, including grant of $8,000 to the Canadian Horticultural Council, $336,000.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): I notice this vote includes $8,000 for the horticultural council. Will the minister tell me the names of the president and secretary of that organization ?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: While my deputy is looking up that information I might tell my hon. friend that there is an increase of $46,000 in the vote, which increase is largely returnable to the treasury. This amount is to provide for the inspection of fruit in British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec, and this money will be repaid very largely through the charge of $3 for every car inspected. There is some slight statutory increase in salaries, in addition.

Mr. SENN: Would the minister tell us who compose the horticultural council and what institutions or societies are represented on it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Burrows of Ottawa is the secretary and Mr. J. H. Lavoie, Quebec City, is president. The Canadian Horticultural Council represents 216 horticultural and allied industry organizations having a membership in excess of 85,000. I will give the list of officers.

Mr. SENN: I asked what societies were represented by that council; are they producers' societies?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, I understand they are all producers' societies.

Mr. SENN: Will the minister say whether the dealers are represented?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will get that information.

Mr. McMILLAN: The shippers, the jam manufacturers, and all the manufacturers of these lines are represented.

Mr. ROWE: The consumers' league.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The membership of the council is as follows:

Hon. President
Colonel H. L. Roberts, Grimsby, Ont.

Past President
J. T. Mutrie, Vernon, B.C.

Members

Fruit Growers
Thos. Abriel, Nakusp, B.C.
Paul Fisher, Burlington, Ont.
W. J. Tawse, Macdonald College, Que.
H. A. Slipp, Keswick, N.B.
V. B. Leonard, Clarence, N.S.

Vegetables Growers
Fred A. Lewis, Vernon, B.C.
Herbert Sulkers, Winnipeg, Man.
W. J. Cooke, Kingston, Ont.
Thomas Rowley, Leamington, Ont.
J. H. Lavoie, Quebec, Que.
J. J. McEvoy, Montreal, Que.
F. W. Bishop, Paradise, N.S.

Nurseymen
E. B. Luke, Montreal, Que.

Florists and Gardeners
Chas. Craig, Ottawa, Ont.

Canners
W. R. Drynan, Hamilton, Ont.

Amateur Horticulturists
J. E. Carter, Guelph, Ont.

Western Canada Fruit Jobbers
Herbert Emery, Winnipeg, Man.

Eastern Canada Fruit Jobbers
W. J. McCart, Toronto, Ont.

Committee Chairmen
Publicity, E. B. Luke, Montreal, Que.
Plant Registration and Ornamental Horticulture
W. T. Macoun, Ottawa, Ont.
Transportation
H. L. Roberts, Grimsby, Ont.
Legislation
W. J. McCart, Toronto, Ont.
Standard Score Cards and Statistics
Professor T. G. Bunting, Macdonald College, Que.
Markets
Paul Fisher, Burlington, Ont.

The officers of the council are as follows:

President
J. H. Lavoie, Quebec, Que.
First Vice-President
Paul Fisher, Burlington, Ont.
Second Vice-President
Charles Craig, Ottawa, Ont.
Secretary-Treasurer
L. F. Burrows, Ottawa, Ont.

Mr. SENN: The reason I asked the question was that I had heard from different sources that the growers themselves were not represented on the council to the extent that the other allied interests were.

An hon. MEMBER: Such as politicians.

Mr. SENN: Such as the shippers and canners; they appear to be in the majority on the council.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I do not think we should allow this vote to go through.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The canners have a representative in the person of Mr. Drynan of Hamilton.

Mr. EVANS: I would like to ask the minister—

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): Have I the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. EVANS: I would like to know why a grant is made to this horticultural council. What public service do they perform?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They look after the interest of the horticulturists and the fruit interests, in the same manner as other organizations. I think it was in 1923 or 1924 that they undertook to institute a registration system so that any new plants, shrubs, trees, or anything of that nature which had been propagated and introduced as new varieites could be registered and recorded.

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): I do not think that we should vote this $8,000 to the horticultural council, as their chief activities seem to be in the line of politics. Their chief ambition seems to be to impose a certain fiscal policy upon the government which fiscal policy is not that of the government.

An hon. MEMBER: What is yours?

Mr. YOUNG (Weyburn): A year ago last March this organization held a convention in the Chateau Laurier at which they drew up a schedule of values which were to determine the duties to be levied by the government of Canada upon certain imports. The secretary Mr. L. F. Burrows, has an office in this city. I believe that office is located in a government building, and I do not know whether or not he has to pay any rent for it; I do not think he does. He is registered in the telephone directory of this building, and his telephone is attached to our central. In addition to all this, he is getting $8,000 per year and he has been conducting a very active lobby within the very walls of this building. He admitted as much to me last spring, sitting there in the corridor, and I found him there again yesterday although I do not know what he was doing. I do not think it is the function of this government, or any government, to vote public funds to any political organization in order to carry on political propaganda throughout the country.

Mr. STIRLING: I would like to make a few remarks in connection with the Canadian Horticultural Council. The view has been advanced that because this council has been dealing with the matter of protection, which the industry considers to be desirable, therefore it should no longer receive assistance from this government. Let us consider for a moment the history of the council. It came into existence at the instigation of the Minister of Agriculture. Prior to that time the minister and his predecessor had found it very difficult to obtain information from the various sections of the industry throughout Canada which have since been affiliated in the horticultural council. When the government desired information in connection with the regulation of the industries they were put to considerable expense in collecting that information in regard to fruit, vegetables, flowers, bulbs, plants and kindred subjects. Therefore the minister decided that it would be a good thing to foster the creation of an association of these allied interests, and the horticultural council came into existence in 1924. It has an office in Ottawa with a resident secretary, and since that time whenever any question has arisen with regard to the allied industries the minister has been able to obtain the necessary information through the machinery so created. The industries organized under that council considered that protection was desirable. Was it wrong of the council to be the means of collecting the evidence and of laying it in an orderly fashion before the tariff advisory board? Under our law we see to it that even a murderer has his case properly presented to the judge. Is it wrong, when the allied interests considered that protection was desirable, whether they be right or whether they be wrong, to use this piece of machinery

for laying their case before the tariff advisory board? The minister brought this council into existence; it is a child of the minister's. I have never looked upon the minister as a person who would desire to eat his own young, even though on occasions, in moments of vexation, he may desire to bite the one that comes from Weyburn. But the council does present the case before the tariff advisory board on such matters as seasonable tariffs. What other organization in Canada could so readily draw together all the points in connection with the case and present it in orderly fashion before that board? I can hardly imagine that the minister will take seriously the plaintive cry of the free traders. It is not many years since forty members from Quebec pleaded with the government for further protection on vegetables. I remember that the petition contained the name of the present Secretary of State before he became such. He probably has forgotten that he signed it. It contained the name of the chief government whip and the names of thirty-seven or thirty-eight other members from the province of Quebec. The president to-day of the horticultural council is Mr. Lavoie, a man keenly interested in fruits and vegetables in Quebec. I cannot imagine that the minister would be so obdurate as to cut off this grant or that the fruit growers and vegetable growers in Quebec, the maritime provinces, or Ontario or British Columbia would be pleased at his doing so. I cannot imagine that the cutting off of this assistance would be popular in Canada, simply because certain free traders asked that that be done. They are perfectly at liberty to follow the dictates of their consciences with regard to their policy; but why should they have such an influence with the government as to get them to withdraw this grant? I suggest that such action would be most unpopular and I can hardly imagine that the minister will listen to this Jeremiah cry.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I have listened to the argument of the hon. member for Yale with a good deal of interest. By the same principle and the same argument, if this vote passes, as it probably will, we should grant $8,000 to the council of agriculture in order that they may be able to present the claims of agriculture. They should be equally important with the council of horticulture as a political interest, and by the same token, a grant of $8,000 should be made to the consumers' league so that they may be able to present their views. I submit that those two grants should be made along the same lines.

Item agreed to.

Seed, feed and fertilizer control, including grants to seed fairs, etc., and necessary buildings, also grant of $13,000 to Canadian Seed Growers' Association, $625,000.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): What is the nature of this seed, feed and fertilizer control?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This branch is presided over by Commissioner George Clark and his duties are outlined in the item. Part of his duty is to look after the seeds, including the garden seeds, field seeds, and also the clovers and grasses. The feed is under the Feeding Stuffs Act. That act has been revised in parliament during the last few years. The fertilizers are the artificial ones.

As regards grants to seed fairs, those subventions were made for many years to seed fairs before I had anything to do with the department. The item also covers necessary buildings and a grant of $13,000 to the Canadian Seed Growers' Association. The increase in the vote is due to the necessity of erecting a seed laboratory in the city of Ottawa owing to the old one, which was a private dwelling originally, having to be dismantled. It was in the way of the new building that is being erected and it has had to be torn down. Therefore in order that we may have proper accommodation, a new laboratory is to be constructed on the experimental farm, for the purpose of housing the staff of the former seed laboratory which was situated near the power plant.

There is $150,000 for the establishment of a seed cleaning plant and storage plant in Saskatchewan. This is expected to be and will be, I think, in the city of Moose Jaw. This building is being erected primarily for the purpose of taking care of the government's cereal products which sometimes require treatment. We have not the facilities at the present time to treat them. For instance, let me take the case of reward wheat, one of our finest wheats, the best I am aware of that has been introduced. It has a blemish called blue smut on the inside of the wheat. It cannot be treated in the regular way that loose smut can. It has to be treated with hot water and we are obliged, for lack of facilities, to send out to 5,000 farmers wheat that is contaminated with this blue smut, and ask them with their lesser facilities, to try to treat it with hot water and thereby kill the germ inside it before they sow it. We have found in the past that it is somewhat dangerous to treat the wheat two or three months in advance, but we found by experimentation last winter that if we treat it and dry it, we can do it safely without retarding the germination of the wheat. The purpose of the new building

is to treat new varieties of seeds that may develop blemishes so that we may send them out clean to the farmers and not polluted as has been the case during the past few years. Many farmers are complaining that with their scanty facilities they cannot take care of the wheat we send them if it has blemish. We should be able when we have this laboratory in operation to send the seed out in a state of purity, free from disease. We anticipate in the near future to have developed completely—I do not know how many years it will take, but we are working towards it—a rust-resisting wheat. Should we attain that with all the necessary qualifications as to purity, quality, early maturing and prolific power and then find it has some blemish, it is very necessary that we should be able to offset that by whatever treatment is required before we send it out to the farmers. When we get these facilities, it will be incumbent upon the department to supply all the farmers who carry out the experiments, with one bushel of clean wheat.

A similar service should be supplied to adjoining provinces as soon as they are ready to cooperate with the department in that respect. It has always been my intention that it should be so. This vote provides for only one cleaning plant, however, as there is only one organization ready to make use of the service at the present time.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the minister state that he will agree, when the other provinces are ready, to make a grant on the same basis to the other two provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, just as soon as they are ready, we are ready. We will not even wait until they organize as has been done in Saskatchewan. We will be ready to cooperate with the Alberta Department of Agriculture with whom we have had some correspondence.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Has the department not already got in touch with the minister in this matter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. As I understand the arrangement, the Department of Agriculture in Alberta administered the seed plant themselves, but owing to the expense of the business and the owner requiring the plant for himself for some purpose, they are deprived of those facilities. They are trying to meet the situation the best way they can, but even if they do not organize a cooperative registered seed growers' association such as they have in Saskatchewan, we will be prepared to deal in the same way with the departments of agriculture of the two adjoining provinces for the purpose of giving them the same kind of service. It is felt by a good many that these seed cleaning institutions should not invade the domain of the private seed merchants by handling poultry supplies, bee supplies and artificial fertilizers which cannot be properly considered to belong to a seed cleaning plant, and I am prepared to state that those reservations will be inserted in the lease.

Mr. ROWE: I think the Minister of Agriculture has skated around the whole question and absolutely evaded giving an answer. How much rent is it proposed to ask from the registered seed growers' cooperative association of Alberta? Here you have a $150,000 grant—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Might I disabuse my hon. friend's mind of the idea that this is a grant? It is the cost of the additions to the government's seed cleaning plant that we require for our own service. It will have a capacity of 100,000 bushels, and we are leasing the balance to the registered seed growers' association of Saskatchewan. The ownership is in the government and the site continues in possession of the government. If we cannot make a satisfactory lease with the registered seed growers' association, the department may have to operate the plant. With regard to the lease, we have not prepared any draft yet except in a tentative way such as I have outlined. I think that there should be reservations in the lease that this cooperative seed growers' association, whose purpose is to handle their own goods largely, should not engage in selling merchandise such as that to which I have referred. In spite of these restrictions there will be a regular cash rental—

Mr. ROWE: How much?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not worked that out for the very good reason that we do not know if it be worth anything to them this year, because of the lateness in starting construction, and consequently they may have to store some of their grain in some other building and transfer it later. The building season out there for concrete work is very short. The rental for the first year, in my estimation, should be quite small, and after that I think it should be on a graduated scale, starting with say three or four per cent and going up to five per cent or whatever rate government money is worth, and then stop-

ping at that figure for the balance of the period of the lease. It would continue at five per cent, say, for ten years, but that is just a tentative suggestion.

Mr. ROWE: The whole thing seems to be tentative. It is very strange that this cooperative association of farmers, in whom the minister and I are really interested as members of the same vocation, should be made a gift of a building worth $150,000. It is unfair to every other organized business with which it will come into competition. I would ask the minister what the A. E. Mackenzie Company, the seed distributors of Brandon, the Hogg and Lytle people, the Steele, Briggs people and the Rennie people might have to say about this. I have as much sympathy with cooperative marketing and cooperative production in the agricultural districts as the minister or any other hon. member, but it does seem to me absolutely unfair that the minister and this government should hand out to the registered seed growers' cooperative association a building and establishment worth $150,000, to enter into competition with organized business interests of the same character.

The minister might well take into consideration the progress that has been made in Prescott, Russell, Grenville, Carleton, Renfrew, Lanark, Pontiac, and other counties in the Ottawa valley. They have not been assisted by the department, and while there were only two seed cleaning plants in these counties in 1914, there are now fourteen. In a large seed-growing province like Saskatchewan there is one plant established at Moose Jaw, and I ask any hon. member interested in agriculture to say how this is going to be of any particular advantage to the different farmers throughout Saskatchewan. I leave it to hon. members on the other side. I know they will agree with me that this is simply a hand-out from the Department of Agriculture to a purely business and commercial interest. It is one of the examples of ruthless extravagance and political hand-outs on the part of this government. I say that in all fairness to the Minister of Agriculture, whose friendship I have always appreciated. I have never belonged to a cooperative association because they always had some sort of politics mixed up with them. I am a farmer, and I have spent a lot of my time down here. I am interested in cooperative organizations, in cooperative marketing and cooperative production, and I have much in common with every other farmer in this country, but I say that here is a sample of an unjustifiable hand-out, whether it goes to the farmers or not. As I have pointed out we have fourteen seed cleaning plants in the Ottawa valley, for the establishment of which this government can take no credit. They are operated on a purely private basis and are a benefit to the districts al through the Ottawa valley. They have all the equipment which the minister will provide in this $150,000 plant. They are provided with the clipper cleaner, the Marot grader, the Carter disc separator and all the equipment that you will find in any seed cleaning plant. The products of the registered seed growers' cooperative association of Saskatchewan come down through Ontario and Quebec and every other province of this Dominion. I have every respect for the seed growers of Saskatchewan and I should be glad to see them get every assistance possible, but it is not fair to the farmers of Saskatchewan or to the business interests of the rest of Canada for the minister to hand out $150,000 to a purely commercial organization, and I ask the minister to correct me if I am wrong when I say that it is a purely commercial organization. There may be some five or six hundred farmers in that organization, but I know well that they paid their manager $5,000 last year, and any organization that can pay their business manager $5,000 a year does not need $150,000 from this government. I say in all fairness to my fellow farmers from Saskatchewan that this is an absolutely unjustifiable hand-out, and of no particular benefit to the original producers of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that the minister could have used that $150,000 to much better advantage if he had spent it like the Quebec government is doing. It grants a subsidy of 25 per cent for the establishment of seed cleaning plants all through that province. They have all the equipment that this $150,000 plant has, but they touch vitally the farmers interested. This is a $150,000 hand-out to the commercial interests of the seed grain trade of Canada. I know that the minister and his colleagues as well as members of both sides of the house are aware that the seed firms I have mentioned are in rebellion against this thing. It is absolutely unfair to the seed trade of the Dominion, and it is of very little benefit to our farmers. I buy hundreds of bushels of grain from Saskatchewan, not for seed but for feed. It is all very well to talk of this vote being for the benefit of the Saskatchewan farmers, but it is for the benefit of a commercial organization in Saskatchewan.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): In reply to the statement of the hon. member I may be permitted to give an outline of the Saskatche-

wan registered seed growers' association. He has said that it is a purely commercial organization. That is incorrect. The Saskatchewan registered seed growers' association is made up of between 1,000 and 1,100 farmers of the province.

Mr. ROWE: Only 750.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Between 1,000 and 1,100. It has been stated around the corridors for some time by those who oppose this vote that Mr. A. E. Mackenzie, a millionaire seedsman has described this as a purely commercial organization. The organization functions under a provincial charter, because a special act had to be passed in connection with this seed pool—for it is a seed pool—just the same as a special act had to be passed for the organization of the wheat pool, the Saskatchewan Wheat Producers, Limited.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: How is this comparable with the wheat pool, which is a truly cooperative organization?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The Saskatchewan registered seed growers' association, or the seed pool of Saskatchewan, is more truly a pool than is the wheat pool.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Is it not a joint stock company?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): No. Like the wheat pool it was formed under a special act.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): I think I am right.

Mr. ROWE: Certainly it is a joint stock company.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Perhaps my hon. friends will allow me to proceed. All the members of the Saskatchewan seed growers' association have taken stock in the company. That stock was not taken with the hope of ever obtaining dividends, but merely as a donation to the organization and to forward membership in it. It is a non-profit organization so far as the company is concerned. The farmers all over the province who are growing registered seed have it inspected by the government seed inspector; it is shipped to this plant from all over Saskatchewan, the freights being pooled on the inward shipments; there it is again examined, cleaned, and sealed, and then it is sold at the lowest possible price to the farmer. Only a very small spread between the cost of the registered seed and the cost of ordinary wheat going into the market channels is obtained by the registered seed grower. Because we have not had the proper facilities in Saskatchewan for handling our pure seed, a good many hundreds of thousands of bushels of seed that should have been sowed in the province have gone into the ordinary channels of trade, and in that way the Dominion has lost a great deal of money and a great deal of crop each year. I compliment the minister on his foresight and his business ability in agriculture in loaning this building to an organization such as the Saskatchewan registered seed growers' association. In the past we have given large grants—never too large—in aid of agriculture. For instance, in connection with the bull loaning policy of the government thousands of dollars were spent every year. A vote of $150,000 for a building to ensure pure seed for the greatest grain growing province in the Dominion is a drop in the bucket compared with the advantage that will accrue not only to the province but to the Dominion generally from the return of a better crop from better seed. My hon. friend objected because a farmers' association wanted to compete with private corporations. These private corporations have been active in Saskatchewan for the last thirty or thirty-five years.

An hon. MEMBER: Commercial interests.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Yes. Had they supplied the demand for good seed, or registered seed, there would never have been the necessity for forming the Saskatchewan registered seed growers' association. But seeing that that demand throughout Saskatchewan was not supplied, the farmers took it into their own hands, as they have done in regard to a great many other things in that province, and they are making a marked success of the organization. It is only a few years ago that they started into this business, and the production of registered seed in Saskatchewan has gone up by leaps and bounds ever since. My hon. friend stated that the Saskatchewan registered seed growers' association paid their manager $5,000. That statement also is incorrect. The government of Saskatchewan in order to help an organization of this kind has supplied it with a man who costs the province $5,000.

Mr. ROWE: He gets $5,000 nevertheless.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): From the government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. ROWE: It does not matter.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I hope it will be continued.

Mr. ROWE: That government is through now.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): And likely that policy will be through also.

Mr. ROWE: It looks like it.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does my hon. friend say this is a non-profit sharing organization?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Yes.

Mr. ROWE: Do they not sell this seed grain throughout the Dominion in competition with other companies?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Yes.

Mr. ROWE: Then how are they a non-profit organization?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): It is a pool.

Mr. ROWE: But they sell their seed grain throughout all parts of Canada in competition with other seed companies.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Surely. It is not their seed they handle, it is the seed of the farmer.

Mr. ROWE: But they are in the commercial business.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): The wheat pool is in the commercial business too.

Mr. ROWE: Sure.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Have you any objection to that?

Mr. ROWE: It is not too good this year.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): I think the wheat pool has been of great benefit to this country, and the sooner my hon. friends realize that organizations of this kind should be fostered by the government the better it will be for agriculture.

Mr. ROWE: It did not do much good in Ontario this year.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): So far the Saskatchewan registered seed growers' association have been carrying on as a true pool. They have obtained their finances in this way. Every farmer shipping and selling seed through the association allows to be deducted from the sale price of his seed five per cent, and that five per cent is used by the seed growers' association to finance their operations. That is formed into what is called a revolving fund, and at the end of five years the 5 per cent begins to go back to the farmer to whom it belongs. Besides the seed pool, there is a pool for each kind of seed which is shipped into the plant. The seed growers' association now pool the freight on the seed from all parts of Saskatchewan to their plant, and it is their intention to pool out the freights as soon as they get proper statistics and data on the subject. This building is not given to them; part of it will be leased to them for the work they are carrying on, and I trust that the Minister of Agriculture will not make that lease too costly to them, because they are doing a work which his department should have been doing in this country for a good many years. If the Department of Agriculture themselves endeavoured to carry out the work which the Saskatchewan registered seed growers are doing to-day it would cost the country a good deal of money. This is a voluntary organization and is the best of its kind for the distribution of those new seeds which are being developed by the Department of Agriculture on the experimental farms. You have here a thousand growers of seeds who specially prepare their land for it, and when a new seed has been developed and the type set that seed can go to an organization of this kind and can quickly be multiplied and developed by growers whose farms are being properly inspected and checked. The seed is kept pure and can be multiplied very quickly so that the country as a whole can get the benefit of it much more rapidly than would be otherwise the case. Too often in this house we criticize the work of the department and of certain servants of the government, or of the people, who are carrying on a great work for Canada in the development of new grains. I have some little knowledge of the system which is employed, having had the privilege of attending an agricultural college some years ago, and I can truthfully say that there is no work which takes so much labour and shows so little apparent result as the work of Mr. Newman and his staff. I do not think there is any department of the government which has done more for this country than that branch has done in the last few years. It would pay every member of this house to take a trip to the experimental farm in Ottawa and to the experimental farms in their own provinces and see the vast amount of work that is being done, and the great good which is being accomplished by these men in the seed branch and in other kindred branches of the Department of Agriculture. I repeat that there has never been a more forward step taken by the Minister of Agricul-

ture, so far as western Canada and Canada as a whole is concerned, than the erection of this building and the leasing of a part of it to an organization such as the registered seed growers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Will this plant be available for the use of all the farmers of Saskatchewan?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Not only for those who happen to belong to the pool?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It requires only a dollar to belong to the organization. Anyone who is not a member, desiring to ship in a car of seed, can pay a dollar and automatically become a member.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): How much space in the building does the government intend to use?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have distributed between 10,000 and 12,000 bushels this year and we may require between 15,000 and 20,000 more.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): What is the total capacity?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: One hundred thousand bushels.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): And it is proposed to lease the remaining capacity?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): I consider this a good move but it should be undertaken by the provincial government. I konw that in the eastern provinces the seed cleaning plants have been aided with provincial money, and I am at a loss to know why the provinces which have helped seed cleaning plants should be asked to contribute towards a seed cleaning plant for Saskatchewan or for the three prairie provinces. The hon. member for Pontiac suggests that there is need of stimulation along certain lines in Saskatchewan. I notice that a part of the vote goes to fertilizer control. What is the nature of that control, what is the number of inspectors, and so forth?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Perhaps I might make a few observations regarding the necessity for better seed throughout Canada as well as in the west. During the war there was a good deal of laxity in the matter of quality of production. The demand abroad for food of all kinds, including meats, was so keen that almost annything went, with the result that bacon, for instance, deteriorated. The same was true of many of the other farm products, among others grain; because grain was grain and, as I say, everything seemed to go. Shortly after the war, however, an agitation began, to get back once more to quality, and this department, before I became minister, initiated a policy in that direction, in order to place production on a quality basis. And the quality of seed was taken into consideration. We instituted four or five years ago a policy which did not require any particular additional expenditure, except for the conversion to this special purpose of the subventions which had been given to seed exhibitions in the past. Wherever it was desired to have a seed cleaning plant in lieu of the seed grant for exhibition purposes, we established these small cleaning plants. This was done right across Canada from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island. There are eight or ten of these plants assisted in various ways in Ontario—small plants costing from $1,000 to $1,500 apiece. There is also one in Prince Edward Island, and there is another in British Columbia. Let me try to show how general was the demand that someone should take a forward step of this kind. After all the foundation of satisfactory cereals lies in the improvement of seed: like begets like, other things being equal. With that principle in mind, the people throughout the country who were either actively engaged in the business or who were looking on interestedly, realizing the importance of the matter, have been passing resolutions urging the desirability of such action. For example, the National Research Council of Canada recently passed a resolution recommending the establishment of seed warehouses for collecting and distributing seed of approved varieties. This resolution states that undoubtedly the use of good seed would go further than any other single factor in improving the quality of the wheat crop. And the agriculture committee of this house, at page 7 of their report last year, made this recommendation:

> In order that the high quality of our export wheat be maintained, and in order to discourage, as far as possible, the growth of undesirable varieties of wheat, we would urge that one or more seed warehouses be established for the purpose of collecting and distributing seed of approved varieties, and that an experimental flour mill of sufficient size be established in order that experimental work in milling and baking may be conducted on a scale that will give results in line with those obtained in commercial mills.

Part of that recommendation is carried out under this vote; the first step in carrying out

that recommendation is this $150,000 which is not a grant, as my hon. friend stated, but which is desired in order to construct a government seed warehouse for cleaning and storing seed grain, so that when large volumes of seed which have been held by farmers who cannot afford to hold it over to spring is being sold, it may be retained by these seed associations in the accommodation we will supply. That has been an important question in the west for fifteen years. The management of the old cooperative elevator at Regina was requested many times to adopt a policy of this kind but they thought they should confine themselves to commercial grain only, and so far as I know this is the first step to be taken in the way of a general policy of this nature. We have taken care of the requirements of eastern Canada by the arrangement with the small plants to which I have referred.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I suppose the title to this building will always remain in the crown?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, and the title to the site as well.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is the business of this warehouse limited to registered or approved seeds?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As far as Saskatchewan is concerned it is limited to registered and certified seeds, but conditions may be different in the other two provinces, and I am told that they may require high class commercial seeds to be handled as well. We will vary these services to suit the requirements of the different provinces.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it the idea that this will be the one distributing centre for the three provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, we are prepared to render the same assistance to the other two provinces as soon as they are prepared to make use of this service. Then I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Dufferin-Simcoe that in a return made this year to the hon. member for Maple Creek, in which he asked by what amount the revenue obtained from the administration of the Grain Act exceeded the expenditure in each year, or in other words how much the amount collected in fees exceeded the amount required to administer the act, the answer made by the Department of Trade and Commerce was as follows:

1925-26	$1,083,679
1926-27	573,287
1927-28	625,043
1928-29	672,180

That makes a total of over $2,700,000 collected in fees for weighing and grading in excess of what it cost to administer the act. Having regard to the fact that this large amount of money was levied on the farmers and went into the general revenue, surely it is not too much to spend $150,000 and then charge them interest on their own money. So the committee will see that this is not a proposition which will do any harm; we are simply using part of these revenues to put up a government plant which will be retained in the name of the crown so that supervision may be exercised by whoever occupies the position of Minister of Agriculture in years to come, in order to see that the proper kind of grain is used in these seed houses, and that spurious seeds are not taken in and good seeds contaminated, in order to protect the seed of the whole country from contamination. It is a well recognized fact that Canada's wheat is gradually deteriorating in the markets of the world, and in view of that fact some such step as this is imperative.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not know whether the minister is trying to block his own estimates, but I should like to ask him if any part of this building has been constructed as yet?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Are the plans prepared?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And the ground purchased?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The ground was transferred to the government.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister says, "Look at us; see what we have done. We have collected over $2,000,000 of a surplus under the Grain Act and we are going to spend some of it in this way." By looking at the minister's estimates it will be seen that he is spending it all right; he is a wonderful spender. He says, "Oh, I propose to spend only $150,000 on this enterprise," but I want to point out to the minister that every province in Canada is looking after its own seed grain as far as the cleaning is concerned. Now the minister proposes to go into an enterprise which will compete with private firms in that line.

Mr. DONNELLY: Does the federal government not pay to the province of Ontario a certain amount for the seed houses in this province?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is so, and we do that also in the maritime provinces and in British Columbia.

Mr. DONNELLY: Has the Department of Trade and Commerce any authority to collect from the farmers of western Canada over $2,500,000 more than they really need? As I read the statutes, the Department of Trade and Commerce is supposed to collect only enough to pay for the cost of weighing and inspecting the wheat, but I believe that during the last few years they have collected more than they require. What is their authority for doing so?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The fee is $1 per car for grading and inspection, and $1 for weighing, making a total of $2 per car. The volume of wheat has increased enormously and the revenues have been suddenly inflated; the larger volume of grain has been more economically handled, and therefore the fee of $2 which was about right formerly is now found to produce a surplus.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the minister tell us—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I was following the question just answered by the minister.

Mr. BANCROFT: I would like to bring to the attention of the minister the need of some regulation and control over the sale of binder twine in this country, and I bring it up under this item—seed, feed and fertilizer control—because the inspection of binder twine is administered by the seed branch of the Department of Agriculture.

I wish to take a few moments, Mr. Chairman, to discuss this matter of binder twine, which is sold in Canada in bales which weigh 50 pounds gross or 48 pounds net. The farmer pays for fifty pounds of twine or the gross weight of the bale. The twine is labelled 500 feet, 550 feet, 600 feet or 650 feet per pound. The 600-foot per pound twine is the twine which is most commonly used in western Canada. A farmer can easily detect short weight in his twine because he can check that quite easily, but he cannot detect short length. To check the twine for length it would be necessary to unwind the whole bale. A bale weighing 48 pounds of 600-foot twine should measure 28,800 feet, or about 5½ miles of twine. Once the twine is unwound it cannot be used for harvesting purposes, therefore the farmer should be safeguarded against short-length twine by the provisions of the act under which the sale of binder twine is regulated. The present Inspection and Sale Act of 1906—

[Mr. Donnelly.]

there has been nothing done since 1906, Mr. Chairman, and since then there has been a great increase in the consumption—does not provide the proper safeguards in this matter I would like to read a few sections of this act which regulates the sale and inspection. Section 347 reads as follows:

> Upon or attached to every ball of binder twine sold or offered for sale in Canada there shall be a label with the name of the dealer and the number of feet of twine per pound in the ball marked or stamped thereon.

Section 352 reads as follows:

> Every dealer who sells, offers for sale or has in his possession for sale in Canada any ball of binder twine not properly and correctly labelled with the number of feet per pound in the ball, as required by this part, shall be liable to a penalty of not less than one dollar and not more than five dollars for each ball of such binder twine—

This is the important part of this section:

> —provided, that no deficiency in the number of feet of twine contained in any ball shall be deemed to be a contravention of this section unless the deficiency exceeds five per centum of the length indicated by the label.

Section 347 provides for the tag to be attached to each ball, which tag shall state the number of feet in each pound of twine. Section 352 provides that no twine shall be deemed to be short unless the shortage exceeds five per cent of the length indicated on the label. These are the only provisions in the act to safeguard against short-length twine. There is no provision in the act regarding the tensile strength of twine and no provision for the checking of salvaged or reconditioned twine. It is true that the inspectors in the seed branch of the Department of Agriculture have done splendid work in checking the binder twine offered for sale in Canada, yet their effectiveness is limited by the inadequate act under which they operate. The act states that binder twine can be five per cent short of the length indicated on the tag and still be legal, and that provision makes possible a systematic shortage. Take a bale of binder twine labelled 600 feet per pound, containing forty-eight pounds net of twine; it should measure 28,800 feet per bale, but the five per cent leeway allowed under section 347 amounts to 1,440 feet, so the manufacturer could sell a bale labelled 28,800 feet, which might contain only 27,360 feet, and which would still be legal under the present act. A farmer purchasing five hundred pounds of 600-foot twine which measured just up to the minimum required by the act would be paying for 288,000 feet and would be receiving only 273,600 feet; he would be 14,400 feet or nearly three miles short.

I went to a few hon. members of this house to inquire as to their purchases of binder twine.

I went to the Minister of Immigration and I learned that his annual purchase of binder twine amounts to 1,500 pounds of 600-foot twine. The hon. minister believes that he is purchasing 28,800 feet of twine in every bale, but if the manufacturer takes advantage of the five per cent leeway allowed under the present act, the purchase would be 43,200 feet or more than eight miles short in the 1,500 pounds. I went to the hon. member for South Battleford (Mr. Vallance)—who has moved back to this side of the house—and found that his annual purchase amounts to 1,300 pounds of 600-foot twine; his shortage would amount to over seven miles if the manufacturer took advantage of the leeway allowed under the present act. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Steedsman) has an annual purchase of 1,000 pounds, and his shortage would amount to 28,800 feet, or nearly 5½ miles. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Beaubien) has an annual purchase of 1,000 pounds, and his shortage would be the same. The hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Milne) has an annual purchase of 600 pounds of 600-foot twine, and his shortage would amount to 17,280 feet, or nearly 3⅓ miles.

The various brands of binder twine offered for sale in Canada each year are checked by the government inspectors and by some branches of the organized farmers. Those inspections show that some firms put out twine which measures well up to the standard, while others seem to be trying to keep just to the five per cent shortage allowed by the act. I have a few figures which I would like to give, taken from some of the inspections.

Ten bales of binder twine labelled 550 feet per pound, or 522½ feet of minimum length allowed under the present act, measured as follows: 507, 528, 554, 559, 594, 518, 550, 555, 560, 597. This was a good lot of twine; there were three short, one correct and six overlength; the average was well above the lengths stated on the tags.

Here is another lot of 24 bales of another brand, labelled 550 feet per pound, and which measured as follows: 505, 517, 524, 528, 510, 522, 525, 531, 534, 538, 541, 548, 550, 556, 531, 533, 538, 541, 543, 550, 551, 560, 558, 578.

An hon. MEMBER: Take it as read.

Mr. BANCROFT: This is a very poor lot; of the 24 bales, two were the correct length, five were overlength and eighteen were short.

Mr. ROWE: Give it to Hansard.

Mr. BANCROFT: Here is another lot of thirteen bales, labelled 600 feet per pound, and which measured: 556, 563, 572, 572, 596, 613, 557, 568, 572, 576, 609. The minimum length allowed by law, as the leeway is 5 per cent, is 570 feet. Two of these bales were overlength and eleven were short.

I have two more measurements which I would like to give. Ten bales of twine, labelled 550 feet per pound, or 522½ feet minimum length allowed under the present act, measured out as follows: 507, 518, 528, 550, 554, 555, 559, 560, 594, 597.

This is an exceptionally good lot. Three were short, one correct and six overlength. Another lot of nine bales, labelled 600 feet per pound, measured out as follows: 565, 577, 600, 600, 605, 613, 613, 616, 625.

This was an exceptionally good lot. There were two short, two correct, and five overlength.

Mr. ROWE: Are these mostly from the United States?

Mr. BANCROFT: We have a very small importation of binder twine from the United States. These figures show that the binder twine sold in Canada varies greatly in the mater of length. If we take one bale of 550-foot twine mentioned in one of these inspections, this bale measured out 505 feet to the pound. This 48-pound bale was 2,160 feet shorter than the length stated on the tag. This bale was found to average 505 feet per pound, or 45 feet short on each pound in the bale. It takes two feet of twine to bind a sheaf of grain. This particular bale tied 1,080 fewer sheaves than it would have tied had it contained the full length stated on the tag. Probably because of the leeway allowed under the present act, the method of measuring binder twine as it is being wound into balls, is the worst hit-and-miss business you ever saw. In fact, it is not measured at all. The twine is wound into balls on rapidly revolving spindles. When the ball attains a certain size, it is shoved off the spindle automatically and a new ball is commenced in its place. I would suggest that each bale of binder twine offered for sale in Canada should carry a label stating the number of feet of twine contained in the bale. That is, a bale containing 48 pounds net of 600-foot twine, would be labelled "This bale contains 28,800 feet of binder twine." No leeway should be allowed. The manufacturers can, if they find it necessary, attach measuring devices on twine machines.

Proof that the 5 per cent leeway is not necessary is found in the advertisements of some of the binder twine manufacturers. I have two advertisements under my hand. This advertisement of a certain company reads:

This harvester twine is guaranteed for length, strength and weight—the ball of standard manila must contain at least 4,400 feet of twine.

That is the 550-foot twine.

If you buy a "cut-price" ball and it falls only 50 feet short of this standard, the shortage means 25 bundles that must be bound out of the next ball. In such a case, each succeeding ball assumes an additional handicap of 25 bundles. This handicap amounts to 150 bundles by the time you have used a single bale of twine.

Another large binder twine concern in Canada, speaking of their particular 600-foot twine, say:

It is the only twine which is guaranteed 28,800 feet per bale.

All we ask is a guarantee of the number of feet of twine in the bale. The act should also prohibit the sale of binder twine that has a tensile strength of less than 60 pounds.

Another safeguard which should be in the act is to provide for government supervision in all cases where binder twine is salvaged and reconditioned. I have under my hand an instance of some salvaged binder twine which was reconditioned, rewound and offered for sale in western Canada two years ago. This twine was being offered for sale at about two cents per pound below the market price. Twelve bales of this were purchased and weighed. This twine was being sold as 50-pound bales gross weight or 48 pounds net. These bales were weighed by three men, each of whom made an affidavit as to the accuracy of these figures. The gross weights of these twelve bales were as follows:

Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
41½	41½	42	42½
42½	43	44	41
41	44	41½	43½

I would suggest that anyone desiring to salvage or recondition binder twine must apply to the minister for authority to do so.

These are the main items that, I think, are needed in an act to control the inspection and sale of binder twine in this country. I know the minister and his departmental officials have been working in this matter, and I hope the minister is in a position to-night to state to the committee that a bill will be brought down that will properly safeguard the farmers in the purchase of binder twine.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. member for Selkirk is to be congratulated upon the perseverance with which he has pressed this matter on the attention of the department. I have a bill now ready, and I propose to submit it to my colleagues. If it is favourable to the house, it will then be submitted to the committee on agriculture where the whole question can be thoroughly threshed out.

[Mr. Bancroft.]

Mr. EVANS: I have one more word to say regarding the seed house at Moose Jaw. I am in complete accord with the proposition that a grant should be made for it. I am not in accord with the method of help that the government is giving to this scheme. The minister has already quoted the fact that the co-operative elevator of Saskatchewan was a success. It was a success for the simple reason that the ultimate ownership of that scheme came into the hands of the farmers themselves under a cooperative plan. I would like to see the government give us the help that is needed to establish the house, but instead of a rent, they should strike a number of years in which the whole sum to the government could be paid back with interest and the ultimate ownership should be vested in the cooperative company of farmers themselves. This is the only way in which it can succeed, and when I say this I have in mind other institutions which have been established on a plan similar to that on which we are now thinking of establishing this one, and which have failed. There is no other way, to my mind, to give us the help we need in this matter than a purely cooperative plan.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Earlier in the evening I asked about the number of inspectors that were engaged in fertilizer control, and I have not yet been able to secure an answer.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The services that are supplied by this branch cover seed, feed, fertilizer, hay, pests, poisons, binder twine. There are thirty-seven in all.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): How many on fertilizer alone?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They are all qualified to perform any of these services, and they do so as the work fits in.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Has the minister found any violations of the act of late years?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, every time any restriction is imposed upon the public there are always violations of such acts. After the first six months or a year of operation, we endeavour to see that they do not get away with such violations without prosecutions being instituted.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): I am in sympathy with the remarks of the hon. member for Selkirk and I appreciate the sympathetic hearing that was given to him by the minister. This inspection might well be extended into other fields. I have in mind at

the present time the steel products which are used by farmers for roofing and siding on farm buildings. Anyone driving through Ontario or the eastern provinces must have been struck by the fact that steel roofs that have been on a few years become rusty. There is a great loss to the farmers because these products are not made up to a certain standard. I just throw out the suggestion that this matter might be well looked into, as well as binder twine. I have had it drawn to my attention by many individual farmers and by agricultural representatives throughout Ontario that it is desirable that steps be taken to see that steel products are manufactured to a certain standard, and that they are properly galvanized.

Item agreed to.

For experiments in dehydration of fruits and vegetables, $29,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I notice that there has been an increase in this watered stock. I would like to know something about it.

Mr. McRAE: If we cut out the importation of some of the American fruits and vegetables we should not need so much dehydrated fruit, and the vote would be less.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): Is not this a provincial responsibility? We were told a little while ago what Ontario was doing in connection with its seed. I think this is something that the fruit-growing provinces ought to do for their own industry.

Item agreed to.

Live stock, including grants to exhibitions, feeder shows, etc., $1,530,000.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Why is there an increase of $50,000 in this vote?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The work of the live stock branch and of the exhibition branch is constantly increasing. We have a large chain of exhibitions across Canada that seem to require greater expenditure to take care of them. We are continuing the class B fairs. The committee will remember that we discussed them last year. Part of this increase is due to the continuation of the twenty-two class B fairs. We are also giving assistance to various exhibitions in connection with their winter fairs.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): The grants to the class B fairs will be continued?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, to those already established.

Mr. TUMMON: Last year the minister practically gave the house to understand that the grants to class B fairs would be discontinued, and for that reason a number of us who have class B fairs in our constituencies did not press for grants, but towards the end of the session in reply to a question by the hon. member for Argenteuil the minister said that he would reconsider the matter. I belive the grants to the class B fairs have been paid during the past year. There are perhaps six fairs in Ontario that come within class B—Kingston, Belleville, Stratford, Peterborough, Lindsay, Renfrew. Of those six I think only Peterborough receives a grant. I submit that the other class B fairs are just as much entitled to the grant as Peterborough. It would save a lot of discussion if the minister would just say that he would treat all these class B fairs alike.

Mr. McRAE: Is the grant distributed with any regard to the percentage of population in the various provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We are trying to equalize it and have done so to some extent, but it is very difficult. For instance, no matter how you try to equalize it, Ontario gets the most because of the Toronto fair. That really does not belong to the province but is for the entire Dominion. Nevertheless, every province persists in pointing to Ontario and saying: Look at what Ontario is getting. I did take the stand last year as indicated by my hon. friend, but the government reconsidered the matter in view of the very strong feeling that seemed to exist especially in the prairie provinces. They seemed to take the ground that once a B fair always a B fair, so we considered it advisable to continue the grants to these B fairs, holding them down to the present incorporated institutions.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: How much are you giving them this year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The same as last year, $1,500.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): We did expect that the minister would keep his word. We did not press the matter any further when he said last year that he would not continue the grants. Then he went west on a trip and afterwards changed his mind. It has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction throughout Ontario that notwithstanding the minister's statement he has carried on the policy that he affirmed he was going to discontinue. Further, when the minister says that Ontario is getting the largest grant, there is the fact

that one place in Ontario gets the most of it and many other fairs receive nothing. The minister must admit that that policy cannot continue and that he must treat all alike. I think that in all he does he looks at things in a reasonable way, but there is no reason of any sort in a policy under which you give a grant to one class B fair and nothing to five or six other class B fairs. I ask the minister now if he cannot see that his policy is causing a great deal of dissatisfaction. All the rural population feel there is an injustice in this treatment, and I hope the minister will now say, "We will treat you all alike."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If we give to this and that fair we shall not be able to stop until we have covered every little hamlet in the Dominion.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): If the minister lays down a certain policy of course he will treat all alike so long as they fulfil the requirements of that policy. I am only asking the minister to establish such a policy.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend has made such a courteous representation that I will give it full consideration during the recess.

Mr. McRAE: In view of what the minister has said, will he kindly go back a step and tell me that the fair associations in my province of British Columbia may expect their proportion of this appropriation?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Since my hon. friend inquired into this matter we have made a business arrangement with the city of Vancouver for the construction of a winter fair building on the same terms as in Ottawa and elsewhere.

Mr. SPENCER: I congratulate the minister on continuing the grants to these B fairs. I feel they have done a great deal of good. As one of those who appealed to him to do this I am very glad to hear his decision.

M. LUCHKOVICH: I think the grants should be given to the B class fairs because they deserve them. In my opinion these fairs are doing more to encourage agriculture than the A class. How long are these grants to be continued?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am not likely to make any particular effort in the near future to discontinue them after the experience I had last year.

Mr. ROWE: How much of this vote goes to the Canadian national exhibition?

[Mr. A. E. Ross.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The regular grant of $5,000.

Mr. ROWE: The construction of a very important building in the Canadian national exhibition grounds is being held up because of certain action by the minister's department. I think he will agree with me that the Canadian national exhibition plays a much more important part in the agricultural life of this country than probably any other fair throughout the Dominion. Since its establishment the attendance has grown from 100,000 to over 2,000,000. Every province is represented there. It has been truly termed the "show window of the nation." The minister would have been well supported by all sections of the house had he granted the request of the exhibition board for a substantial contribution towards the new live stock building. The very fact that the imperial government have spent over $90,000 on fixtures for the British Empire marketing building in the grounds shows their appreciation of the value of the exhibition for British Empire trade.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And for Canadian trade.

Mr. ROWE: Yes. Hon. members on the other side may say that the exhibition is of great benefit to the city of Toronto, but I would point out that the 350 acres forming the exhibition grounds are exempt from civic taxation. The minister knows what the city contributes towards this great enterprise, which I submit, is truly the greatest advertising agency we have in the Dominion. I have no hesitation in saying that the Canadian national exhibition does more to develop empire trade than any other organization in this country. The minister might well have included at least that small grant of $17,000 to supplement the city of Toronto's and Ontario's grant. I should think the committee would approve of the inclusion in the estimates of this sum, or if it is not in the estimates then the amount should be taken from some other vote, for the Canadian national exhibition. I do not consider it a provincial or an Ontario fair; it is a Canadian fair and is advertising Canada to-day just as much as any other enterprise in the Dominion.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I must congratulate the hon. member on his loyalty to his fair and to his province. But I would ask him this question: Has he ever seen the Calgary stampede?

Mr. ROWE: I saw it in Calgary and also on the Canadian national exhibition grounds, and it was only a minor event in comparison to the Canadian national exhibition.

Mr. LADNER: The world's poultry congress is to be held in London next year. Canada occupies a particularly prominent place in that coming event by reason of the fact that one of her highest and best officials, Mr. F. C. Elford, is president of the congress. He is a gentleman with a high reputation and is internationally known. In view of the fact that this exhibition is held once in three years, and considering the rapid development of the poultry business in Canada and its extension to foreign markets, is provision being made in these estimates for Canada's participation in the congress?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the supplementaries there is $25,000 for the purpose.

Mr. KENNEDY: Does the minister's department control the regulations in regard to the grading of meats?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY: What progress have we made in Canada in the grading of meats for home consumption, including beef, pork, mutton and lamb?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have regulations only with regard to beef and poultry. The positions of graders of beef have recently been advertised and are now under consideration by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. KENNEDY: The department has spent a good deal of money to encourage the production of lamb in Canada and has carried on strenuous progaganda to keep up quality. But we are permitting New Zealand mutton—old bucks I believe—to come into Canada for sale all over the country as lamb. What on earth is the use of spending government money to encourage farmers to produce lamb when we allow mutton to come in from New Zealand and be sold throughout the country as lamb? This at once spoils the market for the article which you are encouraging the farmers to produce. I think it is foolish. We ought to have a grading system which will protect the consumer against exploitation in this regard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have given more attention in Canada to the grading system than anywhere else on this continent and I think we might try it out on beef on the voluntary basis before beginning with lamb—even the old fashioned lamb my hon. friend refers to. The United States has tried the system but it is nothing to write home about. I think, however, that if we in Canada persevere to the end we shall succeed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How long have the voluntary grading resolutions been in force?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As regards beef, the regulations have just been gazetted and the advertisements for graders have been only recently completed. The matter is now before the Civil Service Commission and until we have the graders appointed we cannot consider the act in force.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the minister anticipate that the butchers are going to ask him to send his inspectors to stamp their meat?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They will ask the department to have their beef graded. The regulations apply only to the abattoirs, who have already had several conferences with the beef grading committee which has travelled throughout the country for the last twelve months, and they have agreed to cooperate with us in a voluntary way.

Mr. KENNEDY: Is there any constitutional difficulty in the matter of beef grading so far as the provincial governments are concerned?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have no difficulty, and in any case the provinces have passed the necessary concurrent legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY: If the department can prevent mutton being sold as lamb they should take steps in the matter at once.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I appreciate my hon. friend's support of the general policy of meat grading. We are now at the stage where home consumption is satisfied by home production, and we intend to try out the system with beef before applying it to lamb. We have had a number of representations, and I expect to go to the Pacific during July, when I shall make diligent inquiries into the desirability of pursuing the grading system further in the direction indicated.

Mr. ROWE: Does the minister propose to make to the Canadian national exhibition the grant I suggest? The exhibition is worth more than $5,000, especially when they are putting up a building of such magnitude as the one I have mentioned. The Canadian national exhibition contributes $36,000 annually in floor space to the British Empire marketing board and when it can do that surely it is only reasonable that this government should give that fair $17,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I find myself very much in sympathy with my hon. friend's representations, but I think he and I could make better progress if we did not say so much about it to the house.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to ask the minister if his department is responsible for the health of the animals imported into Canada?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, certainly.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And I understand there is quite an expensive quarantine establishment maintained?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): With very efficient officers?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I hope so.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The point I want to get at is that the minister is taking all possible precautions to prevent diseased animals and animals likely to be diseased from coming into contact with our own animals?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then I would like to know why this department has seen fit to deduct $10 per head from the remuneration or damage paid the farmers who have had imported hogs slaughtered for hog cholera. Perhaps I had better put it this way: It has been brought to my attention that at least in the province of Alberta several farmers were induced to import some Chester white hogs. An active campaign was carried on by the importers and by the federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture to prevent the farmers from importing those hogs, but in spite of the information they received they did import them. This importation could be made only through the quarantine station and after the officers undertook to see, as far as they could, that the farmer and the country were protected from any possible contact with hog cholera. The Chester whites came in; they were in quarantine; they passed quarantine and they went out to the farmers. Possibly as a result of the importation of those hogs, and possibly because of some other reasons, hog cholera broke out and many herds were slaughtered. The farmers were to be paid a certain amount of money, about 75 per cent of the value of the animals, but in the case of the Chester whites the department saw fit to deduct $10 per head in addition, so that instead of the farmers receiving 75 per cent of the value of the hogs they received 75 per cent less $10 per head.

The shocking thing about it is that when I wrote the department protesting against this deduction of $10, the reply from the department under date of May 8 advises me that it is true that the Department of Agriculture is responsible for letting these hogs into Canada; they admit responsibility, but say that the hogs were permitted entry only after the quarantine period. That is all the more damaging to the department. The officers of the department examined these hogs thoroughly, or at least they had every opportunity to do so; at all events these hogs spread hog cholera and now the farmers concerned are penalized in this way; they are stung twice, first on the Chester whites as breeding stock and then by the fact that they were disease carriers. The department comes along and deducts $10 per head from their remuneration. I cannot understand that, and I want the minister to let the committee know just why the department has taken this unfair advantage of these farmers.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Both the Department of Agriculture at Edmonton and the federal department did everything the law allowed them to do to exclude these animals altogether. They were quarantined at the point of entry, as my hon. friend indicated, but evidently the signs of the disease were not distinguishable at the time of the quarantine. We have a working arrangement with the United States under which they recognize our certificates of cleanliness and we recognize their certificates on all animals, but apparently in this instance some of these certificates have not been absolutely reliable. I can assure my hon. friend that if I had had any kind of weapon with which to keep out these hogs they never would have entered Canada, but my hon. friend must remember that once a minister begins to exclude animals from the United States there is always the suspicion that he is doing so to protect the home market.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not protesting against the minister's action in quarantining the hogs or trying to keep them out; I think he acted wisely, but why penalize the farmers $10 per head extra?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This matter has not been brought to my attention until now, to my recollection; the outbreak occurred when I was absent from Canada, and since then we have been fairly busy. I will make inquiries into the matter.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is not good enough. Here is a farmer who is entitled by law to 75 per cent of the value of the animals slaughtered. The department is supposed to protect him against the introduction of diseased animals, but failed to do so. I am not blaming the department; accidents will happen, but as a matter of fact the department did fail. The farmer was not only stung with these hogs as breeding stock but, after the department's failure, he is penalized another $10 per head. That is absolutely unfair; under the law the farmer is entitled to the whole 75 per cent of the value of the animals slaughtered, and as representing the interests of these men I must insist on that 75 per cent being paid in full. The department has no legal right to deduct an additional $10 per head; that is a clear swindle on the farmers who are concerned in this matter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend has not the right angle on this question. I understand the situation now better than I did when my hon. friend introduced it, and under the law the minister may or may not pay compensation. We may exercise our discretionary power in that matter, and if there are any peculiar or exceptional circumstances under which this contagion broke out, indicating that the farmers were responsible for it—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But the farmers were not responsible for it. What chance has a farmer to inspect hogs in quarantine?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the farmers had not bit so freely when they were exploited by the men who imported the animals there would have been no difficulty. I would have liked to stop these men from buying the animals, but there was no provision by which I could save them from themselves. This expense was loaded on the country as a result of the importations; if there had been no importation there would have been no trouble, but the farmers insisted on buying these hogs against the advice of all the officials. They brought the animals in; they were primarily responsible for the introduction of the disease, and the officers of the department considered themselves justified in withholding a portion of the compensation in order to indicate that farmers always run a risk when they import animals of that description against the advice of the provincial and federal officials.

Mr. SPENCER: It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture could have prohibited these hogs from being brought in.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: How?

Mr. SPENCER: If they are allowed to come in under proper inspection then there should be some responsibility upon the government.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the hon. member will agree to give the department the authority to exclude animals which are under suspicion I can assure him that I will be delighted to take the initiative in asking for that authority by way of legislation or regulation. At the present time I do not think we have the regulative powers to do it; there is no law that I know of upon which regulation could be based. I feel now and I felt then that the goverment of the day should have the authority to exclude suspected animals coming from a country which was filled with hog cholera. But if I had taken that action I know the attitude which would have been taken by many hon. members in this house; they would have opposed it upon the ground that there was an element of protection introduced by the exclusion of animals under the guise of trying to keep out suspected animals. Section 6, as amended, reads:

> The minister may order compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered under the provisions of this act.

It is entirely optional and sometimes we exercise that option. I am open to further information on this point. I think that the officers were justified in only allowing part compensation to the farmers who were responsible for bringing in these diseased animals from the United States.

Mr. SPENCER: Were the purchasers of these hogs notified that they would be penalized, as it were, if hog cholera were found? If it was intended that an extra charge should be made, I think it would have been only fair that these farmers should have been notified.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is enough in my hon. friend's contention to justify my reviewing the case. My officers are very careful in deciding a matter of this kind and I am disposed to take their finding until I have further evidence placed before me that it is wrong.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am very glad that the minister has taken this attitude. I think he realizes the hardship imposed upon

these men. They are not rich men and they cannot afford these losses. They have had to wait a long time for their payment, and they are asking for interest. They have had to go to the bank and borrow money, not on the $10, but on other moneys due them; they had to borrow money to carry on their spring work instead of being able to carry on with the indemnity from the department. They have suffered a heavy string of hardships throughout this whole matter, and I hope the minister will reconsider the whole question. When the minister suggests the meaning of the word "may", I would refer him to his hon. friend the Minister of Justice from whom he will probably get the information that in most of these cases the "may" is taken as an imperative; that is, it shall be paid. It is not used in the ordinary colloquial way. I have not read the section but I presume that the "may" is not altogether discretionary; it may be, but I would like the minister to look into it. I wish to put a letter on record so that the minister will have it before him when he is considering this case. I protested to the department because of this reduction, and I received the following reply, dated May 8:

> I have your letter of the 6th instant, with reference to the Chester white hogs imported and subsequently slaughtered suffering from hog cholera, and in this connection I would advise you that it is true that the Department of Agriculture is responsible for letting these pigs in, but they were permitted entry only after all the quarantine period which the law allows had been served. That is, they were kept in quarantine for thirty days after entry—

And yet the department did not find a trace of hog cholera. The letter continues:

> —and were released on a certificate from United States veterinary officers stating that they had come from a herd which had not been serum treated, and they had not been in contact with any herd in which hog cholera had been present six months prior to entry. Consequently, this department did all it could to protect the health of our Canadian live stock in this particular matter.

Apparently they failed in this case. The letter continues:

> The trouble is that the pigs were sold to Canadians by a bunch of sharpers—not to use any stronger term—who apparently found some way of deceiving the United States officers, and in getting certificates which apparently were quite in order. These imported hogs were sold to our Canadian farmers in face of all the information given to them about the breed of pigs that should be used in Canada to get the best results, and in face of the strongest representations of our federal officers and, I believe, of the provincial officers as well.

On that point Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the department and to the minister that very frequently there are others besides farmers who are stung by sharpers once in a while; even the department has been stung at times. That is no legitimate reason why the farmers should be refused their fair compensation. The letter continues:

> The farmers were deluded into these transactions by the hope of extraordinary gains. For instance, they were told by the agents of the United States company selling these pigs that "all their sow pigs from the first two litters would be bought at a stated price—$25 at that time, provided they weighted 125-135 pounds at six months and met the standard of the open gilt sold the farmer." We think that this is one of the reasons why farmers were induced to act against the well-known recommendations both of the provincial and federal departments of agriculture. They were also warned of the risk of the introduction of disease.
>
> We put the Royal Canadian Mounted Police on the track of these agents, and finally the traffic was stopped, due partly to the fact that the dealers did not live up to the promise of taking the young pigs off the hands of the farmers, and partly because we made things so hot for them that they desisted.
>
> Under the circumstances I felt that we could not justify anything in the way of paying for these imported pigs at the expense of the country which had already suffered so much on account of the introduction of disease due to the persistence of these farmers in acting contrary to the recommendations of both departments. So far as the law is concerned, we could, of course, pay for these hogs, but I am still of the opinion that we should not do so.
>
> Yours very truly,
> J. H. Grisdale,
> Deputy Minister.

While some blame may be attached to the farmers for acting as they did, we must admit that even the minister himself sometimes acts contrary to the advice of his own officers, and very properly so. For some reason or other the farmers thought that they were in for a killing; they were, but it was not the kind of killing they expected. Under all the circumstances, I hope the minister will give consideration to these men and allow the additional $10 per head.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I wish to assure the hon. member for Bow River that I had no desire to be harsh with these farmers who were misguided, or who exercised the wrong judgment in this matter. As my hon. friend says, we are all disposed to do that; if we deprive everyone in the world of the initiative to do right or wrong we would soon have a breed of people who would not be worth their salt. While I am open to further information I am closed to importunity, but we would need a little more information before we would be justified in changing the decision. I would direct the attention of my hon. friend to the section of the regulation

under which the officers acted, and I think in view of the circumstances they acted quite properly. Section 2 reads in part:

Such compensation may be withheld—

I agree that sometimes "may" is not permissive, but is rather mandatory and might mean may or shall; but I do not think in this case any such discretion can be exercised in respect to the use of the word "may":

Such compensation may be withheld in whole or in part whenever the owner or the person having charge of the animal has, in the opinion of the minister, been guilty in relation to the animal of an offence against this act, or whenever the animal being a foreign one was in his judgment diseased at the time of entering Canada.

It is evident to my mind it was this latter proviso upon which the officer acted. Notwithstanding that, I have lost enough animals myself during the last almost fifty years in the west, before there was any compensation, to know exactly how a farmer feels when he finds his animals have to be slaughtered without reservation on account of any kind of contagious disease like glanders, cholera or the like. My disposition would be to err on the side of leniency if the circumstances of the case warrant that conclusion.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): In western Ontario last fall there was an outbreak of hog cholera in some of the counties such as Essex and Kent. The hogs were inspected and slaughtered. Recommendations were sent in for compensation, but this spring I received communciations from different farmers complaining that as yet they had not received compensation for the hogs. I should like to ask the minister whether all those claims have been paid?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): Could some means not be provided whereby the compensation could be paid more promptly? It seems a hardship to many farmers, at a time when they are expecting this money to meet fall expenditures for taxes, payments on implements and other things, that they should lose their entire herd and then have to wait until the spring before they can receive from the department the money which is granted as compensation for losing their hogs.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is the first time for many years—and we simply did not anticipate it—that we have had such a large amount of bovine tuberculosis in a certain area in the province of Quebec along the United States boundary. This ate up our money so rapidly that we ran out of funds and the payment of those overdue accounts had to be extended into the current year. The reason was an underestimate of our requirements. It was due to the fact that we had these outbreaks of hog cholera in Essex and Calgary quite beyond our anticipations. In addition to that, there was the large percentage of bovine tuberculosis that was quite beyond any of our experience during the last seven or eight years. We shall be more on our guard this year. We shall simply have to stop the work if we find that we run into an unexpected lot of diseased animals of any kind that is going to take up our money. We will simply not contract the debt and we will let the work stand until the current year comes around, rather than contract the debt and have the people complaining of not being paid. With the additional amount provided in the supplementary estimates I do not think we shall have any difficulty this year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister would be very unwise to carry out a policy of that kind and I do not think he is serious in his suggestion. If he finds an outbreak of hog cholera anywhere, I am sure he will take all necessary precautions.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not mean to suggest that I would not take care of hog cholera outbreaks.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am sure the minister did not. How did the difficulty ever arise? Would it not have been possible to secure the necessary money by governor general's warrant? Has that not been done in other cases?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. gentleman is asking a rather awkward question. I had no thought of discontinuing the work in connection with any contagious disease such as has been referred to, but in the case of the large areas in which we eradicate tuberculosis, we can stop the operation of that at any time. I would not suggest not dealing with an outbreak of hog cholera. As regards governor general's warrants, the government do not like to exercise that option any more frequently than they have to.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I agree with that, but there are occasions when they have been used.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend knew how valiantly I endeavoured to meet these accounts, I do not think he would complain.

Mr. FANSHER (Lambton): When were the farmers recompensed for the slaughter of those hogs?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In that district they were all completed about five or six weeks ago. I think everything is cleared up in the districts that have complied with the "clean-up" conditions.

Mr. COTNAM: Under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act does the department grant remuneration to farmers who have experienced the loss of cattle suffering from hemorrhagic septicaemia?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That does not come under the Health of Animals branch.

Mr. COTNAM: Is there any way whereby the department can grant remuneration in cases of that kind?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not that I know of.

Mr. KENNEDY: In regard to imports of mutton from New Zealand and elsewhere, is it possible for the Department of Agriculture to arrange that the statistics be kept in such a way that we can tell what quantity of lamb and what quantity of mutton come in? At the present time the whole thing is so jumbled up that one cannot tell what it is.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will try that out.

Item agreed to.

Health of Animals, administration of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and Meat and Canned Foods Act, and necessary buildings, $2,450,000.

Mr. BARBER: I wish first to register a protest against the delaying of perhaps the most important estimate until the dying hours of the session. I want to draw to the attention of the committee what I consider a very raw deal that has been handed out to the dairymen of certain sections of the Dominion. I refer to those areas in which the department is carrying on a campaign to eradicate bovine tuberculosis. I do not think any hon. member objects to the action of the department along those lines. We want to clean this up, but the unfairness comes in when the farmers, the dairymen, are called upon to pay about 75 per cent of the cost. I have two complaints to make. The first is the compensation that is allowed, and the second is the delay in payment. As I have said, the compensation is sufficient only to compensate the man for about 25 per cent of the cost of replacement of his herd. This means that the farmers, in order to protect the consumers of milk and in the interest of the public health of the country, are contributing 75 per cent of the cost. In regard to the compensation I cannot hold the minister altogether responsible because the compensation is provided for by statute.

[Mr. B. W. Fansher.]

As perhaps hon. gentlemen are aware, a good grade cow is valued under the act at $50 and the compensation allowed is $33.33. It would cost the farmer to replace that cow to-day $125 to $150. For pure breds the maximum valuation under the act is $150, and the compensation two-thirds, or $100. As far as the Fraser valley is concerned, last year the third test was made in that district, and 286 cattle were slaughtered for which the average compensation, including pure breds, was a little over $39. This is not sufficient to enable the farmer to replace the cattle in his herd. To increase the compensation it would no doubt be necessary to amend the act. Therefore I cannot hold the minister entirely responsible for the amount of the compensation awarded, but I do hold him directly responsible for the delay in the payment of this compensation. Provision was made in the estimates last year, on the basis of the loss not being over perhaps 1½ per cent; I believe it was under that. But an estimate was made and a sum provided in the estimates. I find to-day that in respect of the cattle slaughtered last October and November the farmers of the Fraser valley were deprived for five or six months of the compensation that was awarded to the amount of $10,050.30. I consider that the minister is altogether responsible. I have under my hand a letter from a man in my district in which he says:

> It seems to be an unfortunate fact that throughout the Fraser valley district, tuberculosis is more or less prevalent. Although it is claimed that the average affected is low—ranging perhaps approximately one per cent of the total dairy cattle—yet in some sections the loss has been heavy and I know of instances in my own district (Matsqui) where some farmers have lost the greater part of their herds. One farmer has lost his entire herd. I have lost eight head out of approximately twenty. The compensation value arbitrarily placed upon these condemned cattle in my herd was $32 each. I am assuming that other owners of condemned cattle have been promised payment on a similar scale, which is approximately about twenty-five per cent of their commercial replacement value. Cattle were found to be affected by tuberculosis in the opinion of the department's veterinary inspector, and were condemned in October of last year. To date no payment has been made that I can ascertain in our district (Matsqui). It all seems manifestly unfair, particularly as in some instances where the loss of cattle has been great and the entire herd taken the farmer has been left absolutely without means to carry on because he has not the means in the absence of any remittance from the government to even partially replace his dairy herd.

I wish briefly to put this before the government: I think the compensation is too low, and in order to eradicate bovine tuberculosis

we should not expect the farmer to pay 75 per cent of the cost. In addition, there is no reason whatever for the delay of five or six months in the payment of the small amount of compensation provided. In regard to my district, I charge that this amount has been transferred to meet payments in other districts. This amount was included in the estimates last year. It was the third and final test for bovine tuberculosis, and the officers of the department could estimate the losses. They knew what the probable losses would be, but over $10,000 has been held back from the farmers in my district. I think that that is very unfair, and I lodge a strong protest against the action of the minister in that regard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As to this raw deal that my hon. friend speaks of, he is an hon. member who usually uses very moderate language. I would say to him that there are hon. members whose constituencies had overdue accounts ten times as large as the one he mentions, and when the circumstances were explained to them there was not a word of complaint. My hon. friend represents the beautiful valley from which the cities of New Westminster and Vancouver get nearly all their clean milk, and it was for that reason that we started a campaign early in that section to ensure to those cities the best milk supply obtainable. I would also point out that Canada gives larger compensation for this class of diseased animals that are slaughtered than any other country in the world, and 33⅓ per cent higher than is granted in the United States. I hope that such a delay in the payment of compensation will not occur again, and it probably will not because we shall have to have more leeway. I say further that there was no disposition on the part of the department or of my officials to discriminate against my hon. friend in the matter of the time when the compensation should be paid. There was only one place in connection with which we did give a preference, and that was with regard to the animals slaughtered for hog cholera. We paid the compensation in that case; we had sufficient money at the time to clean up the disease earlier in the year. The owners of these animals were peculiar sufferers, and we paid the accounts around Calgary before paying other accounts in the eastern provinces, for the reason that Alberta had the first outbreak. But there was no discrimination against my hon. friend. The amount he mentions, $10,000, was not a big amount when compared with what other parts of the country had to put up with. There was no raw deal in connection with it at all, but a good service was rendered, and the compensation was paid just as promptly as we had the money to do it.

Mr. BARBER: In regard to protecting the cities of New Westminster and Vancouver, I am not blaming the minister for that, but the figures I have given show that the farmers of the Fraser valley are paying about 75 per cent of the cost of cleaning up bovine tuberculosis.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not at all.

Mr. BARBER: Yes, according to the replacement value, and I consider that that is very unfair. As far as the other matter is concerned, I think the minister will agree that he knew that the third and final test was coming on in the Fraser valley and that a certain amount would be required, something like $14,000. Of that amount $4,000 was paid, and the other $10,000 was transferred to some other district.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend is quite off his eggs.

Mr. COTNAM: I think the Minister of Agriculture is very fair-minded and very sympathetic. Speaking of hemorrhagic septicaemia in cattle, I would draw to his attention a case, of which he is no doubt aware, which occurred in North Renfrew about a year ago. I understand that a case of hemorrhagic septicaemia was discovered and diagnosed as such by the veterinary surgeon who was called in. Several farmers in the district became very much alarmed and asked the veterinary surgeon to inoculate their cattle against this disease, which was considered very contagious. The cattle were inoculated in good faith by the farmers of the district, but the serum was not satisfactory and many of the cattle died, in fact whole herds were wiped out. I am not blaming the veterinary surgeon, for I know he is a reputable and reliable man, nor am I blaming the firm that supplied the serum, but it was very unfortunate indeed for the farmers. I have always found the minister fair minded, and I would ask him if he cannot under the act compensate these farmers for the heavy losses they sustained, or at least make them some compassionate allowance.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Hemorrhagic septicaemia is not a contagious disease, nevertheless it is fatal. It can be taken care of by the farmers injecting their cattle with an immunizing vaccine. As my hon. friend indicates, we have on more than one occasion made

compassionate allowances, but I would have considerable hesitation in doing so in connection with losses due to this particular disease, because we would then have to apply the same principle to losses from all diseases, whether contagious or not. This is not a contagious disease, and therefore we are not justified in dealing with it under the act. My hon. friend certainly has my compassion, but I do not know how I am going to exercise it in the way he suggests.

Mr. COTNAM: The circumstances were rather unusual in this case, because the vaccine was administered in good faith, and it is very unfortunate that these farmers in trying to protect their cattle against an outbreak of the disease should have incurred very heavy losses. I know some of them will not recover financially for several years. I would urge the minister to make some allowance to these farmers. Otherwise the case will drag on in the courts, and from what I know of the circumstances I am afraid those interested will not recover much, if anything; by way of damages.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Will my hon. friend send me a communication detailing the circumstances so that we may have the matter looked into?

Mr. COTNAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister; I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. FRASER: Last year I put before the minister the case of an official of his department in the city of Kamloops. It was for payment for the inspection of 146 stock cars. Unfortunately I had to leave before he came to a decision. His decision was against me. I want to review the case to-night to a final conclusion.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Go to the mat, as it were.

Mr. FRASER: Yes. Must I take up the time of the house to review this case? I am quite prepared to do it, but I think he is fully advised of all the circumstances. The man earned $146. Your officials are prepared to say that he performed those services and earned the money. Still you refuse to pay him. Am I to understand that you still persist in that attitude?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not reviewed the case for the last few months, but I think the man was paid a full time salary, and when he was doing this car inspection he was just simply putting in part of his day's work. If we recognized the right of any officer to be paid two salaries, one for full time and the other for extra work, we would be running into all sorts of difficulties, because an embarrassing precedent would be set. For instance, our seed branch staff of thirty-six men perform services of five or six different kinds. This man—his name is Smith, is it not?

Mr. FRASER: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Smith was given full salary as a fruit inspector, and in addition he was inspecting stock cars. Well, that was part of his day's work. When he was doing that he was not inspecting apples.

Mr. FRASER: I want to put the minister right on the statement he has made. That man never inspected one stock car during the time he was inspecting fruit cars. He put in from twelve to fourteen hours every day during the whole time he was employed in the fruit branch inspecting fruit cars, and every single stock car was inspected after hours. Does that meet the situation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was he instructed to do so?

Mr. FRASER: He had an official appointment and was discharging the duties of that appointment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The official correspondence does not indicate that the work was done after hours. The question was raised and this is the first time we have been told that it was extra work. I do not doubt my hon. friend's statement. It is generally understood that when an officer on full time pay works out of hours he is not so well qualified for his full time pay. We were under the impression that we were paying two men, both of the name Smith, and there being as a matter of fact only one man in the case this gentleman enjoyed two salaries for a period; and having received that double salary for a while he thought he was entitled to it for good. But after we discovered that the two Mr. Smiths were in reality only one Mr. Smith we reduced the salaries to one.

Mr. FRASER: Let me state the matter further. This full time job lasted only five months, at a salary of $125 a month, making $625. The total the man earned for the two jobs was $825 a year, and out of that $825 you deduct $146. Now he earned that $146. He inspected the cars and earned the money and you have refused to pay him. Is that a fair proposition? He was engaged for five months and that engagement as junior fruit car inspector was entered into with the full con-

currence of his superior officer. In the first instance he was a stock car inspector and nothing else, and when this other position was open he made application to the Civil Service Commission, who appointed him with the full knowledge of his superior officer. His total earnings, as I say, for the whole year amounted to $825 and the department has deducted $146 which it has refused to pay him for work done overtime. He discharged his duties as car inspector to the satisfaction of the department and was paid $125 a month, and after hours he inspected cars, for which work he is entitled to $146. But that is not all. Had you told the man at the end of the first month that you would not pay him, the situation would be different; but you allowed it to drag for five months and at the end of that time refused to pay him. That was the first intimation he had that he would not be paid. Now I am not making this appeal, especially at this late hour of the session, without justification. I submit that the man is entitled to this $146 and unless the minister assures me that he will be paid I will give him all the trouble I can before he gets his estimates through.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is not a Christian spirit.

Mr. McRAE: He hasn't been to church today. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FRASER: Just a moment; I have the floor. I want an answer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have spent more than $146 since you started.

Mr. FRASER: I haven't started yet.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend isn't through yet—

Mr. FRASER: I want your answer.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This matter was brought to my notice on more than one occasion and it is so complicated that I do not know whether my hon. friend's recital of it is correct or not, not having the file before me.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Give him a cheque for it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. The matter was submitted to the Civil Service Commission and they decided that we should not pay it, and we submitted it to the Justice department, whose decision was the same. Am I to override these two decisions? I thought it my duty to be guided by their advice. I asked the deputy to review the whole case and I read the whole file myself; and I asked the deputy to get an opinion from both these bodies. He did so and I have acted on their advice. We do not want to hold back money that belongs to someone; we should be delighted to pay it and be through with this fracas that has occurred every year.

Mr. FRASER: I do not question the minister's statement that the payment has been turned down by the Civil Service Commission, but this is the first time that he has given me that information.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is just this winter that both decisions have been given.

Mr. FRASER: If the minister had information of this nature he should have communicated it to me but he has not done so during this session. I have the file with all the correspondence and there is absolutely nothing on that file to indicate what the minister has just informed me. This is the third session I have been following up this matter. I had it before the minister last year when I followed it through the department from the junior officials right up to the minister. I went into the matter with the greatest care and I now tell the minister that I am convinced that this man is entitled to the money he has earned. He is entitled to the $146. I want a satisfactory assurance from the minister on this occasion.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: A cheque.

Mr. FRASER: Yes, I must have a cheque.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not intentionally hold back the information with the idea of springing it on my hon. friend in the house; not at all. I read the file last winter and asked my deputy to get a decision. But I have had a few other things to do since then and have not inquired what the decision was; I have only just now got it. The hon. member cannot therefore say that I have taken an advantage of him and sprung something to disconcert him when bringing up his case. I did not know until now what the decision was.

Mr. FRASER: If I cannot press the matter without bringing in the political end, I am prepared to bring in the political end now. I have submitted every argument and I have followed the matter with the greatest care. I do not want to make any rash statements and I wish if possible not to touch the political phase of it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What is that political end?

Mr. FRASER: The minister informed me that there was no reason for the dismissal of this man except a political reason.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend must have been dreaming.

Mr. FRASER: I am not dreaming; I came to that conclusion by deducting.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER: As I say, that is what I concluded by deduction; it was not a straight statement by the minister, and I am going to tell the members of the committee exactly why the minister will not pay this man this $146.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Let us have it.

Mr. FRASER: Yes, we will have it. In the first place let me tell the minister how I arrived at that conclusion. I met the minister in his office by appointment to discuss this matter, and when I went into his office I said, "Now we will have a talk about this Smith claim in Kamloops." The minister said, "Smith? Oh, yes, that is the man who was carrying your voters to the poll on election day." Is that not political?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, on his behalf.

Mr. FRASER: On your behalf. You did not get that information from me; I did not have it at the time and I did not know what the minister meant, because this man had never submitted the political part to me. When the minister made that statement I immediately wrote Smith and asked him about it. To give the committee the whole situation, I would like the committee to understand that I met Mr. Smith only once in my life, and I never knew him until he got into this trouble with the department. He is not even an acquaintance of mine. He lives in the city of Kamloops, where he was performing his duties for the department, and I have followed this matter up consistently and persistently only because he has been so unfairly dealt with in a political way.

I wrote Mr. Smith and asked for an explanation of the minister's remark. He said, "Yes, I quite realize what this means. On election day I had a lady friend working in the Kamloops hospital. It was a rainy day, and on my way to vote I called around to take this lady friend to the polling booth in my automobile. I took her there and back to the hospital. When I returned to the hospital I was met at the door by the matron, who asked me to take two patients from the hospital to the polling booth, since it was a wet day and they would not be able to get to the booths unless they were taken there. I consented and took the two ladies down to the polling booth. I did not know either of them; I had never seen them before; I asked no question about their voting or anything else. I took them down to the polling booth and I brought them back to the hospital, and unquestionably some of the zealous friends of the Liberal party observed me, a government official, twice go to the polling booth and deliver voters, and they so reported to the minister."

That is the reason underlying the refusal of the Department of Agriculture to pay this $146. I am sure the minister does not want this kind of thing to go on, after all, but the fact of the matter is this: I am convinced that he has had communications from the Liberal organization of the city of Kamloops; he has been apprised of these facts; he refuses to pay this bill and discharges the man. This man is a returned soldier with a tubercular affection; he was ordered to the hospital and did not put in a proper application for leave of absence. For that reason he was discharged from the employ of the government.

I submit with all the force at my command that it is not fair or right to discharge an official in that way, particularly a returned man who has tubercular trouble and who received only $825 per year. I want to hear what the minister has to say in this regard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend has indicated that this money has been withheld because of the fact that this gentleman took a number of ladies to the polling booth. I do not know that that is such a serious offence, but I can assure my hon. friend that that was not part of the evidence upon which the Department of Justice based its decision. I do not think that information was sent to that department and I am sure the Civil Service Commission had not that information. My remark was only intended to let my hon. friend know that I had some complaints of that nature. At any rate, Mr. Smith was continued in our employ for some time after this dispute about salary.

Mr. FRASER: No, you are wrong.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is what the file indicates, and he was let out finally for an entirely different reason. I have not the file here, but my recollection is that he was signing blank certificates indicating that these cars were inspected, and farming them out to a substitute, and we never knew whether or not the cars were really inspected. That was the difficulty.

Mr. FRASER: When this man was ordered to the hospital by the doctor he did ask a man to carry on his work and he did sign these blank certificates. There is no question about that; I am not disputing it, but what could the man do? Kamloops is a long way from Ottawa. If a man is ordered to the hospital by his doctor what better can he do than to put in a substitute during his absence? Let me tell the minister that the man who did the inspection while he was in the hospital had helped him in the stock car inspection previously and was acquainted with the work, so the inspection was carried on just as efficiently during his absence. I submit that this is only a paltry excuse.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Then will it suit my hon. friend if I submit this question a second time to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice? We will submit all the evidence on the files and all the additional evidence my hon. friend has in his possession, and if they say I should pay this account it will be paid. Is that fair?

Mr. FRASER: This man inspected 146 cars for you, to the satisfaction of your officials. Why should that question be referred to any other body? Your own officials will certify that the work was done efficiently and this man is entitled to that $146. If it were only for one month I would not have persisted in the matter, but when you drag a man along for five months and allow him to fill a dual position I think in all fairness you should pay him without referring his account to any commission. You could put a special vote in your estimates to-night if you wanted to, and it is only fair that you should do so.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think I could do that.

Mr. FRASER: You can do anything you like in matters of this kind.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, we cannot raise the amount, although I think it could be reduced. I could not override the decisions given by the commission and the Justice department. They will have to rescind their decision after hearing new evidence, before any different action can be taken.

Mr. FRASER: I quite understand the limitations imposed on the minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have spent over half an hour on this item of $146. I have no doubt as to the sincerity of my hon. friend and of the minister, but if we passed to another item and allowed these two hon. gentlemen to have further conversation with respect to the particular matter under discussion, they could possibly come to some agreement.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I would like to ask—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Allow this item to stand in the meantime.

Item stands.

Pensions—To hereby provide, notwithstanding anything in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act or any other act or law, for payment out of the consolidated revenue fund to Mrs. Beatrice Bell, widow of the late Graham A. Bell, of an annuity at the rate of $1,750 per annum, to commence from April 1, 1929, and continue thereafter until the remarriage or death of the annuitant, $1,750.

Mr. KENNEDY: Will someone explain just why this item appears in the estimates? I would like to know what principle governs these cases.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Allow the item to stand and it can be taken up when the minister gets the information.

Pensions—to hereby provide, nothwithstanding anything contained in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act or any other act or law, for payment out of the consolidated revenue fund to Rebecca J. Farrow, widow of the late Robinson Russell Farrow, of an annuity at the rate of $1,411.60, to commence from October 3, 1928, and to continue thereafter until the remarriage or death of the annuitant, $2,109.79.

Mr. SPENCER: Could we have some information on this item?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think we had better pass to the next item and allow that one to stand.

Pensions—To hereby provide, notwithstanding anything in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act or any other act or law, for payment out of the consolidated revenue fund to the widow of the late Chief Justice Taschereau, of an annuity at the rate of $1,200, to commence from April 1, 1929, and to continue thereafter until the remarriage or death of the annuitant, $1,200.

Mr. HEAPS: I should like to know why it is necessary to provide for pension in a case of this kind.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is a vote to cover a pension to the widow of the late Chief Justice of Canada, who had been the Deputy Governor General and a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This case was called to my attention by various members of the house and especially by the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail). This lady was in difficult financial circumstances, and in consideration of the fact that her husband had served this country for so many years, parliament considered the pay-

ment of an annuity. I hesitated in recommending this because I thought it might create a precedent, but upon investigation I found that a precedent had been already created. I found that Lady Lafontaine, whose husband had been Chief Justice of the Appeal Court of Quebec, had been granted a pension. I found also that Lady Cartier had been granted a pension and so I recommended to the Minister of Finance that this item be included in the estimates.

Mr. HEAPS: What was the income of the late Chief Justice? I believe he died before the salaries were increased, and was receiving $7,000 per annum.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): When did the Chief Justice die?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think it was in 1905 or 1906.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Has this pension been paid since that time?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): When did it commence?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is the first year.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Why should it commence now?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is there some special need at the present time?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That has been represented to me, and I must say that the most insistent representations were made by the hon. member for Southeast Grey.

Mr. HEAPS: Will the Minister of Justice always acquiesce in representations made by the hon. member for Southeast Grey?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Apparently she was mistaken, for she told me that her friends would support it.

Mr. HEAPS: If any other representations are made to the hon. minister by the hon. member for Southeast Grey will he acquiesce in them?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not necessarily.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is very difficult to object to a particular item of this character, and it is next to impossible to decide wisely when we do not know the circumstances connected with the particular case. Perhaps it is not desirable that all the conditions should be revealed to the general public, but I think we are creating a very dangerous precedent when we begin to pick out certain individuals and take the public money to pay pensions to them. I do not see why one particular class of people should be considered in a different light from those in another class, or one individual be given assistance denied to another. As my hon. friend behind me suggests, if you select the widows of judges, why not the widows of former members? Why not people outside of politics altogether? In connection with the old age pensions we were very particular to insist that the beneficiaries should have their private affairs examined very carefully, and if they have any other income, that is deducted from the amount they would otherwise receive from the public funds. I do not think it is a good principle to begin to pick out this, that or the other individual who happens to have some particular friend in the government and pay them annuities out of the public funds. Probably any one case out of a thousand which might be brought here would arouse our sympathy, but I cannot support this particular case without having all the details placed before the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I desire to support what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said. Anyone drawing the substantial salary of the late Chief Justice Taschereau should have provided for his widow through insurance. Most of us are forced to get along on smaller incomes than that, and we are compelled to take out the necessary insurance to provide for our wives and families. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, this is establishing a very dangerous precedent. I do not know just what representations were made to the hon. minister by the hon. member for Southeast Grey, but I know that this is the first time that he has acted in conformity with her representations.

Mr. LAPOINTE: She is not the only one who made the representations.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If the minister will go through Hansard, he will find many other representations that the hon. lady member has made that are more deserving than this one, but that he and his colleagues have totally ignored, and I certainly cannot subscribe to the principle contained in this item.

Mr. HEAPS: From what the minister has said, it would appear that this lady has been a widow for about twenty-four years. This is an extraordinary procedure, to my way of thinking. After this lady has been a widow for twenty-four years, it is proposed to grant her a pension of so much per annum. If there were any necessity to give her a pension, it should have been granted imme-

diately she became a widow, and not twenty-four years afterwards. I am inclined to think, if this matter were allowed to stand over until to-morrow, we might get a little information. We do not know the position of the lady, whether she has an income from any other source or whether she is really in need of the amount it is proposed to give her each year. I do not think the minister has given that information.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I said that this item was inserted because it was represented to me that she was in need of it.

Mr. HEAPS: I am informed—I do not know whether my information is correct or not—that there are immediate relatives of hers who are well able to take care of the lady in question, and who ought to do so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member's information is wrong.

Mr. McRAE: This is a very bad precedent to establish and I entirely agree with what has been said on this subject by other hon. members. I will move that this item of $1,200 be reduced to $1.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I desire to say that I withdraw the item.

Mr. McRAE: That is satisfactory.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I inserted it because of representations made to me by members on the other side, of both oppositions.

Mr. MANION: The minister says: "Of both oppositions". He absolutely adheres to the statement that members on our side of the house asked for this pension?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. Last year I had representations that this should be done.

Mr. MANION: From members of the Conservative party?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. However, it is dropped.

Item withdrawn.

Pensions—To hereby provide, notwithstanding anything in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act or any other act or law, for payment out of the consolidated revenue fund to Mrs. Beatrice Bell, widow of the late Graham A. Bell, of an annuity at the rate of $1,750 per annum, to commence from April 1, 1929, and continue thereafter until the remarriage or death of the annuitant, $1,750.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for Peace River inquired about this. Major Bell died on January 13, 1929. Under his will, made some years earlier, his estate was left entirely in trust for his three sons and no provision was made for his widow. The late Major Bell had served the Dominion for over thirty-eight years and was eligible, in respect of length of service, for a pension of $7,000 per annum, which he could claim when he reached the age of sixty; his age at his death was fifty-four years. He had been a contributor for thirty-five years to superannuation fund No. 2, under the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act, and had contributed sums amounting to $3,510.36, which were entirely surrendered to that fund due to Major Bell's oversight to elect to transfer to superannuation fund No. 5. Had Major Bell died prior to January 1, 1925, Mrs. Bell would have been eligible, under the Widows' Annuities Act of 1927, to receive a pension of $1,750 per annum; or had Major Bell elected to transfer to superannuation fund No. 5, Mrs. Bell would also have been eligible, without any cost to Major Bell, for an annuity of $1,750.

Major Bell could, under the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act of 1924, have elected to transfer from superannuation fund No. 2 to superannuation fund No. 5, and by an additional contribution equivalent to the difference between the 3½ per cent rate of contributions to fund No. 2 and the 5 per cent rate of contributions to fund No. 5, plus 4 per cent simple interest, have provided for an annuity for Mrs. Bell of $3,500. It seems reasonable to consider that Major Bell's apparent neglect to provide for Mrs. Bell must have been occasioned through his devotion to his work having kept him from giving sufficient consideration to the situation in which Mrs. Bell might be left in the event of his death. So we are giving the superannuation as if he had transferred to superannuation fund No. 5.

Mr. SPENCER: What was the estate of Major Bell when he died, and is anything being done by the sons for their mother?

Mr. ROBB: I have no information. All I am interested in is the obligation of the state to a public servant who served the public for thirty-eight years and who contributed to that superannuation fund.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Again in this case I think some of us can appreciate the sympathy extended by members of the cabinet to the widow of a colleague, and that is undoubtedly to be commended. On the other hand, it seems to me that we in this house ought to act in such a way that we can justify our action before the public at large, and that the precedent will constitute a general law. We are often accustomed to listen in

this house to cheeseparing policies with regard to amounts that are to be paid to certain of the more poorly paid officials in the employ of the government. Again and again during this session I have called attention to the fact that some people in the employ of the government are receiving only $85 a month and nothing is done in the case of their widows. Nothing whatever is done should the children not be able to provide for their widowed mothers. In regard to old age pensions, if children are in a position to provide for their parents, old age pensions are not paid. I cannot see that we are justified in setting up one law for the well-to-do, the well-placed, the well-paid, and a totally different law for the poorly paid people who have no high official positions.

We are given no information at all with regard to the estate of the late Major Bell. We are told that he had quite a large estate, and that he left that estate entirely to his sons. Major Bell may have been wrapped up in his duties, as has been suggested, but surely he was very much lacking in forethought if he devoted the whole of his estate to his three sons and made no provision whatever for his wife. Further than that, while I do not know any of his three sons, or their circumstances, I cannot understand how sons who have inherited an estate from their father can leave their mother without any support whatever. The fact that they are sons of a highly respected official who served his country well does not change the situation in any degree. I cannot see that we can go on picking out here, there and yonder certain officials whose positions have enabled them to endear themselves to the public or to certain highly placed people in the government, and provide them annuities, and yet make no provision for the thousands of other government employees who, after all, in their own particular station have served the public just as faithfully as those who, throughout their lifetime, served in a high position and at a high salary.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I understand there is fundamental difference between this item and the one we were discussing a few moments ago, and that is, had Major Bell's payments to the superannuation fund been applied differently, this would have given his widow a pension to the extent of $1,750 a year. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL: So far as that is concerned, it puts the matter in a different category from the other; but I want to remind the minister of this: there are many civil servants who have paid large amounts of money into that fund and yet on their dismissal or death there is not a dollar coming to them or their dependents. I discussed a case with the minister last year of a poor man whose wife at that time was sick in hospital, and who was absolutely penniless. He had paid $350 into the superannuation fund, but due to a technical fluke, if I may call it that, he was not able to secure anything. The treasury board did have the power under the act to repay him that money, but they absolutely refused to do so. If they were not prepared to do so in that case, where this man and his family were in a state of absolute penury, I say it is rank injustice to do it in this case. I am not complaining of the case before us so much as I am complaining of discrimination. If the law can be got around in this way or switched around—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Is the hon. gentleman sure of his facts when he states that the treasury board refused to pay that man anything when they had authority to do it in a case such as he mentions? I have been a member of the treasury board ever since coming to Ottawa and I have no recollection of a case of that character ever having been refused by the board. While I am on my feet may I say that if it had not been for an oversight on the part of this official his widow would have been entitled to $1,750 per annum under the law, and I do not believe that there is a man in this House of Commons who is going to deny to any individual what he would have been entitled to receive but for a technicality. I can assure my hon. friend that the treasury board will not turn down a case such as he mentions if the facts are properly brought before it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: They did turn it down.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I should like to be sure of that before taking my hon. friend's word, although, of course, I must accept his word.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I gave the facts to the Minister of Finance last year when his estimates were before the committee.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I have never known the treasury board to turn down a case that could possibly be justified, and I resent accusations of that character.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The same accusations were levelled at the Minister of Finance last year and he accepted them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): All I have to say is that this minister is not accepting them.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Perhaps not, but the Minister of Finance is in a more responsible position than the Minister of the Interior, and he did accept them. The man was dismissed. The act—I am speaking from memory—gives the treasury board power to deal with cases of that kind, but it did not make it compulsory for the board to pay the man, and I say that if you can deal with cases like the one before us by putting an amount in the estimates to correct an injustice—I am not complaining so much of this particular case because I think it is only correcting an injustice—I say that you should do the same in other cases.

Mr. ROBB: I do not recall the case to which my hon. friend refers, but the treasury board have one rule that they follow, and they are compelled to follow it under the act. If the official was dismissed for irregularities, for theft in office or being drunk on duty or anything of that sort, then under the act we cannot pay him, but wherever under the act we can legally pay him, the treasury board is disposed to deal generously with the public servants.

Another hon. gentleman a moment ago referred to those in minor positions. The Civil Service Superannuation Act provides the same privileges for the lower paid servants as for the higher paid, except that the compensation is based upon the salary and the amount that has been paid in. My hon. friend from Mackenzie has very correctly stated the position. I am not going to argue it at any length, but if hon. gentlemen do not wish to pass this item the responsibility will not be upon the government.

I repeat, Major Bell died on January 13, 1929. Had he died on January 1, 1925, under the law Mrs. Bell would have been entitled to exactly the amount that we are asking the committee to vote to-night, so we are only giving her what she is entitled to under the law.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I say that in succeeding parliaments, innumerable cases of this kind will undoubtedly arise. I have no doubt that a great many civil servants have not taken the precaution of protecting themselves by coming under the provisions of the Superannuation Act, and from time to time parliament will have to do something of this nature to look after such cases.

Mr. KENNEDY: Will they all be treated the same way?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Exactly, as provided under the act. I want to put myself on record as saying that I am prepared to vote in parliament the sums necessary to compensate these people if through any lack of attention on their part they have failed to take advantage of the act.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Do I understand that Major Bell has paid in sufficient in the way of premiums to warrant his widow receiving this amount of $1,750 had he not made that slight error?

Mr. ROBB: Exactly.

Mr. QUINN: I have no opposition whatever to offer to this item, but I have a case to submit to the committee. It is that of a man who has served, not for twenty or thirty years, but for fifty-two years. This man entered the service of the imperial government in the year of confederation, in 1867, may I say to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why say it to me?

Mr. QUINN: Because I want the Minister of Justice to pay special attention to this. This man entered the transport service of the imperial army at Halifax and served continuously from that time until the transport service of the imperial government was turned over to the Canadian federal authorities. He continued to serve until 1919. Now here is where I condemn the Tory government, or the Union government, whichever you choose to call it.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): It is all the same.

Mr. QUINN: A rose by any other name would smell as sweet. This man served his government and his country for fifty-two years and nine months as a captain in the transport service at Halifax. He was dismissed with a paltry gratuity of $900, not $900 a year, but a lump sum gratuity of $900. I brought this matter to the attention of the Hon. E. M. Macdonald when he was Minister of National Defence, the very first year I entered this parliament, in 1926. I also brought it to the attention of the present Minister of National Defence, and in all fairness to the minister, I wish to say that he saw no way of providing for this man. He is now eighty-five years of age, and since 1919 he has been living, I do not know how, on this paltry gratuity of $900. If an item is brought down in the supplementaries under any department, I do not care which, I guarantee to the Minister of National Defence that not a member on this side of the house would oppose it, and I appeal to the minister to include such an item this session. I am suggesting it to the Minister of

National Defence, to the Prime Minister, to the Minister of Justice—that they put an item in the supplementary estimates to pay that man an annuity until the day he dies. He is eighty-five years of age.

Mr. CAMPBELL: They will not need to pay him very long.

Mr. QUINN: I submit you are not dealing with all civil servants along the same lines when you deny this man a small annuity for superannuation.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Lest there might be a misunderstanding in the case of the civil servant that I mentioned a moment ago, I may say he was dismissed, not for any of the offences mentioned by the Minister of Finance, but for inefficiency, although, speaking from memory, I think he held the position for over three years, which would seem to negative even that charge. I am not particularly objecting to the estimate; I would be prepared to support any similar vote where money had been paid in and through some technical error it had not been properly applied. But I say if the principle is going to be invoked in one case let it be invoked in another. The principle on which this government acts seems to be: to him that hath shall be given, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. The higher up civil servants and their dependents are well looked after, but the poorer civil servants—this man drew a salary of only $70 a month—could not secure $350.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest against passing this item in favour of Mrs. Beatrice Bell, for the same reasons as those set forth a moment ago when opposition was taken to a vote for a pension to Lady Taschereau. If the act allowed a pension in the present case, the house would not be called upon to approve of this item. No exception should be made. The same rule should apply to everybody. If Lady Taschereau has no right to a pension, in consideration of the services rendered by her husband who, at his death, was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, I deem that the services rendered by Mr. Bell do not warrant any more the granting of a pension to his widow.

I wish to add that I was informed that Mr. Bell left to his children an estate of $75,000, and nothing to his wife. I cannot see why the government should be called upon to support the widow when her husband could have left her a sufficient amount to provide for her needs. I am opposed to this item and I trust that the hon. members of this house will concur in my views.

[Mr. Quinn.]

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am not going to oppose this grant, but how can a member go back to his constituents and say, "I voted for such and such a grant, but I cannot do anything for your case because death took away your husband just two or three months short of the time when he would have qualified for superannuation." This is a letter from the chief accountant of the Finance department in reference to the case of a widow in my constituency:

> Under the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act, to which your husband was a contributor, it states that no allowance may be granted to an employee who has less than ten years' service. At the time of Mr. Hamilton's death his service was only nine years, five months and twenty-five days.

Here is a case where the man lived within four or five months of the time when he would have qualified for superannuation and left a widow and daughter without means of support, yet nothing is granted to them.

Mr. McRAE: I would ask the Prime Minister if the committee in approving this vote may consider that the precedent so established will be the policy of the government with respect to future cases of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Each case, I think, has always to be considered on its merits. If another case presented itself in which the circumstances were as distressing as these are, I have no doubt the house would take the same view.

Mr. McRAE: I do not think that quite answers my question. There is a principle involved here. I quite agree with what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said a few moments ago with respect to this case. Many hardships, many injustices, many unkindnesses are suffered by people under circumstances very similar to those surrounding this case. When considering such a case as this where the husband has left what might be considered a comfortable fortune to his family and has deprived his wife of any participation in it, it is only fair that we should also take into consideration many of the smaller claims as outlined by members on this side of the house. It is only right that an equal measure of justice should be accorded to these minor claims that have even more merit than the one in question.

Mr. BENOIT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to state in this house that the government of Canada must not consider itself in the present circumstances, in the light of a charitable institution. I am told that Mr. Bell earned much more than Sir Elzear Taschereau, I therefore cannot understand

why we should grant a pension of $1,750 per year to the widow of an official who received an annual salary of $12,000. I must further add that if Mr. Bell left his estate to his children, the latter should have sufficient filial affection to look after their mother. I strongly protest against the passing of this item for a pension of $1,750 for the widow of Mr. Bell.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, in view of the attitude of the committee the item is now dropped.

Item withdrawn.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What about the premiums that have been paid in?

Mr. ROBB: The law takes care of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I promised my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre that I would move the adjournment of the house at twelve, but if it is desired to continue—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know whether the house would care to go on a little longer.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not see, Mr. Chairman, that we are making any progress. We cannot possibly finish to-night, and I think we ought to carry out the arrangement as to the hour of adjournment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We are certainly not getting through many items.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at twelve o'clock (midnight).

Friday, June 14, 1929

The house met at eleven o'clock.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. C. E. FERLAND (Joliette) moved the first reading of Bill, No. 398, (from the Senate) to amend the Bankruptcy Act as respects locality of a debtor.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

COMMUNICATION WITH SENATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. B. ADSHEAD (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the government in the Senate apparently has complained that certain news was lost in transit between the House of Commons and the Senate. Can the Prime Minister give us any information as to how it was lost?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am afraid I have no information. My hon. friend will have to judge for himself, as I will have to do.

VISIT TO WASHINGTON OF PRIME MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): We are all very much interested in the persistent reports to the effect that the Prime Minister of Great Britain is likely to visit Washington in the near future, and the suggestion has been made that the Prime Minister of Canada may be asked to be there at the same time. Since this is probably the last opportunity we will have to make such an inquiry, I would like the Prime Minister to say whether he has any information on the subject?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): This is another case in which my hon. friend has just as much information as I have.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Air services—Royal Canadian Air Force—further amount required, $250,000.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): This amount is required to make preparation and do preliminary work in connection with a permanent combined land and seaplane training station. As the committee knows, Camp Borden was used as a concentration camp in 1916; later it was used by the imperial munitions board for a time and then was repurchased by the department and has been in use more or less temporarily as an air force training camp since about 1920. Frome time to time representations have been made that Camp Borden was not satisfactory even for the purpose of land plane training, and it has been found very necessary to increase seaplane training, particularly in view of the very large amount of work we do in this country which requires seaplanes. It is felt that a double overhead should be done away with as soon as possible and that the department should have a combined station. A large number of sites have been examined and, as I said the other day, it would seem as though Trenton is the most desirable site to be found so far. I could go into much greater detail if the committee desired, but

this vote is for the purpose of commencing the construction and development of a combined station.

Mr. TUMMON: The minister made this announcement the other day on another item and I think he intimated that the matter might be discussed when this vote came up. Needless to say, I am very much pleased that the department has decided on the bay of Quinte as the place where this camp will be located. This question of the establishment of a camp for the Royal Canadian Air Force for both land planes and seaplanes, along the bay of Quinte, has been discussed for many years in that district. For some time it was expected that Camp Mohawk, a few miles west of Deseronto, would be selected. This camp was operated quite extensively by the Imperial government during the war and was looked upon as a very excellent camp. The people of that district expected the camp to be established there, particularly in view of the fact that in the report of the Department of National Defence for 1926, under the heading, "No. 1 Flying Station, Camp Borden" the following appeared:

> The air station at Camp Borden, at present in use, is that which was built during the war by the Imperial Munitions Board as a training station for the R.A.F. units recruited in Canada. The station, though admirably suitable for flying operations on a large scale, is too large for the present establishment of the R.C.A.F. Maintenance charges in general are altogether disproportionate to the present strength of the R.C.A.F. The camp is, as well, isolated and difficult of access. For these reasons it is hoped that accommodation, on a more suitable scale, involving smaller maintenance charges, may be made available at an early date for the training of the R.C.A.F.
>
> With this in view, an excellent site has been surveyed at Deseronto for a joint seaplane and aeroplane base, and it is hoped that funds may be made available for the construction of the necessary buildings in the near future.

Naturally there was considerable disappointment at Deseronto when it was learned that another location had been decided upon. I would like to ask the minister if he would make a statement as to the considerations which contributed to the making of this choice.

Mr. RALSTON: If the committee will permit me to say so, I think it would be undesirable at this time to put on record the factors which were considered in respect to something like thirty different places which have been examined. The reports are confidential and perhaps it would not be in the best interests of the service to have these matters spread on the record; the towns themselves might prefer that they should not be. A deputation from Deseronto recently interviewed me and asked that the proposal in regard to Trenton be reconsidered. Deseronto had been under consideration and in 1926 it was thought to be the best site, but after that time Trenton came into the picture and a thorough examination was made of that site. I wanted Deseronto to feel that their claim had been thoroughly considered and I told them that our one object was to obtain a location which was most suitable to the service, having regard to the many factors which had to be considered. I told them that Trenton had been selected after a full investigation by responsible technical officers, and I could not hold out any hope that any change would be made. In order that the citizens of Deseronto might be assured that every angle of the matter had been studied, I offered to have the relative facilities, the advantages and disadvantages of the two localities checked up again in order that no paramount feature in favour of Deseronto might be overlooked.

Mr. THOMPSON: Would the minister advise the committee as to the amount which has been expended upon Camp Borden, and the amount which it is calculated will be necessary to expend upon the new camp at Trenton?

Mr. RALSTON: Camp Borden was a concentration camp in 1916, and 40,000 men were quartered there, while the proposed camp will have a capacity of 500 men. The committee will see that a comparison between costs of a camp for 40,000 and one for 500 would not be a fair one. We have made a careful estimate of the existing facilities at Camp Borden, outside of the land itself, and have arrived at the conclusion that notwithstanding the cost the buildings and plant would represent only a valuation of $234,000 for the purpose of being usefully utilized in connection with the development of a permanent station at that camp. Outside of that, the total expenditure at Camp Borden could be regarded as an expenditure for a military concentration camp for war purposes, and not for aviation in time of peace. The amount which was paid for Camp Borden in connection with aviation was $375,000, which was paid to the imperial munitions board at the time the buildings were taken over on a 25 per cent basis.

Mr. THOMPSON: What has been the total cost of the camp to date?

Mr. RALSTON: I will give my hon. friend the construction items. Since that $375,000 was spent, the air board has spent $37,000 on construction—I will give my hon.

friend the round figures—then the air force spent $60,000 and the Canadian corps of signallers spent $14,000. The air board has spent on maintenance $110,000, the air force $175,000 and the corps of signallers, $20,000. The actual capital expenditure since that time has therefore been $111,000, because my hon. friend will understand that the items for maintenance do not enter into the calculation because they are annual expenditures which would be required in any event.

Mr. THOMPSON: What did it cost the government before that?

Mr. RALSTON: The whole 17,000 acres composing the camp were not of course used for the air force by any means. The total amount expended on the whole camp up to the time the imperial munitions board took it over would be about $1,584,000 for construction, and about $21,000 for maintenance.

Mr. THOMPSON: What will the new camp cost?

Mr. RALSTON: The buildings at either camp would cost about the same. It is estimated that necessary buildings and improvements at Camp Borden would cost about $1,400,000, while the estimated cost for buildings at some other point, without married quarters would be $1,100,000 and with married quarters about $1,500,000. In addition to the $1,400,000 which would be necessary to be expended at Camp Borden, the committee will understand that we would have to spend probably $500,000 to provide a seaplane base at another point.

Mr. ROWE: This camp being situated in the riding which I have the honour to represent, it seems to me that at this time, when we are talking so much about economy, this would be a very extravagant move for the government to make. Anyone familiar with Camp Borden will readily appreciate that the camp should be sufficient to maintain the nucleus of an air force, and especially in view of the efficiency of that camp in times of war. I quite appreciate that the vast acreage would not be needed to maintain a training camp, but it is situated inland and this factor was considered as being of great importance by the Imperial government and by the royal air force. The Imperial government and the Department of Militia and Defence recommended this site very highly. Criticism has been made as to lack of transportation to the camp, but it is situated on a switch only four miles long on the Canadian Pacific railway and five miles long on the Canadian National railway. It is only about half a mile from a good highway, and it seems to me that with the conveniences which are at the camp at present it would be sufficient to maintain a training camp for the purposes for which the minister proposes to vote this money. The camp has been equipped with seventeen hangars, one hundred and twenty by sixty feet each; each hangar capable of housing six aeroplanes, or a total of about one hundred. There is an engine shop, sixty by forty; a carpenter shop, sixty by forty; two large barracks eighty by eighty, two storeys high, each capable of housing comfortably seventy-five men, all steam heated, electric lighted, with other quarters for married men; twenty cottages for married officers and their families; school for forty pupils; hospital capable of looking after thirty-five or forty patients. It has in fact, everything necessary for the comfort of the soldiers, and the only feature that could be improved is the location for a hydroplane base. Further, it is within fifteen miles of Kempenfeldt bay, which would be a most appropriate place for a base for hydroplanes. Surely it is a consideration if a camp is situated where there is a denser population and where there is heavy traffic on the highway similar to that at Trenton. Hon. members who are familiar with the Toronto district know the trouble they have had at Leaside in keeping the traffic back and avoiding accidents. There is a large patrol force there in order to keep the traffic back when flights are being made.

I wish also to impress upon the committee the fact that a camp situated on the boundary line between this country and a foreign country is not as appropriate for a military camp as a camp situated some fifty miles away, as the present Camp Borden is. That was a feature which was strongly impressed by the British government on the royal air force when it was established at Camp Borden. The United States has fifty-three aeroplane bases and only three of them have accommodation for hydroplanes and aeroplanes as combination bases, and surely if such a large country as the United States consider it sufficient to have, out of fifty-three, only three with hydroplane facilities, we should take this increased expenditure into consideration. Moreover, I think only one of those fifty-three, the one at Mount Clemens, is anywhere near the boundary line. It is for the committee to consider whether it is wise to spend millions of the public money to establish a military camp close to the international boundary to replace a camp that has cost between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000.

The sum of $375,000 that was paid by this government was only about twenty-five cents on the dollar of what the camp cost the British government. While there are 16,000 or 20,000 acres of camp ground it is not all used for aviation. There is an aerodrome a mile square. It has been recognized by most eminent authorities on aviation that Camp Borden is one of the best camps in the British Empire for such a purpose. At Leaside and other camps, after heavy rains, they cannot take off with their planes, but at Camp Borden, owing to the sandy loam, they can take off in safety fifteen minutes after the heaviest rain. It is an absolute extravagance to waste Camp Borden which has cost the country so much money, and a camp which was sufficient in time of war should be sufficient to maintain the nucleus of an aviation force in time of peace.

Mr. THOMPSON: I feel that I must join with my colleague from Dufferin-Simcoe in protest against this expenditure. Undoubtedly the amount already expended on the site has been upwards of $2,000,000 and it will take a like amount to establish a camp at Trenton. I venture to assert that when the Trenton camp is finished it will not be equal to what we are going to scrap at Camp Borden. During the present session the government have retained, to a certain extent, the sales tax which falls so heavily upon the poor people and they have done so on the ground that they need the money. The government have also refused to contribute toward highway construction and technical education on the ground that they have no money to spend on such objects. Now we are asked to scrap a camp, costing upwards of $2,000,000 and to establish a camp on a new site.

If the minister is sincere in his statement that he wants to make a combination camp, why does he not utilize some of those magnificent stretches of water that are almost in the immediate vicinity of Camp Borden? He could establish at several points an auxiliary camp to be under the jurisdiction of the main camp, which would serve the dual purpose equally well and at a very small cost to the people. The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe has mentioned Kempenfeldt bay within fifteen miles and an auxiliary camp could be established there. He could even go to lake Couchiching with the town of Orillia near by and a camp could be established there. If he wants to go on the southern shore of Georgian bay, all in the county of Simcoe nearby, there are such places as Collingwood, Penetanguishene, Midland, Coldwater or Victoria Harbour, Waubaushene or Fesserton, all on land-locked harbours, and they are admirably situated for this purpose. Now we are asked to give up all that we have spent there and duplicate the expenditure in a new place. Has the minister considered what a serious thing it is for that community to lift out bodily a population of 700 souls and transport it to a new location altogether? This camp has been in existence for fifteen years; social and business relations have been established, and all this is going to be disrupted by the action of the minister. I think he would be well advised if he would let the matter stand in abeyance and look more closely into the question of Camp Borden. Camp Borden was not chosen hurriedly in time of war. If the minister will study the records of his department, he will find that the military authorities had for years previously thought of establishing a camp there. It seems to me that this proposition is a useless expenditure of money, and the matter could be handled much better than by scrapping the valuable camp we have at Camp Borden.

Mr. TUMMON: I am not at all surprised at my good friends from the district where Camp Borden is situated being anxious to retain that camp there. As to the suitability of a location for a camp, I do not feel that I am in a position to speak as an expert. I must put myself largely in the judgment of those who are capable of selecting a site for such a camp. The location at Trenton has been mentioned by my hon. friends in comparison with Camp Borden. While I cannot take the position that I am capable of judging, yet there are advantages there that in my opinion should be looked upon as of special importance as regards the location for such a plant. It is on the bay of Quinte, a landlocked body of water. It is protected on the north by the mainland, on the south by the county of Prince Edward, and on the west by that strip of land which connects Prince Edward county with the mainland. It is close to a prosperous and growing town, with a city on the other side to the east. There is a paved highway running between Toronto and Montreal, and both the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National railways, thus affording not only rail and highway transportation but water transportation as well. If a larger body of water is needed, lake Ontario is only a few miles away What I have said in regard to Trenton can I think be said with equal force of Camp Mohawk. The minister has said that he proposes to

investigate further the camp at Mohawk, and I think that will meet the approval of those most interested.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am not going to discuss whether Camp Borden is suitable or not. I wish to consider this question from the point of view of economy. I think the minister, before the item goes through, should and must make a further statement in regard to this selection. It has always been considered that the camp near Deseronto was an ideal air force camp. Until within a few short weeks it was practically accepted as the site for the new camp. Here is a camp that has been tried, where there has been service and training, and it has proved absolutely satisfactory to everybody, and to my knowledge satisfactory to the whole area. But now within the last few weeks a new site has been selected. I think the house should know the reason why such a change has been made.

It must be accepted that Mohawk camp is absolutely acceptable both from past experience, and according to the advice of the technical officials in the department. I have spoken with them and I know that it is absolutely acceptable to them. I have no interest in the removal of the camp from Camp Borden to any other place, except from the point of view of economy, but I have felt that if any change was to be made, no better place could be selected than Camp Mohawk.

I want the house and the committee to realize that we have at Camp Mohawk today all the water supply ready for use. That means a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Are you going to scrap Camp Borden with all the expenditure that you have made there, and are you going to scrap Camp Mohawk with all the expenditure that has been made at that place? I have seen a letter to the effect that it had been practically decided to make Camp Borden the permanent camp. Neither of these two sites, Camp Mohawk and Camp Trenton, is in my constituency, but both are a short distance away, and I do say that when several hundred dollars can be saved in the selection of a site, we should insist upon saving that money. I think it is up to the minister to explain this sudden change of location. Not only that, but there are numerous cement bases at Camp Mohawk all ready, which with a very little expenditure could be enlarged and made suitable as buildings. The camp was actually used during the war and has been used ever since, and it has proved acceptable to all parties. I will guarantee that it is acceptable to the technical officers of the department, and that they consider it preferable to moving to a site that was never formerly considered by anybody. You have these two sites on the same body of water. Training, I believe, can be done under more favourable conditions at Camp Mohawk, where you have a well protected site. It has always been a training ground. Before the selection of Petawawa camp, Deseronto artillery camp was the only training camp in Canada. Here is a camp fixed up with a water supply ready for use, with concrete bases that can be made use of. I have no doubt that the technical men might say that these concrete bases would not be acceptable. I know both grounds and I want to know what are the advantages of this new camp pointed out by the technical men. Never mind the feeling of the people of these two towns; it is the country and economy that we are interested in. Surely there cannot be so much difference between two places only fifty or sixty miles apart that we must suddenly scrap hundreds of thousands of dollars and start a new camp. I want to know what are the advantages of this training camp before I will vote for it.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend might be satisfied with what I suggested, that I am perfectly willing, and have so told the deputation from Deseronto, to go into the matter further with the object of making absolutely sure as to the relative advantages of these two places. I can give my hon. friend in detail what the technical officers represent as the advantages, but after all it seems to me, having given my hon. friend that assurance, he might be reasonably satisfied. I can assure him that there has been no change in the last few weeks. Trenton was first discussed by the officers in July, 1928, and I have here a list of no less than a dozen technical officers of the department, including the engineers, all of whom favour Trenton, but at the same time in view of the fact that the deputation came to me with such strong representations, I undertook to make further investigation to see if any of the paramount features, which Deseronto alleged, had been overlooked. I hope my hon. friend will accept that. Our only idea is to find the very best site, having in view the interests of the service and nothing else.

Mr. MANION: What would be the objection to leaving Camp Borden where it is to be used by the land air forces, and establishing at Trenton a camp for the water air forces? I understand that in the United

States except in very rare cases they do not have the land forces and the water forces in the same station. In the interests of economy, I would ask the minister if it would not be advisable to leave the land forces where they are, and to establish the water forces at Trenton.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think my hon. friend got the figures that I gave. I pointed out that if we stay at Borden we will still have to make a very substantial permanent expenditure of something over one million dollars; the buildings there are not fireproof and we have had over half a million dollars fire losses; that we have $1,700,000 worth of technical equipment and stores there and therefore Borden would have to have permanent structures if we were to stay there. In addition to that, if my hon. friend's suggestion were accepted we would have to have another base for seaplane training at Trenton or some other suitable place.

Mr. MANION: I did not mention Trenton particularly. I meant the point decided on.

Mr. RALSTON: It would mean not only double expenditure in connection with plant, but also double overhead. Dealing with what my hon. friend from Kingston—

Mr. TUMMON: Might I just say a word before the minister proceeds? Reference was made to the air organization in the United States. Is it not a fact that there they have two different services while in Canada we have only one?

Mr. RALSTON: That is the answer. In the United States there are three air services as a matter of fact, the navy, the military and the Department of Commerce. Here all the air services are combined under one department. One hon. member said that the United States have 53 training stations while we have one central station. I think our form of combined organization will lead the committee to the conclusion that it is in the interests of economy that we combine our seaplane and land plane training if we possibly can. That is what we are endeavouring to do. We are not scrapping Camp Borden as a permanent aviation plant; it never was such. There is, as I have said, plant at Borden to the value of $234,000 which might be utilized in connection with a combined station; but when you got through with spending over a million dollars you would have only a land plane base, with disadvantages which I need not take the time of the committee to enumerate. I can assure hon. members that the matter has been carefully looked into by the officers of the department, and they say that Borden cannot be made a suitable place for an aviation training station. My hon. friend said that the British authorities reported something to the contrary. I think he will find that that is not so. They simply took an army concentration camp such as we had and adapted it as an aviation camp; but it was not primarily an aviation camp and was not so constructed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I mention that it takes a little time to arrange for the proceedings of prorogation, a number of matters having to be considered in connection therewith. I would suggest, therefore, to the committee that we leave over for the time being items that are likely to be discussed at some length and dispose of what might be termed non-contentious items, in order that the government may be able to form some idea as to the hour at which prorogation can be arranged. We have taken nearly one hour on this single item. I think we might well proceed with other items and take up this particular item again if it is going to involve much more in the way of discussion.

Item stands.

INDIANS

Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories—

Hospitals, medical attendance, etc.—further amount required, $25,000.

Supplies for destitute Indians—further amount required, $30,000.

To provide farm working outfits for graduates of Indian schools, $15,000.

Surveys—further amount required, $5,000.

Sioux—further amount required, $8,000.—Total, $83,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Under this item I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the sale of section 26, township 32, range 32, west of the first meridian. This land was formerly used as pasturage by the Keeseekoose Indian reserve. At different times there was talk of its being thrown open for sale. A number of people wrote to the department asking to be given an opportunity to bid. There are letters on the file showing that departmental officials promised to notify some of these people when the land would be offered for sale. However, it was finally withdrawn in 1926 and remained as pasture. Later on apparently a certain party got after this land and it was sold to him privately at a good deal less than its actual value. One of the gentlemen who had correspondence with the department, a barrister and real estate agent, tells me that he had offers

from bona fide farmers in the district as high as $20 an acre; but the land was sold privately for $10 an acre.

The council of the village of Pelly asked for a right of way through this land to a quarter section on the beach of Racing lake, where they have a recreation ground. After considerable correspondence the department agreed to grant them a road allowance, the papers so far as I know were all completed, and all that was necessary was to have a survey of the road. There was some detailed work done in that connection and finally the village authorities did have a surveyor on the ground. The road was laid out, there being no doubt whatever about accepting the word of the departmental officials, because the matter was settled so far as they were concerned. However, after the survey was made and after they had done some work on the road they suddenly found that the land had been sold, and the party who had purchased it then stepped into the picture. On appealing to the departmental officials we found, as they had to admit, that consideration had to be given to the purchaser; and a good deal of correspondence is still going on. But the village even at best must now pay the other party a considerable amount for the land. They have been kept out of it for a long time and at the moment they are not absolutely sure that arrangements can be made.

I protest, first, against the failure of the department to carry out the promise they made, that they would notify the people in the district when the land was sold—and it was apparently sold to a man whom we suspect of being a political favourite, for very much less than its intrinsic value. That is the first complaint; and the second is that a direct obligation was undertaken by the department to provide the village of Pelly with that road. On the strength of the assurances given by the officials this survey was made, and later on the department's promise was deliberately disregarded and the land sold to private parties.

I wish to quote from sessional paper 169 a letter dated August 27, 1926, to the secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs, and signed by W. M. Graham, Indian commissioner. The letter reads:

> On the 12th instant I wrote, recommending withdrawal from sale of section 26-32-32, W1st in the Keeseekoose reserve, as the area can be profitably used by the Indians as a pasture and I shall be glad if you will inform me whether the action recommended has been taken.

A further letter, No. 7 on the file, dated September 3, is addressed to Mr. Graham, the Indian commissioner:

> Replying to your letter of the 27th ultimo, under your file No. 310-6, I may say that the sale covering section 26-32-32, W1, Keeseekoose reserve, will be withdrawn from our sale list and reserved for the Indians in the reserve, as requested.

Apparently up to that time the matter was closed, and then appears a letter from George W. McPhee, the honourable member for Yorkton, dated December 15, 1926. It is addressed to the Hon. Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, and is marked personal. Before I read that letter I wish to commend the minister for his decision to leave personal letters in the file and to bring them down in sessional papers. On a previous occasion I had a good deal of argument with the Postmaster General (Mr. Veniot) over this question of including in the file personal letters of a really public nature and bringing them down. I consider it an infringement of the rights of parliament to withhold such letters, and in this case, whatever blame I attach to the Minister of the Interior in other respects, I commend his fairness in putting these letters on the file. This particular letter reads:

> Mr. McKay wrote last summer to Mr. Graham, Indian commissioner, asking with respect to section 26, township 32, range 32, west 1st, and he received a letter dated June 18, giving the acreage of this section. Mr. McKay wanted to buy the west half and forwarded a certified cheque for $200 deposit. This was returned to him on the 30th of August, stating that the land had been withdrawn from sale. I know this land and I feel satisfied that it is not required by the Indians and should be in the hands of someone who will make it productive. Mr. McKay has offered $7 an acre for the west half and $2 an acre for the east quarter of this section.

The letter is signed George W. McPhee.

First I want to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Yorkton takes upon himself to say that the land is not required by the Indians, whereas in fact there is a letter on the file from the Indian commissioner who states that the land is required for pasturage; moreover, there is a further letter which I shall read, written by the Indian agent, saying that the land is required for pasturage. As a matter of fact, I know that up to that time the Indians of Keeseekoose had no other pasture land. There is a letter from the minister to Mr. McPhee dated December 20, 1926. It reads:

> I have received your letter of the 15th instant, with reference to the desire of Mr. Norman McKay, of Verigin, Saskatchewan, to purchase a portion of section 26-32-32, W. 1 M.
>
> The department, I may say, was not aware that Mr. McKay had made application to purchase these three quarters, as Commissioner Graham some time ago recommended the with-

drawal of this section from sale on the ground that the Indians required the land for pasturage purposes. Mr. McKay's application therefore did not reach the department. For the reason stated, this section is, of course, not at present listed for sale, but I have instructed the officials to request Commissioner Graham to report in the matter, and to state whether in his opinion the land is still required for Indian use. I shall be very glad to write you further in the matter in due course.

Then there is a letter, which I will not delay the house reading, from the assistant deputy and secretary to Mr. Graham at Regina, asking for a further report. Next is a letter dated January 7, 1927, addressed to George W. McPhee, Esq., M.P., Yorkton, Saskatchewan. This reads:

With reference to my letter to you of the 20th ultimo, relative to the desire of Mr. Norman McKay, of Verigin, Saskatchewan, to purchase a portion of section 26-32-32, W. 1 M., I enclose copy of a report submitted by Commissioner Graham, of Regina.

You will observe that in the opinion of the Commissioner, this particular parcel of land is required by the Indians for pasturage and hay purposes.

Then there is a letter addressed to the Department of Dominion Lands from Pelly, Saskatchewan, dated May 14, 1927:

I understand that the above section of land has been held by the Indian department and used by the Indians south of Pelly for pasture land; and that recently this section has been turned back to the department and is to be sold.

If this is correct when and how is it to be sold? Will it be by public auction or private sale? A party spoke to me to-day who wishes to bid on this land and I will be glad to hear from you as to how and when it is to be disposed of.

This letter is signed J. M. Telford, who is a barrister dealing in real estate in Pelly.

Next is a letter dated June 8, 1927, to J. M. Telford of Pelly, Saskatchewan:

Replying to your letter of the 14th ultimo, in connection with the above land, I may say this section is still being reserved for the use of the Indians for pasturage and hay purposes. In the event of the land being thrown open for sale, you will be advised.

This is signed J. C. Caldwell, in charge of the lands and timber branch. I direct particular attention to the last sentence. I submit that when a responsible officer of the department writes a letter of that kind to someone in the country it should be taken seriously and there should be someone in the department who feels in honour bound to carry out the obligation undertaken. Yet this promise was deliberately disregarded. The land was sold at private sale for at least not more than half of what some of the farmers, with whom Mr. Telford was in communication, had offered to pay.

[Mr. Campbell.]

There are many other letters dealing with the same matter, but I do not wish to delay the house reading them. There is in the file a letter dated August 19, 1927, to Mr. Fred J. Malakoff, signed J. C. Caldwell, informing him that the land at that time was not available for sale. On November 3, 1927, a letter was written to E. A. W. R. McKenzie, Jr. Indian agent, by J. C. Caldwell, as follows:

Will you kindly advise the department, at your earliest convenience, if section 26, township 32, range 32, W1-M, is still required for the use of the Indians for pasturage and hay purposes.

Here I want to draw the attention of the minister to this fact: On November 23 there was a letter from Kamsack, Saskatchewan, to the secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs, Ottawa, as follows:

Replying to your letter No. 68970-4 of the 3rd inst, regarding section 26, township 32, Range 32, W.P.M. I beg to advise that this is the only pasture that the Keeseekoose band have for their cattle and is still required for pasturage and hay purposes.

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) E. W. R. McKenzie,
Indian Agent.

To my mind this is the worst offence of which the department is guilty. Here you find the Indian agent, a man on whose recommendations they must depend, informing the department that this was the only pasturage land available for this Indian band, yet in spite of this the department deliberately disregarded the obligation entered into with Mr. Telford and disregarded as well representations of the Indian agent, all in the interests of one man who desired to secure this land for much less than its actual worth.

Then there is a letter under date of November 30, 1927, addressed to the hon. member for Yorkton, in which the official takes the stand that the land is not for sale. Some other correspondence follows, with which I need not weary the committee, but in this correspondence it is suggested to Mr. McPhee by the departmental officials that he might discuss this matter with Mr. Graham. The letters which passed between Mr. McPhee and Mr. Graham are not in the file, and one can only surmise what actually happened, but I find a letter from Regina under date of April 23, 1928, addressed to the secretary of the Department of Indian Affairs, as follows:

In reply to departmental letter No. 68,970-4, of the 11th instant, I have to say that I am of the opinion that section 26, T. 32, R. 32 west of the first meridian could now be disposed of without adversely effecting the interests of the Keeseekoose band.

Your obediant servant,
(Sgd.) W. M. Graham,
Indian Commissioner.

What caused Mr. Graham to change his mind between the time he wrote the original letter and this later date is hard for one to understand. The other letters are not material to the point I wish to discuss; there was considerable correspondence between the village of Pelly and the department with regard to this roadway through the land to their recreation grounds on the shore of the lake.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Will it shorten the discussion if I say to my hon. friend now that any promise which has been made by the department with respect to that road will be carried out? I judge from my hon. friend's statement that the department committed itself to a road; the road was surveyed and in the meantime the sale took place, and now the village is being asked to pay for that road. On behalf of the department I will say to my hon. friend that I will see to it that the promises contained in the correspondence are carried out by the department.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am glad to have that statement from the minister; it will shorten the discussion very considerably. In the meantime, however, there has been a long delay and the village not only had to settle with the department according to the original agreement but now they are obliged to settle with the new purchaser, and it has cost them considerably more than it should.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The correspondence must indicate that the road was to be granted before the survey took place; I suppose that is the fact. I want to make it quite clear that however the department obligated itself with regard to that road, that obligation will be carried out.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I appreciate that, and I am only sorry the minister could not carry out the other promises of his department.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not dealing with that at the moment; I thought I could shorten the discussion in this way.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It will shorten the discussion very materially, because there are about a dozen letters it will not be necessary to read. However, there is one letter I should like to read, written from the village of Pelly to the Department of Indian Affairs, Ottawa, under date of May 9, 1929:

It seems that we are never going to get cleared up in this matter, and I feel that most of the difficulty is due to the action of your department. You instructed us to go ahead and have the survey made for the road across section 26, then you disposed of the land without reservation of this road and consequently threw us in considerable trouble and expense. When a committee of people are endeavouring to act in the public interest in obtaining facilities for a summer resort, and doing the work entirely gratis, at considerable trouble to themselves and also some expense, we feel that we should be assisted instead of hindered by a department of the Dominion government. If you will look up your file in connection with the sale of section 26-32-32-W1st. you will see that I made enquiry about it and you informed me that it was being used by the Indian people for pasture and it was not for sale, but when it was to be offered for sale I would receive notification about it. The next thing I heard it was sold to MacKay of Verigin. This does not seem a very fair deal either.

We were proceeding to take expropriation steps in the matter of this road, then came a letter from the Department of Highways informing us that your department had written asking for the ten dollars per acre and that you would issue the transfer for this road. We stopped the expropriation proceedings and sent in the $10 per acre. Now after three or four months we get word from the Department of Highways that you have the money and that we are still to reckon with MacKay for his equity. I think a situation like this absurd and that your department has certainly been very unfair. Here it is spring again and we are still held up in the use of this road. It is very discouraging and I certainly think your department should take some steps to assist us out of the difficulty that you have got us into. Kindly let us know the price paid for this property by MacKay, so that we may have some idea of what he may be entitled to over and above the $10 per acre. Trusting you may be able to get this matter straightened out.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) J. M. Telford.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I shall make my answer as brief as possible; I will not need to deal with the question of the road, since I have already answered my hon. friend on that point. First let me say that this dispute with regard to the road was first brought to my attention by my hon. friend; evidently the negotiations have been carried on in the department. I just want to reassure him that whatever the department agreed with the village of Pelly to do will be carried out, regardless of the fact that the sale has taken place.

With regard to the sale itself, there have been one or two instances of this kind recently; there is one pending now, and I have decided that for the future the same system which prevails in the sale of Dominion lands will prevail in these cases, that is, by public auction after being advertised for a considerable period. I am bound to say that the statements made by my hon. friend and the letters he has read with regard to the situation up to 1926 are correct. I remember the circumstances very well, but from 1926 on I had not heard of the matter until my hon.

friend raised the question the other day. I look upon Mr. Caldwell as being one of our most efficient officers, and I look upon Mr. Graham as a man who has always tried to protect the interests of the Indians. These two gentlemen are the ones who handled this sale, and I am not seeking to escape any responsibility when I say that the sale had taken place without my knowledge; I did not know that a sale had been consummated until the other day. They had full authority to conduct that sale, but I am putting into effect a regulation that no sale of land shall take place hereafter until it has been publicly advertised and that it shall be sold at public auction. That will avoid these little charges being brought that more could have been obtained for the land. Upon looking into the file, I found that Mr. Graham decided, as he is in a position to decide, being the Indian commissioner for the three prairie provinces, that this land was not required and could be offered for sale. He put an upset price upon it and the land was sold at that price. If I talked all day I could not say any more than that, but I want my hon. friend to understand that in the future there will be no Indian lands sold unless they are publicly advertised. If my hon. friend has any suspicion as to political interference by these officers, I would say that Mr. Caldwell was secretary to the Hon. Arthur Meighen, and I think Mr. Graham's politics are well known. I have not inquired of either one of them as to their politics, and I am satisfied that these men used their best judgment. If they went wrong in this particular case, then they erred in their judgment, but I am inclined to think that when my hon. friend looks into the matter very carefully he will find that this was consummated in the interests of the Indian department. The fact that others were not notified—I am not offering any excuse because I did not know that that occurred and I cannot discover from the file that a promise was made to the individual mentioned by my hon. friend—is regrettable, but in the future the land will be advertised in the locality in which it is to be sold and the sale will be carried on by an auctioneer.

Mr. CAMPBELL: There is on my part more than a suspicion of political interference; I think it amounts almost to a certainty. The activities of the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. McPhee) are so obvious that one can draw no other conclusion. I am not attaching any particular blame to these officials, and I do not think that Mr. Caldwell's politics enters into the matter at all.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

These men are civil servants and have no particular politics, but I do think that political pressure was brought to bear upon them. I had a great deal of business to do with Mr. Caldwell and I have always found him ready to carry out his word, but in this case the fact that he did fail to carry out an obligation which he entered into with these settlers in the Pelly district seems to me to be evidence of political interference. I am very glad indeed to have the assurance of the minister as to the public advertising of these lands, and I am sorry that he had not put this policy into effect a year or two ago, because in that case it would not have been necessary for me to take up so much time of the committee during the dying hours of the session in debating this matter. It would not have caused the trouble and inconvenience to the settlers in the Pelly district, as well as arousing their suspicion of political interference.

Mr. McPHEE: I want to satisfy the mind of my hon. friend that there was no political interference in this case at all. The negotiations for the purchase of this land were carried on in a fair, square and aboveboard manner, and there was no personal intervention except by correspondence. I think the following quotation from Pope's Essay on Man expresses pretty well the attitude of mind of the hon. gentleman:

> All seems infected that the infected spy,
> As all looks yellow to the jaundiced eye.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have no desire to keep this argument going, but I would like to point out that the very fact that the hon. member for Yorkton was so anxious is evidence of political interference. There was nothing to prevent these other gentlemen from corresponding direct with the department. Mr. Telford is a lawyer and real estate man in the village of Pelly, and he carried on his correspondence direct with the department.

Mr. BRADETTE: Is an amount being included in this vote to assist the hospital at Cochrane?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is an amount provided for a wing for the hospital.

Mr. BRADETTE: Is that an addition to the present wing?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): An addition.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I would like to ask the minister for some information with regard to the $15,000 to provide farm working outfits for graduates of Indian schools.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): When these boys and girls are graduated from the schools the church authorities encourage them to marry and settle down. We have formulated the policy of building a small house, buying a team of horses, a plough, and then, if possible, having a group of them get together and buy a binder which can be used jointly, and the vote is required for that purpose. This means of acquiring farm working outfits obviates a very vicious practice, that of the Indians buying goods on credit.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I have no criticism to make of the vote; I simply wanted information.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the expenses connected with Canadian national parks, historic sites, care of indigents in the parks, etc.—further amount required, including an amount to reimburse the provincial Government for the salary of police magistrate at Waterton Lakes Park, $34,698.

Costs of litigation and legal expenses—further amount required, $15,000.

Amount required to pay salaries and expenses connected with seed grain and relief collections, including half of expenses of seed grain and relief adjustment board—further amount required, $2,400.

To provide for expenses connected with the Supervisory Mining Engineer's Office due chiefly to the recent mining activities in northern Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan—further amount required, $27,500.

To provide for the payment to the province of Saskatchewan of one-half of the amount disbursed by that province for relief to needy settlers, $47,969.23.

To provide for surveys required in the Roseau river watershed in connection with reference re this matter made by the governments of Canada and the United States to the International Joint Commission, $15,000.

To provide for the expenses incurred under the Lake of the Woods Control Board Act, 1921, and under the agreement between the Dominion, Ontario and Manitoba, confirmed by the Lac Seul Conservation Act, 1928, for the construction of a dam at the outlet of Lac Seul and its operation by the Lake of the Woods Control Board and for the remuneration, at the rate of $1,000 each per annum, of Messrs. J. T. Johnston and K. M. Cameron, Dominion members of such board, the money expended to be reimbursed to the Dominion by the licensees of developed power sites on the Winnipeg river in Manitoba (revote), $144,091.10.

To provide for the expenses connected with Canadian national parks, historic sites, etc.—further amount required to provide for the purchase of the Southwold Indian earthworks site in the county of Elgin, $2,500.—Total, $289,158.33.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Could the minister give the committee some information with regard to the item of $47,969.23, to provide for the payment to the province of Saskatchewan of one-half of the amount disbursed by that province for relief to needy settlers?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This is a three-cornered obligation between the municipalities, the provinces, and the Dominion government, for relief in the purchase of seed grain. These amounts are required when the municipal authorities are unable to collect any portion of the advances which have been made. From time to time we are served by the provincial government with notice respecting accrued amounts which they are unable to collect, and they ask us to pay our share.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Is that policy carried out in the other provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes. In Alberta matters are being settled very largely by a board.

Mr. PARENT: I desire to commend the minister for publishing J. B. Mandley's report of 1928. This is a very excellent report, but I would like to urge upon the minister the publication in a short time of this report in a more complete form. My information goes to show that titanium ores can be used to-day as a pigment for paint. Tests have been made in European countries demonstrating the feasibility of their use for this purpose. I do not know that the Department of Mines has taken up the question of this particular use of these ores. Would it be at all possible, between now and next session, to have an engineer examine into this matter further with a view to ascertaining whether there is sufficient public interest to justify any expenditure in connection with such an investigation?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We are pursuing that investigation.

Mr. GARDINER: I should like to ask the minister a question with regard to this amount of $47,000, to provide for the payment to the province of Saskatchewan of one-half of the amount disbursed by that province for the relief to needy settlers. Has that recently been disbursed?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The provinces carry the losses. This is just the same as in Alberta. When it is ascertained that the amounts cannot be recovered, we divide the loss. We are simply carrying out the old agreement that was made.

Mr. GARDINER: This is the old agreement. I thought it was to cover recent disbursements?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—grant to the Western Stock Growers, $5,000.

Mr. FRASER: Who are the Western Stock Growers? What is this amount required for?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is a very active association with headquarters at Calgary, and is largely composed of ranchers; it does not take in the farmers. We have from time to time given them grants to assist them in their work.

Mr. FRASER: Is the minister sure that he has the name correct?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. FRASER: Is it not the Western Stock Breeders' Association?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No.

Mr. FRASER: I know an association called the Western Stock Breeders. Is this the same one?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No. This association is named correctly. It covers all of southern Alberta and part of southern Saskatchewan. Ranchers constitute 90 per cent of it.

Mr. FRASER: Does it include in its membership any of the British Columbia stock growers?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not sure; I cannot say definitely.

Item agreed to.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Post Office—Outside service—to compensate the widow of the late Thomas Jackson who was fatally wounded by bandits following the robbery of the Toronto and Fort William railway post office in train No. 4 near Parry Sound, Ontario, on August 18, 1928, $1,000.

To provide for payment of allowances from April 1, 1929, to railway mail clerks in charge of railway post offices, in accordance with provisions of order in council, P.C. 394-487, dated March 21, 1929, $160,000.

To provide for the readjustment of the salaries of certain postal employees in western Canada who were dismissed in 1919 and subsequently reemployed, to give them payment as from the date of their reemployment for services actually performed at the rates of remuneration paid to other employees for similar service, $100,000.—Total, $261,000.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the very minute amount of $1,000 to compensate the widow of the late Thomas Jackson who was fatally wounded by bandits following the robbery of the Toronto and Fort William railway post office in train No. 4, near Parry Sound, Ontario, in August, 1928. Is that per annum or is it just a total amount?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. VENIOT: That is the total amount.

Mr. ADSHEAD: It is a minute amount for a woman who lost her husband who was in the service when he was killed by a bandit. Just a few moments ago, under vote 373, we gave $1,200 to a man who lost an eye, and under vote 374 we gave $1,350 to a man who had sprained his knee. When we come to a man who lost his life, we give the widow $1,000 and that is all. I have no power to move to amend to make the amount $2,000, or I would do so. But I would be satisfied if it were an annuity for $1,000. Surely such discrepancies as these should not occur.

Mr. VENIOT: This was not an employee of the government. The person unfortunately killed under these circumstances was not, at the time he was killed, engaged in protecting government property. The bandits, after holding up the train and stealing from it, stole an automobile in which they placed the property taken from the train. While escaping, they ditched the automobile close to a farm house. One of the bandits went to the farm house to get a team to haul the automobile out of the ditch. During the progress of the work of hauling the automobile out of the ditch, the man who got killed had gone with his son to help the bandits, not knowing that they were such.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Was he killed accidentally?

Mr. VENIOT: I will explain. During the progress of hauling the automobile out of the ditch, those who owned the car and who had been following it up, came along. Two of the bandits escaped and one remained in the automobile. Shots were exchanged between those who owned the automobile and the two bandits who were hiding in the woods, and in the shooting this man was killed. The Ontario government, according to reports that I received, compensated the two brothers who owned the automobile, and the Canadian Pacific also gave them small amounts. When the matter was brought to my attention, in view of the fact that this farmer had been killed under such circumstances and that others who had been wounded, had been paid small amounts ranging from $250 to $300, I felt that we should at least recognize the services rendered by the man who lost his life and I recommended an amount of $1,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Why is it necessary to insert this item of $100,000 to provide for the readjustment of the salaries of certain postal employees in western Canada? Does the act not provide for that?

Mr. VENIOT: While this is statutory and the amount is fixed as an estimate of what it may cost, I consulted with the legal authorities and I was advised that the amount had to be inserted in the estimates and voted, because the statute reads: "Not to exceed $100,000."

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: This could not be in any way considered a second $100,000?

Mr. VENIOT: No.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: We seem to be voting $100,000 in the act and another $100,000 in this estimate. To my lay mind I could not understand how they could be one and the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I raised the same question at the time, and I was informed by the Department of Justice that the amount had to be voted.

Item agreed to.

Governor general's warrants, 1928-29—payment of expenses, Manitoba natural resources inquiry (governor general's warrant of August 1, 1928), $15,000.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the total cost of the Manitoba natural resources commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think it would be possible to give that information at the present time. The accounts are not all in as yet.

Item agreed to.

Governor general's warrants, 1928-29—to cover cost of testing cows and destroying such as are diseased (governor general's warrant of October 18, 1928), $100,000.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Why is it necessary to have a governor general's warrant for this purpose? I understand it has always been the policy of the department and the government to cover the cost of testing cows and destroying such as are diseased. Surely there must be an item in the estimates for the purpose. Why was it necessary so early after the session last year to have another amount provided by governor general's warrant?

Mr. ROBB: The question raised by my hon. friend is on a parallel with the criticism made of the Minister of Agriculture the other night in connection with delay in the payment of compensation for cattle and swine destroyed under the act. It is only fair to the Minister of Agriculture to say that when he was preparing his estimates for last year, the treasury board reduced the estimate that he put in. In August or September the Department of Agriculture represented to the treasury board that they wanted an additional $200,000 to meet compensation payments owing to an epidemic. We compromised by giving them $100,000.

Item agreed to.

Civil Service Commission—Contingencies—further amount required, including $1,500, to meet the cost of entertaining delegates to the National Assembly of Civil Service Commissions of the United States and Canada, which will be held in Ottawa in September, 1929, $16,500.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not going to delay the committee at all, but I wish at this stage simply to make a suggestion to the government. It arises out of the discussion that took place on the civil service and civil service matters this year, when we discovered that an apparent injustice is being worked on many people who apply for position and pass an examination. While the act provides for a reasonable probationary period, under a ruling of the Justice department the deputy ministers and the ministers have the power of dismissing without a fair trial the person appointed.

Mr. VENIOT: Not dismissing.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Of refusing to accept them; it is the same thing exactly All I am going to do at this stage is to ask the minister in charge to consider favourably the introduction next session of an amendment to the Civil Service Act which would provide for a fair trial before dismissal, in order that this injustice may not occur again. I went to the trouble of drafting an amendment which I now put on Hansard for the minister's guidance. Section 24 would be amended to read as follows:

24. The deputy head may, at any time before the expiration of six months, reject any person assigned or appointed to any position under his control or direction, provided such person has been given a fair trial therein, or he may extend the period of probation within which such person may be rejected for another six months, and the cause of rejection, or the reason for extending the period of probation, shall be reported by the deputy head to the commission. Provided further that, the commission may, at any time before the expiration of six months, cancel the appointment of any person who has been assigned or appointed, if it be discovered that such appointment was made without a full knowledge of the essential facts, or under circumstances which involved misrepresentation.

I put in the proviso in order to protect against the possibility of misrepresentation by the applicant, or the possibility of facts arising which would justify dismissal; for example, it might be discovered after appointment that the appointee had a criminal

record. I do not wish to press the matter at this stage, but I am going to ask the minister to take into his favourable consideration the introduction of an amendment to meet certain of the objections that were raised this year.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Does the hon. member suggest that if a man had a criminal record he would not give him a second chance?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, I would not go that far.

Mr. RINFRET: I promise my hon. friend the very best consideration of his amendment.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I would call the attention of the government to the very severe indictment of some of the departments as found in the unanimous report of the three civil service commissioners. I had proposed to deal with this at some length, but I shall reserve the right to take it up next session. I hope that amending legislation will be brought down, and that in the meantime conditions will be very much improved.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: It was brought out plainly in the house this session that when returns from the Civil Service Commission are ordered by the house the officers of the commission decide what papers shall be sent down to the House of Commons. My own feeling is that that is entirely improper. I do not propose to discuss it here, but next session I am hoping that the matter will be brought up so that we may be sure that when the House of Commons passes an order for the return of certain papers from the Civil Service Commission, those papers will be brought down.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish very strongly to support the position taken by the hon. member for Argenteuil and to point out specifically that in the returns made by the Civil Service Commission this year with respect to the Post Office Department there was held back from the file in almost every case the form which I hold in my hand, and which is essential to a full and proper understanding of the cases. This form is C.S.C. 240—Application for the position of postmaster. From most of the files that was withheld. The other form which should be included is C.S.C. 71—the report on applicants for a postmastership. Without these two forms a clear understanding of the case is obviously impossible, and I think provision should be made that in the future, irrespective of what may be the opinion of one or two commissioners, these public documents should be attached. I understand that in this particular case the chairman of the commission was quite willing and urged that the documents in question be included in every file, but the other two commissioners refused to approve the suggestion. That should not be the case.

Mr. RINFRET: I will take the matter up with the Civil Service Commission.

Item agreed to.

House of Commons—To provide for the full sessional indemnity to members of the House of Commons—days lost through absence caused by illness, official public business, or on account of death during the present session—notwithstanding anything to the contrary in chapter 147 of the revised statutes, 1927, an act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, or any amendments thereto. Payments to be made as the treasury board may direct, $40,000.

Mr. ADSHEAD: What is the meaning of the phrase "official public business"? Does that mean public business in connection with their work in the House of Commons, or public business that they may have in the cities where they reside?

Mr. ROBB: It is a phrase that has been used for many years in the estimates. Generally speaking, it applies to ministers who may be absent from the country on public duty. The ministers in the administration of their departments may be absent from Ottawa.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does it include such public business as attending elections in other parts of Canada?

Mr. ROBB: So far as this government is concerned that is not the case.

Mr. ADSHEAD: A number of members, I do not wish to mention any specifically, absent themselves from this house on the plea, I suppose, that they have personal business at home. That is what I was told by one member. He said he had paired with another member. I said, "Well, you are going to support blindly what your party proposes, and the other member will oppose blindly, for that is the effect of your pair." They draw their full indemnity.

Mr. ROBB: They do not come under this.

Mr. GARDINER: Are there many cases where members of the House of Commons and the Senate do not draw the full indemnity?

Mr. ROBB: I must refer my hon. friend to the Auditor General's report.

Mr. MANION: They all take the oath.

Item agreed to.

Legislation—general—printing, printing paper and binding, $60,000.

(B) Authorized by Statute

Senate

Salary of Speaker, $6.000.
Indemnity to senators, $384,000.
Transportation expenses of Senators, $5,000—total $395,000.

House of Commons

Salary of Speaker, $6,000.
Salary of the Deputy Speaker, $4,000.
Indemnity to members, including additional indemnity to Leader of Opposition, $990,000.
Travelling allowances, $14,000—total, $1,014,000.

Summary

Senate, $169,460.
House of Commons, $662,021.10.
Library of Parliament, $79,425.
General, $60,000.
To be voted, $970,906.10.
Authorized by statute, $1,409,000—total, $2,379,906.10.

Mr. KENNEDY: What has been done in regard to the salaries of members' stenographers?

Mr. SPEAKER Subject to the decision of the Board of Internal Economy, and at the request of the chief of the stenographic branch, I have decided to increase the salaries of the stenographers by one dollar per day. I may say that I have received a vote of thanks from the staff. They are all satisfied.

Mr. KENNEDY: Is it retroactive?

Mr. SPEAKER: It starts from April 1.

Mr. GARDINER: Does the increase apply, for instance, to your own secretary, to my secretary and to the secretaries of the whips?

Mr. SPEAKER: What salary does the hon. gentleman's secretary get?

Mr. GARDINER: Five dollars a day.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the maximum.

Mr. GARDINER: Then the secretary-stenographers who have more responsibility than the stenographers are not getting any increase. Now all the stenographers will be on the same salary basis.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I go beyond the established minimum and maximum it creates a precedent which would be invoked in other branches. As I have said, the staff is satisfied. However, I will look into the matter.

Mr. GARDINER: I would impress upon the Speaker this point, that a secretary such as mine has more important duties to discharge than the ordinary stenographer's.

An hon. MEMBER: Not a particle.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will look into the matter.

Mr. KENNEDY: I understand a vast improvement has taken place because of the action of the Speaker and the Board of Internal Economy, but everything is not yet satisfactory. For instance, the room is too small; the noise caused by a number of typewriters in operation at the same time is distracting; many of the typewriting machines ought to be scrapped.

Mr. SPOTTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. KENNEDY: A little over a year ago the senate stenographers got an increase up to $5 a day as a maximum, retroactive to the beginning of the last session. I wish to quote from a report of the committee of internal economy, sessional paper No. 4 of 1928, page 5:

Whereas the staff was twice reorganized but never classified since the year 1921—

This is dealing with another matter, but I wish to quote the argument:

—while certain senate officers have recently been given higher salaries than similar House of Commons' officers, although the business of the lower house in consequence of its long sittings is far more exacting than that of the senate, and regard should be had of this fact in appointing employees and fixing their salaries.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has been done by the senate itself. I have consulted the chief of the stenographic branch, Mr. Smith, who knows everyone of our stenographers downstairs, and he says they are perfectly satisfied. There are some other discrepancies as between the senate and the House of Commons yet to be adjusted. For instance, the accountant of the House of Commons, although he is far busier than the accountant of the senate, yet ranks lower in salary. Some day there must be an adjustment made as regards the officers of the two houses.

Mr. KENNEDY: This session the Prime Minister made a good deal of the point that the government should be a model employer. As the senate and the House of Commons staffs are practically one organization, it seems to me ridiculous that the officials of the House of Commons do not get the same pay for the same kind of work as their fellows in the senate.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the further payment of claims for compensation for loss sustained by the civil population of Canada during the late war, interest thereon and cost of administration, $4,200,000.

Mr. FRASER: When will those cheques go out?

Mr. ROBB: Not until they are approved by the governor in council at least.

Mr. FRASER: How long will it be before the cheques are mailed?

Mr. RINFRET: As soon as the session is over and this is assented to. We have made preparations and some of the cheques have been already written, and we expect that before the end of two or three weeks at least most of the claimants will have been reached.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All the supply has now been voted with the exception of a few items relating to agriculture. I do not know whether hon. members would care to continue in session now or resume possibly at two o'clock; if we were to do so we might make certain of having prorogation at five. If the committee is agreeable I will move that we continue sitting now.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: We might pass all the items except No. 45 in the main estimates.

Mr. KENNEDY: I do not think it is fair to go on now. Members interested in certain items may have gone, thinking the house would rise at one.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It takes a little time to arrange for prorogation; His Excellency has to be advised in time to attend. Would it be taking too much for granted if I were to advise His Excellency that prorogation might conveniently take place at five o'clock, assuming that we resume at three?

Mr. GARDINER: How many items are left?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The only items are No. 45 in the main estimates, and in the supplementaries 361-2-3-4-5.

Mr. MANION: We might pass them all now and reserve discussion under the main item.

Mr. KENNEDY: There is one which I wish to discuss.

Mr. FRASER: Has item 1 been passed yet?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. FRASER: When was it passed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Some days ago.

[Mr. Kennedy.]

Mr. FRASER: It stood over at my request; I had a question to ask the Minister of Finance.

Mr. ROBB: It must have been passed in the absence of my hon. friend; it was a question of bonding. The hon. member can bring it up again.

Progress reported.

Resolutions read the first and second time and concurred in.

PRIVATE BILLS

REFUNDS OF FEES AND CHARGES—RULING, MR. SPEAKER

Mr. ROBB: I have been requested to make a motion for the remission of certain amounts paid in relation to legislation that did not go through, but I do not feel that I can make that motion in view of the ruling you gave, Mr. Speaker, the other day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may inform the house that several members have asked for the remission of fees in connection with bills which have not been proceeded with. It is essentially contrary to section 35 of the Consolidated Revenue Act, which stipulates that any fees received by the officers of the house shall be deposited at the bank, when they become the property of the Receiver General of Canada. To remit such fees would require an estimate from the Minister of Finance.

Section 54 of the British North America Act is quite specific in this regard; no expenditure can be made unless it is preceded by a message of approval from His Excellency. This is quite clear under the Consolidated Revenue Act as well as under the British North America Act and therefore the request is absolutely untenable and cannot be entertained.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If hon. members would agree, I would move that the intermission to-day shall terminate at two-thirty o'clock. That would give us an extra half hour as leeway in arranging for prorogation at 5 o'clock.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: It seems a very unfair motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Very well, I will drop it immediately.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Some members have gone away—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was merely seeking to accommodate the house; that is all.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Progress reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following message:

Ottawa, June 14, 1929.

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate chamber to-day at 5 p.m., for the purpose of proroguing the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
E. C. Mieville,
Secretary to the Governor General.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Health of animals, administration of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act and Meat and Canned Foods Act, and necessary buildings, $2,450,000.

Mr. KENNEDY: I stated that I wanted a little information with regard to item 363, which provides a grant of $100,000 to the executive committee of the World's Grain Congress. I would like the minister to make a short statement with regard to this item, and I particularly want to know whether this $100,000 is the full amount the Dominion government will contribute, and also whether or not a statement will be rendered showing the details of the expenditure, the salaries and so on, or whether this is a straight grant.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I asked my deputy to prepare a short statement giving a synopsis of the situation, and this synopsis is before me now. This grain show and congress to be held in Regina in 1932 is to be international in character, and the governments of all possible competing countries are being communicated with. The show is to be held on the Regina exhibition grounds, and the exhibition board there is planning to erect quite extensive buildings to accommodate the show. The manager of that exhibition is very closely identified with the preparations, as are also the president and directors, who are named in a little pamphlet which is before me; I can give the names if desired. The different ministers of agriculture throughout Canada are included also.

Contributions toward prize money are being sought from the Dominion government and from many companies and associations interested in one way or another in grain; the railway companies might be particularly mentioned in this connection. It is anticipated that very generous prizes will be offered for wheat of different varieties and the coarse grains as well as for grass and clover seed. A tentative prize list has been worked out and much interest is being displayed in the matter by governments and by farmers, particularly those on the prairies.

I may say that this movement was started by a number of leading farmers and others in the province of Saskatchewan with the intention of having it under provincial auspices. After they had worked along those lines for a year or so they came to the conclusion that diplomatic connections with other countries would not be very easily obtained through provincial sources, so a large deputation came to Ottawa and asked that the Dominion government take it over. My department now has charge of the affair, as we had charge of the World's Poultry Congress two years ago. All the preliminaries have been engaged in and in Toronto last November a large meeting was held of all those interested in this movement for the purpose of arranging a tentative prize list. Those interested in this matter include all ministers of agriculture and prominent men interested in the agricultural life of the country; there are subcommittees, finance committees and all the other requisites in connection with a large enterprise of this nature.

Replying to the second part of my hon. friend's question as to whether any further assistance will be sought, I imagine that it will, according to this memorandum. One of the purposes for which this vote is asked is that the officers may go about the country from place to place in order to canvass for subscriptions for this prize list, and that will cost quite a bit of money. Among others I anticipate that all governments will be given an opportunity to contribute. I might also point out that while some are disposed to make the prize list and the exhibition proper the great feature of the show, that is not in the minds of those who are initiating this great movement. They have recognized that

during the last few years, particularly since the war, the quality of Canada's wheat has been depreciating, and the primary object of this great enterprise is to improve the quality of our wheat, partly through an exhibition, at which all competitors will be inspired to attempt to excel each other, and partly through papers and addresses on the various diseases to which the cereal world is subject, so the educational value of such a show will be very great.

Mr. KENNEDY: It seems to me that we are going to pay a big price for this show, and while the instructional value of the addresses and papers may amount to something it seems to me that $100,000 or possibly $200,000 spent in scientific work would go much further in providing a way to overcome diseases such as rust and smut. I have a great deal of doubt as to the value of this vote, but I do not intend to oppose it in the meantime. However, I would like to know what control may be exercised, as far as this house is concerned, with regard to the expenditure. Are we absolutely through when this money is expended, or will there be a report made to this department giving all the details?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This department will be well represented on the various boards, and I happen to be the chairman. Among other things which will be taken up at the various conferences—because there will be some six or eight sections running concurrently in order that all the ground may be covered in a reasonable time—are soils, physics, chemistry, bacteriological cultural methods, weeds, experimental methods of seed production and registration, farm management, fertilizers, eradication or control of insect pests, agricultural machinery, harvesting, markets, grading, merchandising, storage and transportation requirements, and also milling and baking tests. It is a very comprehensive program indeed.

Mr. KENNEDY: Are there any of these questions on which we have not pretty full information at present?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have never found an occasion of this nature, which brings together all the experts of the wheat growing world, which has not been of very great value indeed. It has been my privilege from time to time to attend a number of international conferences both in the United States and Canada, and I have obtained a great deal of very valuable information from them. I think it is generally conceded that we should use all the forces available to put our wheat once more in its old position.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): As an advertising project I think that this has merit; I think it will be a fine way of attracting the attention of the world to Canada and its possibilities, agricultural and otherwise. The educational work carried on by the Department of Agriculture has conveyed to those of us who are interested enough to study all the information which is known about this subject. Will a complete accounting be made of the expenditure under this vote?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That will be made to parliament?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is more than a grant, then?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. There will be a very close supervision kept of the expenditure because we are well represented upon the committee.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): A mere supervision of the expenditure is not enough; will the house be presented with a statement, properly audited?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: What progress is being made with regard to the prevention of tuberculosis in cattle?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The matter of tuberculosis eradication was taken up by the committee on bovine research which met in Ottawa last winter. Very extensive experiments were reported, both by the authorities in Alberta and by the various subcommittees throughout Canada which are cooperating in this work. Nothing was brought forth which would indicate that any additional light has been thrown upon the virtues of any superior system other than the one we are trying out at the present time, the B.C.G. This vaccine has received a good deal of publicity and it is admitted that a certain amount of immunity is imparted to the young animals through inoculation, but that immunity is only of comparatively short duration and has not proven to be 100 per cent perfect. Further research work has been undertaken, not only here, but practically in all the research stations in the world, including that of the League of Nations, in an endeavour to find out the actual virtues of the B.C.G. vaccine.

Until our scientists are able to discover a more effective method, we propose to continue along the line we are following. The last court of appeal to which the B.C.G. vaccine has been submitted is that of the League of Nations, but they have decided on further experimentation before giving any decision. I believe a six-year period of research has been decided upon before this vaccine can be recommended, and perhaps not then.

Mr. GARDINER: What progress has been made with the research work being carried on at Hull?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have obtained the least immunizing results from our work with B.C.G. at our Hull laboratory and the most immunizing results from the provincial laboratory in Alberta. I think the difference in results is due to the length of time the experimental animals were kept before being slaughtered and to a certain degree some difference in the virulency of the germ or tubercle bacilli.

Mr. GARDINER: Is there any literature available which would give those interested the results of these experiments?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is the report of our own department and the report of the research council. We have received some reports from the League of Nations which are very interesting, and if we could pick out the most interesting parts and have them embodied in a small bulletin I think it would make very interesting reading.

Mr. GARDINER: I would suggest that the minister take into consideration the printing of this literature and its distribution to the members of the House of Commons.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will.

Mr. LUCAS: How many restricted areas are there in Canada, and how many have been added during the past year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is the Fraser River valley, in British Columbia; Last Mountain area in Saskatchewan; Carman district in Manitoba; Prince Edward county in Ontario; the Beauharnois-Huntingdon in Quebec, which extends eastward to the Richelieu river and then further eastward to the St. Francis river; a small area in New Brunswick about ten miles out of Fredericton; the entire province of Prince Edward Island; the entire province of Nova Scotia, with the exception of Cape Breton. We intend to extend this year the Carman area in Manitoba northward to lake Manitoba. The principal work to be engaged in this summer, however, will be in the province of Ontario between the junction of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence rivers and the Rideau canal. That area will take in a little over ten constituencies and I think it will keep us fully occupied for the next year. Four constituencies will be added in the province of Quebec in order to connect up the area with eastern Ontario. We are trying to build up a beautiful Ottawa, and we should endeavour to build up an hygienic Ottawa as well.

Mr. LUCAS: What amount of compensation was paid last year?

Mr. BROWN: I hope the minister will keep in mind the extension of the common area southerly and southwesterly from its present boundary and taking in the municipalities of Pembina, Stanley and Rhineland. This would round out the common area by extending it to the international boundary. I think application has been made from at least two of these municipalities to be included in the area.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand that it will be necessary to include but one municipality in order to reach the international boundary, and to include one on the east to reach the Red river; the area would extend to the international boundary on the south, the Red river on the east and the Assiniboia river on the north, which would make a very satisfactory area.

Mr. LUCAS: What amount of compensation was paid last year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: For restricted areas, $867,132.

Mr. LUCAS: That is getting very close to a million dollars, is it not?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The other was the accredited herds and we have about thirty areas under what we call the municipal order; for instance, cities like Ottawa and Guelph are under the old municipal order of fifteen years ago. That and the accredited herds make up the balance between this sum and $1,000,000.

Mr. FRASER: What is the status in connection with the $146 to which I referred?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Might I ask my hon. friend the result of the negotiations between himself and my deputy since this morning? He will recall that at the nice little conversation that took place in my office, I pointed out that I did not see how, with three authorities deciding in writing against his contention and in favour of mine, we could make any progress. So it was proposed

that he and my deputy should endeavour, by going down to-morrow morning to the Civil Service Commission—I do not know what kind of weapons they are going to take with them—to get results.

Mr. FRASER: I claim the decision made by the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission was hardly fair to the man who was claiming the compensation. Am I to understand that if I am to make that point clear, the minister will pay the $146?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would be glad to pay that amount and get rid of the whole question, but I do not see how I can do it. We have dozens and, indeed, hundreds of such claims, and if we pay a claim without justification, we open the door to innumerable others.

Mr. COOTE: I should like to say a few words to the minister in regard to the salaries of the research men in his department. It is very hard for some of us to understand the policy of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the expenditure of money for different purposes. I think the minister is on record as saying that the research men in his department should be paid higher salaries than they are receiving at the present time. He will not deny that we have lost the services of several valuable men who have been engaged in research in connection with rust, simply because we did not pay them sufficient salaries. I thought a year ago that no doubt by this time the salaries of such men would have been readjusted, but no action has yet been taken. I was wondering whether the minister would be good enough to tell us why he is granting $100,000 towards the grain exposition which is to be held at Regina and has not yet succeeded in getting fitting salaries for men engaged in research work. I am credibly informed that we are going to lose some more of these men this year because the government has dilly-dallied with the question for so long. The government finally got a report from the Civil Service Commission, recommending an increase of salary to these men. The Minister of Finance, who last year would not give us any encouragement in regard to the matter, because, as he said, the Civil Service Commission had not reported, now assumes the attitude that he is going to have another commission inquire into the case again. Has the minister not been able to convince the cabinet that it is really necessary that these research men should be paid a little more, and would the minister say that in his opinion the expenditure of $100,000 for the grain exposition is more justifiable than paying these men increased salaries? I am anxious to know the attitude of the minister. Does he think this advertising scheme is more important than the retaining of these research men in his department, because I am satisfied—and the minister must be of the same opinion—that he is going to lose one or two valuable men if their salaries are not adjusted before another year passes by?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As my hon. friend knows, we have had from the Civil Service Commission a report which has in turn been referred to a commission composed of Mr. Beatty, Doctor Murray and Sir George Garneau. While the matter is before that commission, I do not see how we can make any comments that would be germane to the question, except that I might say that I have never ceased endeavouring to have agriculture recognized as being on a parity with other departments in the matter of salaries. I have always taken the ground that a technical man in agriculture is worth just as much to the country as a technical man in any other department. That was not recognized even by the Civil Service Commission, until about a year ago. The question has arisen: What constitutes a technical man? And the committee has that question before it.

Mr. COOTE: Opposition is often expressed to the proposal to pay the research men in the Department of Agriculture a little more money because it is said that the department is spending too much money now. I am not saying that such is the case; but if the cabinet are willing to spend only a certain amount in connection with the Department of Agriculture, it would be much better to spend this $100,000 in paying these research men higher salaries and to do without the grain exposition which is, after all, merely an advertising proposition.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, no.

Mr. COOTE: While they are advertising we may lose a man whose services might be of just as much value to the country as those of Doctor Saunders, the man who propagated marquis wheat and placed it on the market for the benefit of the farmers of Canada. The minister is pursuing a rather unwise policy in this regard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no reason in the world why both these services should not be carried on and both these expenditures made. The situation would not be improved by abandoning the world exposition because, as I understand the question, it is one not of the money, but of deciding what constitutes technical men. That is what the

Beatty commission is working out now. My deputy reminds me that the other day he and others had the opportunity of being heard before the commission. I was not there, but I can imagine what kind of evidence my deputy would give and I understand that it was favourably received. Everything is being done that can be done in this regard. Long before I came here I was told that the staff were constantly on the job, endeavouring to get their technical men on an equality with others,

Mr. COOTE: If this commission should decide that a number of men who are now engaged in what is called research work in connection with rust at Winnipeg, are technical men, is there any provision whereby the salaries of such men can be adjusted now without the necessity of waiting until parliament meets again?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Prior to a recent ruling, we could get an adjustment by a new classification, but apparently such general advantage was taken of this that a ruling was made that any such classification would not take effect until the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. GARDINER: Could the minister explain the reason why these men cannot secure increases when it seems to be so easy for the deputies to secure them?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend asked a question in regard to the proposal to grant increases to technical men. As he knows, a royal commission has been appointed and at the present time is meeting expressly for the purpose of advising the government what, in the opinion of its members, should be paid to these professional and technical men in the government service. The government hopes to be governed in its decision by the report of that commission. The fact that it has appointed this commission is evidence of the desire of the government to see that those coming within the categories mentioned are properly and adequately paid.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I ask the Prime Minister if that was not the purpose of the reference to the Civil Service Commission of this same question some time ago?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was, but unfortunately the Civil Service Commission gave an answer that I do not think my hon. friend would approve of. Certainly the government did not approve of it. We think that the suggestion of the Civil Service Commission was most inadequate. We felt that the professional and technical men were entitled to very much better recognition than the Civil Service Commission was prepared to grant them, and for that reason we appointed a royal commission to look further into the matter.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It will take its guidance, I take it, from the remarks just now made by the Prime Minister that the salaries should be increased over the rates recommended by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think as respects certain of those concerned that my hon. friend may take that pretty much for granted.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That will be all to the good, but I frankly look with a good deal of dread and disappointment at the continuous delays on the part of the administration in this matter. They have simply passed the thing on from one year to another. The Prime Minister's excuse at this moment may be a very legitimate and a very laudable one, that the government desire to give an increase to the technical men greater than that proposed by the Civil Service Commission. I think perhaps that that is worth while waiting for. In the meantime let us hope that the words of the Prime Minister may be an encouragement to these technical men who are now thinking of leaving their present positions in Canada, and that that encouragement will help them to continue in their present positions.

Mr. COOTE: My only reason for delaying the committee one minute on this question is that I am credibly informed that we are liable to lose one or two of the most valuable men we have engaged in research work in connection with rust, which after all, is one of the biggest problems facing agriculture in Canada. If the remarks of the Prime Minister are correct, I am a little surprised that the government did not accept the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, and if they felt that the technical men were not being adequately compensated by the increases recommended by the Civil Service Commission they could then very well have appointed the royal commission which is now sitting and empowered them to recommend further increases to such of the technical men as they think should receive it. As I said, we are very liable to lose one or two men, particularly one whom we should find it impossible to replace, and who will likely go to the United States at an initial salary of

$10,000 whereas we pay him around $3,000. The government should take a little more intelligent interest in what I consider to be some of the most vital questions affecting agriculture in Canada to-day, instead of taking so much interest in these advertising shows.

Progress reported.

Resolution read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance): I beg to move:

That the resolutions adopted in committee of supply on April 24, 25, 26, 29, May 3, 6, 10, 20, 28, 29, 30, 31, and June 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, be now read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FRASER: I asked the Minister of Finance a question just before the committee rose at one o'clock—

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no debate on the motion.

Mr. ROBB: By unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might put his question.

Mr. FRASER: I had asked the Minister of Finance a question in regard to the audit board and he made the following reply: "Perhaps later on I might let any one item stand and give that information to my hon. friend when I have secured it." I wonder if the minister would put the information on Hansard.

Mr. ROBB: The information with respect to the Board of Audit which my hon. friend asked for is as follows:

Board of Audit

Remuneration—Annual

Chairman, Gordon W. Scott, $4,000.
Members, L. E. Potvin, $3,000; E. J. Howson, $3,000.

The rates of compensation for skilled assistance, authorized by the treasury board, are:
Partners, not over $50 per diem.
Senior clerks, not over $35 per diem.
Assistant clerks, not over $15 per diem.

In addition to these rates both the members of the board and their assistants are allowed actual travelling and living expenses.

Work authorized and completed

Treasury board minute of February 21, 1927 authorized inquiry and investigation into certain branches and accounts of the Department of Finance. The report of the board was completed on December 16, 1927 and tabled during the session of 1928.

Treasury board minute of March 24, 1927 authorized the board to inquire into and report on the financial affairs of the Quebec harbour commission. The report of the board was completed on January 16, 1928 and tabled during the session of 1928.

[Mr. Coote.]

Treasury board minute of March 24, 1927 authorized an audit of the affairs in connection with the enemy property and debt accounts. The report of the board was completed and laid before parliament during the present session.

Work authorized but not yet completed

Treasury board minute of November 16, 1928 authorized the board to inquire into and report on the accounts and records of the Canadian government elevators and the western and eastern grain inspection divisions.

Treasury board minutes of January 25, 1929 authorized the board to inquire into and report on the financial affairs of the following harbour commissions:

Halifax harbour commission.
St. John harbour commission.
Montreal harbour commission.
Quebec harbour commission.
Chicoutimi harbour commission.
Three Rivers harbour commission.
Vancouver harbour commission.
New Westminster harbour commission.

Treasury board minute of January 25, 1929 authorized the board to inquire into and report with regard to the loaning operations of the Soldier Settlement Board of Canada.

Treasury board minute of January 25, 1929 authorized the board to inquire into payments to the Canadian National Railways under the Maritime Freight Rates Act.

Treasury Board minute of January 25, 1929 directed the board to inquire into and report in regard to collection of naturalization fees by the clerks of courts.

Expenditures of the government in connection with the board to March 31, 1929 were:

Fiscal Year	Compensation to Members	Other Expenses	Total
1927-28.. ..	$10,000	$61,317 64	$71,317 64
1928-29.. ..	10,000	59,851 71	69,851 71

Mr. FRASER: In regard to premium bonds, I have been reviewing this question considerably during the session, all based on the report of the Auditor General. I do not propose to discuss it at the present time, as I have already spoken about it, but I would suggest that the minister appoint an inter-departmental commission to review the whole question of indemnity bonds so far as the collection and distribution of the revenue of the country is concerned. As chairman of the commission I would suggest Mr. Finlayson, the superintendent of insurance, and as to the other members, the Minister of Finance knows his officials better than I do.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has already brought this matter to the attention of the house. He may recall that I said some days ago that we had asked the Department of Justice for a ruling as to the legality of the procedure. We have made up our minds to have an inter-departmental inquiry made if the ruling of the Department of Justice is that the present method is not legal. In any

event, I think that it would be profitable to have an inter-departmental inquiry, so that we can report to parliament next session.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

SUPPLY BILL

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. ROBB moved:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1930, the sum of $243,168,149.17 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Robb thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 365, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1930.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REPORT ON ORGANIZATION OF THE STAFF

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to lay before the house the hardy annual—the report of the organization of the staff of the House of Commons.

On motion of Mr. Rinfret the report was concurred in.

PRIVATE BILLS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that the house proceed to the order "private bills."

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

THIRD READING

Bill No. 357, for the relief of Isabella Henderson.—Mr. Heaps.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 316, for the relief of Catherine McRae Beattie McRae.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 337, for the relief of Edward Ernest True.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 338, for the relief of Glennville Wesley Potter.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 339, for the relief of Elizabeth Mitchell.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 340, for the relief of Edith May Enfield.—Mr. Howden.

Bill No. 341, for the relief of Lillian Elizabeth Barton.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 360, for the relief of Ruth Oretta Taaffe.—Mr. Donnelly.

Bill No. 361, for the relief of Frank William Benson.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 362, for the relief of Hilda Rebecca Allison.—Mr. Jelliff.

Bill No. 363, for the relief of Sydney James Black.—Mr. Hay.

Bill No. 364, for the relief of Llewellyn John Chubb.—Mr. Anderson (Toronto-High Park).

LOUIS COIT DARGAVEL

The house in committee on Bill No. 348, for the relief of Louis Coit Dargavel—Mr. Casselman—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

Mr. HEAPS: This bill, Mr. Chairman, provoked considerable discussion last Tuesday evening, and by a majority vote it was referred back to the private bills committee. I think it hardly fair under the circumstances that the measure should be brought up at this late hour; it is not right, because there is so much involved in it. Certain evidence was supposed to be submitted to the senate committee but they claim they had not time to go into the matter. I do not think we should rush these bills through the house with undue haste without giving the parties concerned an opportunity for a proper hearing. This undue haste leaves a bad impression, and for the sake of the house itself I think we should adopt a better method of dealing with these cases. I do not want to move an amendment, but in view of the fact that the bill was referred back to the special committee for the purpose of taking further evidence I think we should have an explanation from the chairman of the committee as to why the matter is now before us without having been properly inquired into.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. HEAPS: No. Is the chairman of the private bills committee present?

Mr. BROWN: I was prepared to speak in opposition to this bill and to give reasons why it should not carry. When the bill was before the house a few evenings ago I was not then familiar with the evidence and therefore I did not vote on the question at that time; I was entirely ignorant of the circumstances.

Afterwards I reviewed the evidence to the best of my ability and I wish now to place before the committee as well as I can the situation as it appears to me.

The petitioners in this case seemed to rest all their evidence, in the first place, upon the alleged fact that the respondent and the co-respondent had been living together as man and wife in a certain block in the city of Rochester. A witness was brought before the senate committee to prove that. The janitress testified that these people had been living there under the assumed name of Rugg. The name of the co-respondent is Kottmeir. The janitress, as I say swore that these people had been living there under this assumed name. She was brought here evidently at the earnest solicitation of a private detective named Wilcox. If you read the evidence you will see that it required a good deal of persuasion on the part of the private detective to get that woman to come; but finally she was persuaded to appear and give evidence. Later evidence was brought that entirely rebutted that testimony. It was shown that Rugg was not a fictitious name but the real name of a man who had been living with his wife in these apartments at the time in question. There was at least suspicion that perjury had been committed in the case. It was shown that the woman who was living in these apartments did not in any way resemble the respondent; the respondent is, I understand, a woman of medium size while the wife of Rugg was a large, tall woman. So that this at least gives countenance to the belief that there had been perjury in the matter. At any rate, the evidence was completely overthrown by the testimony of the former janitor, a man named Shaw, and of his wife, who proved that Rugg and his wife had occupied the apartment at the time the respondent and the co-respondent were alleged to have occupied it. The testimony on that point seemed absolutely conclusive, and the whole case rested in the first place upon that allegation. But when that was overthrown they sought to bring in evidence on another point. This private detective Wilcox accordingly swore that he had seen the respondent and the co-respondent going into another apartment or apartment block—for there seemed to be some confusion on that point—on three different occasions. On two of these occasions, he said, he watched them going into the apartment but he did not see them coming out, and on the third occasion he saw them going in at a certain time early in the afternoon and coming out about five o'clock. This is an entirely uncorroborated statement on the part of the private detective, who we have reason to believe was guilty of bringing forward false testimony in regard to the other apartments. His testimony is entirely unsupported. At the very best it would be only negative evidence; he says he saw them going in but did not see them coming out. On the third occasion however, as I say, he saw them coming out a few hours later but he did not follow them further than to the door of the apartment house. When the case was brought before the senate committee counsel for the respondent wished to bring forward further evidence; at least, he sought a delay in order that he might submit additional testimony. And to support his request for an adjournment he produced certain affidavits. He did not produce them by way of evidence, because the senate committee does not admit affidavits as evidence; he produced them to support his plea for a further adjournment. He was not granted the length of adjournment he wished; he was given a short adjournment which did not afford him an opportunity to bring the evidence he wanted. The affidavits produced are here and I believe they are in proper order. I am not accustomed to dealing with these matters, but so far as I can see they are in perfectly proper order. And the affidavits are to the effect that during the time covering the dates on which the respondent and the co-respondent are said to have been seen going into the apartment house, the man was sick in bed and therefore could not possibly be seen by the private detective as alleged. There is, it is true, another incident that took place in the Oliver apartments, but even in respect to that incident nothing more than an inference can be drawn, and both the respondent and the co-respondent give what seems to be a reasonable explanation of what happened there.

Remember, then, these facts: The statement upon which the whole case was based turned out to be false; it was absolutely disproven. Then there was the private detective, who, we have reason to believe, induced the janitress to come here and commit perjury. I saw her affidavit in which she withdrew the statements she had made. What weight, then, can be given to the testimony of that private detective?—because after all it is on his evidence we must depend. I have reviewed the case very hastily and only as a layman, but it seems to me that the charges against the woman have not been proven, and I think this committee should throw out the bill.

[Mr. Brown.]

Mr. HEAPS: I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HEAPS: I am rather in doubt as to what would be the effect if we rise and report progress now. I am under the impression that if the committee rises and reports progress we will have to proceed with the third readings of the other bills which have been reported. If that is the case I would like the motion to stand, otherwise I would withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman is moving that the committee rise and report progress on this bill?

Mr. HEAPS: No, on all the bills; but before the motion is put I would like to know whether it would mean that the other bills will receive third reading now. I do not want to prevent them from being read the third time, but I am opposed to this bill

The CHAIRMAN: Bill 348 is now before the committee and it will be necessary for the committee to decide if this bill should stand while we report progress on the other bills. Is it the desire of the committee that the proceedings in connection with Bill 348 and Bill 296 should stand for the moment while progress is reported on the other bills?

Motion agreed to.

CHARLES EDWIN WALKER

The house resumed from June 11 consideration of the motion of Mr. Sanderson for the third reading of Bill No. 296, for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker.

Mr. FRANKLIN SMOKE (Brant): In the absence of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Sanderson) I beg leave to move the third reading of this bill. I have read very carefully the evidence taken before the senate committee and I think it proves conclusively the charges alleged in the petition. An adjournment was asked for by the respondent for the purpose of producing a cousin named Mrs. Henderson. The adjournment asked for was not allowed but one of ten or twelve days was granted. Mrs. Henderson did not appear at the adjourned hearing, and counsel for the respondent appeared simply to ask for the expunging of certain portions of the evidence. The senate committee then heard the further evidence and found in favour of the complainant. The evidence which it was alleged Mrs. Henderson would give was in the nature of an alibi. The respondent and Mrs. Henderson were residing together, but it is not reasonable to suppose that Mrs. Henderson would have been able to prove where the respondent was on the three occasions upon which it was alleged offences occurred. One might have happened in one month, the next one two months later, and so on; therefore the evidence as to an alibi could not be conclusive. The bill was referred by this house to the private bills committee and the complainant and his lawyer were present but no one appeared for the respondent although the agent in Ottawa was notified. I therefore beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. ADSHEAD: I was a member of the private bills committee—

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman is moving the previous question?

Mr. SMOKE: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: When the bill was before the house I understand that the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) moved an amendment thereto; has Your Honour that amendment?

An hon. MEMBER: There was no seconder.

Mr. SPEAKER: The records show that there was no amendment. If the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Gardiner) will read No. 43 of the order paper he will find that it reads as follows:

Resuming debate on the motion of Mr. Sanderson for the third reading of Bill No. 296, intituled: "An Act for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker" (Without amendment).

There is no amendment before the chair, but the previous question is always debatable.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Do I understand Your Honour to rule that it is not debatable?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is debatable.

Mr. ADSHEAD: As I remember the case, there was a material witness who was unable to appear before the senate committee because she had undergone a very serious operation. This witness was to prove an alibi for the respondent. It would be a very serious matter to this lady if a divorce were granted upon the grounds of adultery without her being given every opportunity to prove otherwise.

Mr. SMOKE: I rise to a point of order. If my motion is debatable the subject matter referred to by the hon. member who has just taken his seat should not be discussed. He is discussing the merits of the case.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is debatable.

Mr. SMOKE: The motion is that the question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was asked a minute ago whether the motion for the previous question was debatable or not and I said that it was debatable. Let me call attention to standing order 38 which reads:

> The following motions are debatable:—
> Every motion
> (c) for the previous question.

Therefore, when a motion is made for the previous question, it is debatable. I have been asked by some hon. members what is meant by the previous question. Those who vote in favour of the previous question, that is, that the question be now put, vote for an immediate decision, without any further debate or amendment, after this vote is taken, on the principle of the bill. After the motion for the previous question is carried, there is no discussion on the principle of the bill.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Smoke) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Baldwin,	Robb,
Bancroft,	Ross (Kingston City),
Bell (St. Antoine),	Ryerson,
Bock,	Sanderson,
Bowen,	Senn,
Bowman,	Simpson,
Casselman,	Sinclair (Wellington North),
Elliott,	Smoke,
Fraser,	Spotton,
Hepburn,	Steedsman,
Johnston (Long Lake),	Stewart (Leeds),
Kay,	Stirling,
Kellner,	Taylor,
McLean (Melfort),	Telford,
McIntosh,	Thorson,
McKenzie,	Totzke,
McPhee,	Vallance,
McRae,	Ward,
Malcolm,	Young (Saskatoon).—40.
Neill,	
Ralston,	

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,	Garland (Bow River),
Benoit,	Heaps,
Bourassa,	Jelliff,
Brown,	Kennedy,
Campbell,	Letellier de St. Just,
Coote,	Lucas,
Fansher (Last Mountain),	Luchkovich,
Forke,	Smith (Stormont),
Gardiner,	Speakman,
	Spencer.—19.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the third reading of bill No. 296, for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker. Moved by Mr. Smoke, seconded by Mr. Senn, that this bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed, on division.

LOUIS COIT DARGAVEL

Mr. A. C. CASSELMAN (Grenville-Dundas) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 348, for the relief of Louis Goit Dargavel.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On Section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. HEAPS: I beg to move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion (Mr. Heaps) negatived.

Section agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Preamble agreed to on division.

Title agreed to on division.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the report be received?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Next sitting of the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The house will have to decide. There is no amendment to the bill. Those in favour of having the bill reported now will kindly say aye.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those opposed will kindly say no.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the ayes have it. When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. GARDINER: Next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: In cases of pressing necessity, the sponsor of the bill can ask for the third reading now.

Mr. CASSELMAN: In view of the statement that you have just made, Mr. Speaker, and considering that this is almost the last minute of the session, this case is urgent, and I would therefore move with the leave of the house that the bill be now read a third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is for the house to say. Standing order 77 says:

All amendments made in committee are reported by the chairman to the house, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report the bill is open to debate and amendment, before it is ordered for a third reading. But when a bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the house.

Motion agreed to, on division, and bill read the third time.

Mr. CASSELMAN moved that the bill do now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Speaker, we did not hear you say that the bill was read a third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh yes, I put the question quite audibly. It is now moved that the bill do now pass and the title be as on the order paper. Is there objection to that?

Mr. GARDINER: Certainly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion will kindly rise.

Mr. BOURASSA: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are in full house and a registered vote should be taken upon this motion. The vote cannot be taken by counting heads.

Mr. SPEAKER: I asked that the names be called as usual. Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Casselman) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Bancroft	Robb,
Bell (St. Antoine),	Ross (Kingston City),
Bock,	Ryerson,
Bowen,	Sanderson,
Bowman,	Senn,
Casselman,	Simpson,
Elliott,	Sinclair (Wellington North),
Fraser,	Spotton,
Hepburn,	Steedsman,
Johnston (Long Lake),	Stewart (Leeds),
Kay,	Stirling,
McLean (Melfort),	Taylor,
McIntosh,	Telford,
McKenzie,	Thorson,
McPhee,	Totzke,
McRae,	Vallance,
Malcolm,	Young (Saskatoon).—36.
Neill,	
Ralston,	

NAYS

Messrs:

Adshead,	Garland (Bow River),
Baldwin,	Heaps,
Benoit,	Jelliff,
Bourassa,	Kellner,
Brown,	Kennedy,
Campbell,	Letellier de St. Just,
Coote,	Lucas,
Fansher (Last Mountain),	Luchkovich,
Forke,	Smith (Stormont),
Gardiner,	Speakman,
	Spencer.—21.

At 4.50 p.m. the sitting was suspended until 5 p.m. this day.

The house resumed at five o'clock.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

A message was delivered by Major A. R. Thompson, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the senate chamber.

In the senate chamber, His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

BILLS ASSENTED TO

An Act to amend the Railway Act.

An Act for the relief of Calvert Mitchell Carruthers.

An Act for the relief of Florence Jane Sheppard.

An Act for the relief of William Ernest Foulkes.

An Act for the relief of Harry Babington Millward.

An Act for the relief of Alla Chretter.

An Act for the relief of Myrtle Virginia Maulson.

An Act for the relief of Claude Le Cheminant.

An Act for the relief of Alice Gladys Barkey.

An Act for the relief of Irene Mabel Usher.

An Act for the relief of Anna Estella DeNike.

An Act for the relief of Elizabeth Spain.

An Act for the relief of Louisa Hitchman.

An Act for the relief of Minerva Elliott.

An Act for the relief of Edyth May Shields.

An Act for the relief of Mary Melvina Guerin.

An Act for the relief of Marion Ruth Laidman.

An Act for the relief of Sophia Love.

An Act for the relief of Harry Freeman Switzer.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point on the Murray Harbour Branch to a point on the Georgetown Subdivision of the Canadian Government Railways, in the Province of Prince Edward Island.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from Sunnybrae to Guysborough, in the Province of Nova Scotia.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point on the Dundas Subdivision near Brantford to a point on the Dunnville Subdivision near Cainsville, in the Province of Ontario.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Line from a point on the Garson Branch to the Falconbridge Mine, in the Province of Ontario.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point on the Sudbury Branch to a point in the Township of Fairbank, in the Province of Ontario.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point near Melfort to a point near Aberdeen, in the Province of Saskatchewan.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point near Central Butte or Mawer to a point in Township 18 or 19, Range 10, 11 or 12, West of the Third Meridian in the Province of Saskatchewan.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from Neidpath to a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway near Swift Current, in the Province of Saskatchewan.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from Ridgedale, in the Province of Saskatchewan, thirty miles toward The Pas, in the Province of Manitoba.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point near Unity to a point near the Provincial Boundary in Township 36 or 37, in the Province of Saskatchewan.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point near Hamlin to a point near Glenbush, Medstead or Robin Hood, in the Province of Saskatchewan.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from St. Walburg, in the Province of Saskatchewan, to Bonnyville, in the Province of Alberta.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from Alliance to a point near Youngstown or Dobson, in the Province of Alberta.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point at or near Bulwark to a point in Township 38 or 39, Range 8, West of the Fourth Meridian, in the Province of Alberta.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from Hemaruka to Scapa, in the Province of Alberta.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from a point near Swift Creek to a point near Tête Jaune, in the Province of British Columbia.

An Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line from New Westminster to a point on Lulu Island, in the Province of British Columbia, with Branches therefrom.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Act (Private Secretaries).

An Act respecting The Toronto Terminals Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Canadian National Railways Act.

[Mr. Speaker.]

An Act respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway.

An Act to authorize consent to the sale of certain cable and wireless telegraph undertakings established under the Pacific Cable Acts, 1901 to 1924 (Imp.), and the West Indian Islands (Telegraph) Act, 1924 (Imp.).

An Act for the relief of Agnes Victoria Leader.

An Act for the relief of Adèle Cawthra Rogers.

An Act for the relief of Madelaine Virginia Lumsden.

An Act for the relief of Edgar Charles Buchanan.

An Act for the relief of Isabel Honor Gilderoy.

An Act for the relief of Harvey Baden Powell Haney.

An Act for the relief of John Campbell.

An Act for the relief of Joseph Nicholl.

An Act for the relief of Marjory Lavinia Bradford.

An Act for the relief of Patrizio Nardini.

An Act for the relief of Constance Mary Kearns.

An Act for the relief of Edna Louise Brown.

An Act for the relief of Wallace Evered Gillespie.

An Act for the relief of Florence May Forbes.

An Act for the relief of Susannah Musson Savery.

An Act for the relief of Maud Parker.

An Act for the relief of Eleanor Vair.

An Act for the relief of Lillian Augusta Dunn.

An Act for the relief of Catherine Goring.

An Act for the relief of Mary Bertha Dupuis Ranger.

An Act for the relief of Ivy Georgina Lloyd.

An Act for the relief of Helen Steele.

An Act for the relief of Annie Forbes Sangster.

An Act for the relief of Charles Stanley Cuneo.

An Act for the relief of William Allan Griffith.

An Act for the relief of Sydney Bishop.

An Act for the relief of Walter Henry Lyne Dixson.

An Act respecting the Canadian National Railways, and to provide for the refunding of certain maturing financial obligations.

An Act to amend the Fish Inspection Act.

An Act to provide for a further loan to the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners.

An Act to provide for a loan to the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners.

An Act to provide for a further loan to the Chicoutimi Harbour Commissioners.

An Act to provide for a further loan to the Halifax Harbour Commissioners.

An Act respecting the Administration of Justice in the Yukon Territory.

An Act to provide for a further loan to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff.

An Act to amend the Excise Act.

An Act respecting Joliette and Northern Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Premier Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.

An Act respecting a certain patent of Zebulum Colvin Ketchum.

An Act for the relief of Frederick Rutherfoord Zoppi.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Southwood.

An Act for the relief of Bessie Ruth Glass.

An Act for the relief of Edith Marie McFarlane.

An Act for the relief of Cleoniki Paleologou Drakoulas.

An Act for the relief of Nanette Coffey.

An Act for the relief of James Graham McCreadie.

An Act for the relief of Stephen Dymon.

An Act for the relief of Marion Isabel Kemp.

An Act for the relief of Elizabeth Crawford Copping.

An Act for the relief of Arthur Alderton.

An Act for the relief of Elias Abraham, otherwise known as Elie Abraham Allen.

An Act for the relief of Claude Frederick Burgin.

An Act for the relief of Mary Addie Linton.

An Act for the relief of Edna Maud James.

An Act for the relief of Helen Jane Sim Pittendreich.

An Act for the relief of Alfred Roy Edwards.

An Act for the relief of Molly Vaughan.

An Act for the relief of Myrtle Mary Jane McLean.

An Act for the relief of Jeanie Mathieson Howell.

An Act for the relief of Gordon Asher True.

An Act for the relief of Ida Rosenberg.

An Act respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway.

An Act respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Saint John and Quebec Railway.

An Act respecting certain employees of the Postal or Railway Mail Service of Canada.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act.

An Act to amend an Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line between Grand'Mere and East Burrills, in the province of Quebec.

An Act to amend an Act respecting the construction of a Canadian National Railway Line, being a joint section from Rosedale southeasterly in the province of Alberta.

An Act respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of The Kent Northern Railway.

An Act respecting Canadian National Railways and to authorize the acquisition of the Inverness Railway.

An Act respecting a certain patent of Cobb Connector Company.

An Act respecting a certain patent of Jean Baptiste Hurteau.

An Act for the relief of Marie Rose Beffre Baer.

An Act for the relief of Ethel Evelyn Farrow.

An Act for the relief of John Alfred Neary.

An Act for the relief of Charles Storey.

An Act for the relief of Eva Alexandra Grayson Smith.

An Act for the relief of Ernest Gillespie Simpson.

An Act for the relief of Laura Grace Osborne Lea.

An Act for the relief of Gertrude Helena Martin.

An Act for the relief of Laura Warren.

An Act for the relief of Ethel Elizabeth Kelley.

An Act for the relief of Andrew Ralph Wilson.

An Act for the relief of Marion Jane Stewart.

An Act for the relief of Mildred Muriel Lange.

An Act for the relief of Linda Lydia Snowdon Pascoe.

An Act for the relief of John Garbery Hickman.

An Act for the relief of Lydia Alice Hinch.

An Act for the relief of Allan Plant.

An Act for the relief of Pansy Jean Van Luven.

An Act for the relief of William Treslove.

An Act for the relief of Annie Letticia Smith.

An Act for the relief of Frederick Herman Schelke.

An Act for the relief of Jennie White.

An Act for the relief of Alma Berlinda Swayne.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Evelyn Lawrence.

An Act for the relief of Daniel Ray Bouvier.

An Act for the relief of Edyth Viola Beacock.

An Act for the relief of Bertha Nichols.

An Act for the relief of George Nelson Brown.

An Act for the relief of Albert Victor Walter Holman Homan.

An Act for the relief of James Duncan Gerard.

An Act for the relief of Frances Vera Carter Van Luven.

An Act for the relief of Violet Haney.

An Act for the relief of James Thompson Clark.

An Act for the relief of James Collingwood Darroch.

An Act for the relief of Ross James Smalley.

An Act for the relief of Alexander James Purse.

An Act for the relief of Wilfred Keith Black.

An Act for the relief of Fanny Green Fuchs Webber.

An Act for the relief of Henry Lawrence Jones.

An Act for the relief of Dean William Moncrieff.

An Act for the relief of William John Brett.

An Act for the relief of Grace Viola Byers.

An Act for the relief of Mildred Soden.

An Act for the relief of Mabel Graham.

An Act for the relief of Velma Stella Seadon.

An Act for the relief of Emma O'Grady.

An Act for the relief of Edna Marguerite Stroud Robinson.

An Act for the relief of Gordon Hanna.

An Act for the relief of Joseph Richardson.

An Act for the relief of Angus John Archibald Blaine.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Horace Sillery.

An Act for the relief of George Melville Fulton.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Elizabeth Boyd.

An Act for the relief of Annie Fraser Rice.
An Act for the relief of Clarence Spurgeon White.
An Act for the relief of Gertrude Georgeanna Anderson.
An Act for the relief of Lloyd Edward Angel.
An Act for the relief of George Stanley Warner.
An Act for the relief of Vincenzina Gramigna.
An Act for the relief of Kenneth Evan Thompson.
An Act for the relief of Thomas Matthews Moland.
An Act for the relief of Andrew Townsley Hirsch.
An Act to incorporate the Northern Alberta Railways Company, and respecting the Canadian National Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
An Act to provide for the payment of Claims for Compensation for loss sustained by the civil population of Canada during the late War.
An Act to amend The Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.
An Act respecting Water Power in the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.
An Act to amend the Supreme Court Act.
An Act to amend the Penny Bank Act.
An Act to amend the Special War Revenue Act.
An Act to amend the Insurance Act.
An Act respecting Central Finance Corporation.
An Act respecting The Dominion Fire Insurance Company.
An Act respecting Alliance Nationale.
An Act to ratify and confirm the organization and the election of directors of Fami'y Trust, and to change the name of that company to "Financial Trust Company."
An Act to incorporate The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada.
An Act for the relief of Henry Feldman.
An Act for the relief of Marion Rose Harrison.
An Act for the relief of Robert Wilson Reoch.
An Act for the relief of William Edward King.
An Act for the relief of John Wilson Pickering.
An Act for the relief of Wallace Wellington Corkum.
An Act for the relief of Marion Anne Terry
An Act for the relief of Joseph Edwin Wood.
An Act for the relief of Dora Chearnley Chearnley.
An Act for the relief of William Edgar Baird.
An Act for the relief of Edith Laura Hewitt.
An Act for the relief of Bertha Jane Phelan.
An Act for the relief of Roland Emory Anderson.
An Act for the relief of Olive Marion Gerrard.
An Act for the relief of John Beck.
An Act for the relief of George King.
An Act respecting The New Brunswick Railway Company.
An Act respecting Juvenile Delinquents.
An Act to amend The Precious Metals Marking Act, 1928.
An Act for the relief of Ruth Leonard Wiser.
An Act respecting the construction by the Canadian National Railway Company of certain terminal facilities with grade separation and other works at and in the vicinity of the city of Montreal.
An Act respecting The Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Dominion of Canada General Insurance Company."
An Act to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act.
An Act to amend the Canada Grain Act.
An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act.
An Act respecting The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada.
An Act for the relief of Stella Pearl Duncan.
An Act for the relief of Hurley Alexander Fummerton.
An Act for the relief of Barbara Elise Sewell de la Penotiere.
An Act for the relief of Oliver Milton Martin.
An Act for the relief of Mary Jane Teeson.
An Act for the relief of Sam Gladstone.
An Act for the relief of Charles Smolkin.
An Act for the relief of James Franklin McDonagh.
An Act for the relief of Joseph Louis Philippe Corbeau.
An Act for the relief of Frances Thirza Edlund.
An Act for the relief of Vivian Elizabeth Pearce.
An Act for the relief of Alice Clarke.
An Act for the relief of Kathleen Mary Hambourg.
An Act for the relief of Florence Gertrude Singer.
An Act for the relief of Mabel Bullis.
An Act for the relief of Fanny Elizabeth Reed Kendall.
An Act for the relief of Robert Henry Dunlop Ellis.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Cowie.
An Act for the relief of Enid Marjorie Judd.
An Act for the relief of Vera Alice Griffin.
An Act for the relief of Cristina Adams Bourne.
An Act for the relief of Ruth Agnes Townsend.
An Act for the relief of William John Blight.
An Act for the relief of Kenneth Blackwood Gibb.
An Act for the relief of Edith Spencley.
An Act for the relief of Annie Farrow.
An Act for the relief of Evelyn Mae Warren.
An Act for the relief of Vera Maud Gendron.
An Act for the relief of Lillian Ainsworth.
An Act for the relief of Sarah Berkovitz.
An Act for the relief of George Frederick Wilson.
An Act for the relief of Roy Franklin Beattie.
An Act for the relief of John George Laney.
An Act for the relief of Albert Nott.
An Act for the relief of John Thomas Legge.
An Act for the relief of Emil Henry Hornburg.
An Act to amend the Fisheries Act.
An Act for the relief of Catherine McRae Beattie McRae.
An Act for the relief of Edward Ernest True.

An Act for the relief of Glennville Wesley Potter.

An Act for the relief of Elizabeth Mitchell.

An Act for the relief of Edith May Enfield.

An Act for the relief of Lillian Elizabth Barton.

An Act for the relief of Isabelle Henderson.

An Act for the relief of Ruth Oretta Taaffe.

An Act for the relief of Frank Willian Benson.

An Act for the relief of Hilda Rebecca Allison.

An Act for the relief of Sydney James Black.

An Act for the relief of Llewellyn John Chubb.

An Act for the relief of Charles Edwin Walker.

An Act for the relief of Lewis Coit Dargavel.

To these bills the royal assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name His Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these bills.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Excellency:

The Commons of Canada have voted supplies required to enable the government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons I present to Your Excellency the following bill:

An act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March 1930.

To which bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this bill the Clerk of the Senate, by command of His Excellency the Governor General, did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this bill.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the third session of the sixteenth parliament of the Dominion of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

I desire to express my appreciation of the expedition with which you have conducted the proceedings of the session of parliament now concluded, and of the attention given by you to its exacting duties.

It is gratifying to observe that it has again been possible to effect a further reduction of taxation, and also a substantial reduction in the public debt.

The improvement in Canada's financial position has been paralleled by a continuous improvement in the financial position of the Canadian railways and by a steady growth in manufacturing and in domestic and foreign trade. The acts making provision for another comprehensive program of branch line construction by the two railway systems, for the acquisition by the Canadian National system of certain lines of railway in different provinces, for the construction of adequate terminal facilities at Montreal, for the completion of the Hudson Bay Railway and harbour facilities at Fort Churchill, and for further loans to the harbour commissioners of our national ports, are indications of your recognition of the urgent demand for more adequate transportation and trade facilities.

The policy of promoting the expansion of trade by assisting the establishment of steamship services abroad has been amply justified. The Canadian National service inaugurated last year to ports in South America has required the addition of more ships than was at first contemplated, and the West Indies service has attracted an inereasing export trade. Provision has been made for an increased service to South Africa, also for establishing a new connection with Australia and New Zealand. Provision has also been made for an increase in the number of trade commissioners in foreign countries.

Resulting from an exhaustive inquiry and a unanimous report by the standing committee of the House of Commons on agriculture and colonization, amendments have been made to the Canada Grain Act respecting the storage, shipping, mixing, inspection and grading of grain, which it is believed will more adequately protect the standards of Canadian grain and prove of benefit to the producers.

With a view to the improvement of the existing electoral system, a special committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the Dominion Elections Act and the Currupt Practices Inquiries Act. After devoting much time and study to the several subjects submitted for its consideration, this committee also presented a unanimous report, in accordance with the recommendations of which important amendments to the Dominion Elections Act have been enacted. Among other changes introduced by this legislation, provision is made for the future appointment of returning officers by the chief electoral officer, and for a more efficient method of preparing election lists in urban centres.

Among other important measures enacted were bills respecting pensions to employees of the Canadian National Railways, also amendments to the Narcotic Drug Act, the Fisheries Act, the Insurance Act, and the Juvenile Delinquents Act.

The report of the royal commission appointed to inquire into the financial readjustments incidental to a transfer to the province of Manitoba of its natural resources has been received. The report will be made the basis of negotiations between the governments of the Dominion and the province with a view to effecting a final agreement.

A postal convention has recently been signed whereby the rate of postage between Canada and France has been reduced.

The approval of parliament has been given to the general treaty for the renunciation of war; to the protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare, and to the convention and protocol between Canada and the United States regarding the Niagara falls and the Niagara river.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the generous provision you have made for the public service.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The progress of His Majesty's convalescence has given cause for deep thankfulness during recent months. I share your sincere hope that the complication which has lately developed may be of brief duration and that His Majesty's health may soon be completely restored.

In taking leave of you at this time, I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest upon your labours.

This concluded the third session of the sixteenth parliament.

END OF VOLUME III.